

I wish to make the following comments. Please note I have indicated concerns and would like to speak to the hearing.

At the hearing I hope to have more specific information and figures.

I am making this submission as an individual. However I was a Christchurch City Councillor from 2001 -2013, the Council appointee on the Greater Christchurch Urban Development group until 2010 and am currently Deputy Chairperson of the Halswell,Hornby,Riccarton Community Board. In addition in the post Eathquake Council I went on a study tour to Melbourne to look at how Melbourne had developed its city. The Halswell,Hornby,Riccarton Board has the experience of rapid planned growth in Halswell and intensification In Riccarton.

1. I am concerned we are embarking on this path when the same issues were before the Independent Hearings Panel in 2015. Many hours were spent before the panel and in mediation and local communities should not be having to embark on this process so soon after the Hearings Panel met and decided the Christchurch District Plan. The Hearings Panel looked at growth projections and the current need for housing In Christchurch. There were differing views - a planning consultant for CERA was pushing for further land to be made available , while I and others had figures showing the housing market had reached an equilibrium.

2. Growth projections more than ten years out are merely projections. I note you have adopted the medium growth projections. However It could be that the lower growth projection is the more accurate. I suggest figures for both the medium growth and low growth be used.

3. In the table on Page 11 , the authors project that in 2048 , 71% of housing demand in the city will be met by private rentals. This ownership rate falls far below current trends. While home ownership rates are declining , it does not seem realistic to see private rentals at 71% of the market in Christchurch,particularly as Selwyn and Waimakairiri have ownership rates of 33% and 36 % respectively.One cannot predict the actions of future governments- some of whom will intervene in the market to ensure home ownership remains a cornerstone of NZ society. Our current government is intervening strongly.

4. There seems to be sufficient housing allocation for Christchurch City. Yet the front page of The Press on Saturday November 24 had the headline “Housing Shortage Predicted for the City”. Yet In Table 3 on Page 13 It indicates the Christchurch Housing Target is 55,950 while the capacity is 59,950. Therefore major urban planning changes for Christchurch need not occur. As a Councillor in the immediate post earthquake Christchurch we opened up land at the request of Central Government to ensure there was sufficient room for the future. It is important that if there is no predicted housing shortage for Christchurch City it is made very clear in the future documents.

5. It is important to recognise that intensification in Christchurch has led to poor outcomes and pressured living. The area intensified for some years is the southern side of Riccarton Road- now medium density. This means that older single homes on one section are demolished, creating 4 new apartments. This area is no longer inhabited by families. In each apartment there can be 4 young people and potentially 4 cars. If we take for example there are three cars for each four bedroomed unit, there are 12 cars from one section. This creates parking difficulties, young people not parking close to their apartment with increased safety issues, parking on berms, destroying green spaces and difficult congested driving conditions in narrow streets. There is also a high turnover of residents. The residents in this area experience pressure every day. Residents from other areas [Richmond, Linwood, Phillipstown] recently presented before Council as they are just starting to experience this intensity of living.

5 The central city is seen and should be the place for intensification. Allowing intensification in the suburbs cuts against Council's wish for people to inhabit the central city and potentially undermines the concept of a central city and viability of central city retailers. This is an issue for Christchurch City, but I ask you to indicate there needs to be no further intensification in suburban Christchurch beyond what is currently permitted.

6 If intensification is further considered there must be an understanding that any area that the Hearings Panel judged to be inappropriate for medium density should retain suburban density. Many residents have spent hours preparing submissions before the Independent Hearings Panel to retain suburban density, which the Hearings Panel mandated in the

Christchurch District Plan; they should not be forced to go through this again. Two examples were the areas around Condell Avenue and Riccarton House and Bush to Matai Street.

7 Research undertaken by University Canterbury indicates young couples with children prefer a house with some land and are purchasing on the outskirts of Christchurch or growing towns such as Rolleston. Currently young couples with children do not want the intensified housing we have seen in Riccarton. { I hope to provide this research at the Hearing.}

8. Christchurch is not Auckland { 1.6 million} nor Melbourne { 4.8 million} nor London {8.1 million} or Paris[12.7 million] .It appears we are being pressurised into a different form of urban living by pressures appearing in other cities. Christchurch does not have the pressures of these larger cities and one of its advantages is that it is liveable ,attractive and easy to move around. I could also add affordable.

Please do impose a model from overseas or Auckland pressures on Christchurch City.

9 Areas deemed medium density cannot be changed , but please do not create any more areas of this nature. Areas naturally intensify through old homes being removed and two to three townhouses going up where there was one house.

If medium density is to be continued it must be a different form of medium density with allowance for parking and more courtyard space and plantings.

In conclusion there is sufficient land in Christchurch City for the long term with low to medium growth. There is no need to focus on further medium density areas and efforts should be made in the new District Plan to make medium density areas more liveable.

Those residential areas that have maintained their suburban density rating through the Independent Hearings Panel should not be reconsidered.

Helen Broughton

Tel |

Email