

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT
DISTRICT PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management
Act 1991 and the Canterbury
Earthquake (Christchurch
Replacement District Plan)
Order 2014

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Transport Proposal

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN PAUL JORDAN
SUBMITTER #1098 AND #1122
9 JUNE 2015**

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. SCOPE
3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
4. MINIMUM LEGAL DRIVEWAY WIDTH

DECISION SOUGHT

Appendix 7.7 Table 7.10 (i) AMEND the minimum legal width from 3.3m to 3m

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Christian Paul Jordan. I am a residential landlord and developer based in Christchurch. I have been involved in property in Christchurch since 1996.

1.2 I have previously submitted to the Panel on the Residential and Commercial Chapters.

2. SCOPE

2.1 My submission relates to the minimum legal width for 1-3 units.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3.1 The operative plan allows 3m. The current proposal requires a more restrictive 3.3m despite the formed width of 2.7m being the same.

3.2 If the 0.6m landscaping strip requirement is removed from the residential chapter, there is no need to increase the width requirement from 3 to 3.3m.

3.3 Many existing sites where two or three units can be built have existing 3m driveways. Also many sites with existing buildings cannot provide a 3.3m legal width but can adequately provide a 2.7m formed width.

3.4 For at least 20 years the driveway width for 1-3 units has been 3m. This has not caused any obvious problems and there is no reason for change.

4. Minimum Legal Driveway Width:

- 4.1 The rationale for increasing the minimum legal width from (the operative) 3m to the proposed 3.3m appears to be the requirement for a 0.6 m landscaping strip. As this strip is under review and was removed from the latest proposal on the residential chapter, then this width change also should be reviewed.
- 4.2 Another option would be to leave the 3.3m requirement for “greenfield” developments, but to return the requirement to 3m for infill and existing driveways.
- 4.3 Increasing the width requirement would not only restrict development on existing rear sites, but limit infill housing – which as noted in my evidence given in the residential chapter, provides the lowest cost new housing.
- 4.4 Irrespective of whether the minimum legal width is 3 or 3.3m, a reduction of legal width to no less than the formed width should be allowed as a restricted discretionary activity (with no neighbours consents required) for 1-3 units where either:
- i) the existing buildings restrict the possible driveway width. or
 - ii) the existing driveway is less than the required width
- This is in general how the operative plan has been applied, as many infill single lot subdivisions have been approved with drive widths under 3m due to existing buildings on site.

Christian Jordan



9 June 2015