

# Developers' Survey, July 2021

## Executive Summary

Forty one developers, landowners and some involved in the real estate sector completed an online survey in late June/early July 2021. They responded to questions about their views on the demand and supply of land for residential and business development within the Greater Christchurch area, supply issues or barriers to development, and development intentions and possible timing for these. The collated information will assist in informing the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan.

The low response rate to the survey means it is difficult to draw informed conclusions, however, there are some clear, common views expressed across the survey that reflect some elements of the development sector's interests and opinions.

### Residential development

- Key factors that drive residential developers' interest in development are demand for residential new builds, location (e.g. proximity to transport), the availability, cost and condition of land and zoning, and predictability of consenting processes.
- A wide range of areas were signalled of interest to respondents, across all three territorial authorities.
- Developers prefer to build stand-alone single and two storey dwelling, single and two storey multi-unit complexes, with smaller interest in other housing types. These preferences are driven primarily by high market demand.
- Key attributes that residential buyers look for in a property are house design (2-3 (or 4) bedrooms and layout), lifestyle factors (near the beach or park), streetscape, neighbourhood character and school zoning, section size and landscaping. Internal garage and other off-road parking, privacy and orientation to the sun, ease of heating and freehold title appeal.

### Smaller homes and higher density living

- Developers anticipate increased demand for smaller-sized dwellings, and in single storey, easily accessible and older-elderly persons' housing. They expressed interest in higher density developments, preferring 3-4 storeys rather than higher. Financing higher density developments is an issue, along with consenting.
- Privacy, private outdoor space, natural light and house design, including internal garage are key considerations people look for in higher density developments. Lack of these features deter buyers, along with developments that are too high or seem crowded.

### Greenfield development

- Developers reported having greenfield development underway or intending to start within the next 1-3 or 4-10 years. A small number said they intended selling within the next decade; only one indicated they did not intend doing anything with their greenfield land.
- Solid staging of greenfield residential developments is occurring at most phases of development over the next three years (from stage 1 – stage 5 developments).

- Difficulties with restrictive or complicated District Plan rules and regulatory processes were cited as barriers to development of greenfield land, with some mention also of infrastructure capacity and timing issues and difficulties developing some land.
- Standalone detached, single storey dwellings are the preferred housing type by developers as this is where the market demand lies.
- A few respondents commented on the extent to which respective district plans' enable greenfield development and made suggestions for how councils could better support it.

#### Business land development

- The small number of respondents who commented on business land development (for industrial, retail or office use) renders it difficult to make robust summary comments. However, they did identify factors that make business land appealing to develop (e.g. proximity to customer base, car parking and market demand) and barriers (land availability, District Plan requirements, zoning and impact of development on surrounding activities).

#### Christchurch Central city

- A small number of respondents commented on central city development.
- However, a number responded to questions about the impact of the removal of the car parking requirement on development, with the majority saying it has a large or some impact on viability/feasibility of development and will affect the amount of on-site parking that will be provided.

#### Other comments and responses

- A very small number of respondents were from the real estate sector – their views mirrored those of land owners and developers.
- Several respondents provided additional final comments on their perspectives of the overall development sector and issues they have experienced.

## Method

A survey of developers, landowners, and those involved in real estate was run between 28 June and 12 July 2021. The purpose to help the Greater Christchurch Partnership better understand:

- developer/landowner views on the demand and supply of land for residential and business development within the Greater Christchurch area which includes Christchurch City, and parts of Waimakariri and Selwyn districts
- any supply issues or any other barriers to development
- development intentions and the possible timing of these.

Staff from Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council compiled the list of recipients to receive the survey invitation, based on respective property rating data and their knowledge on the development sector. One hundred email invitations were sent, along with 400 by mail. Additional time was allowed for mail delivery. A reminder was sent to email recipients a week from closing date.

A letter of introduction from the Greater Christchurch Partnership Manager encouraged invitees to complete the survey online. An explanation outlined how councils across Greater Christchurch are

working together with central government to develop the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan. The Plan will set the strategic direction for the growth and development of Christchurch city and its surrounding towns now and in the future, and in the context of climate, technological, societal and demographic change. This survey is an important first engagement with the development sector as we progress our evidence base, and we will be talking further with the sector as we develop the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan.

It was made clear that the results individual responses will not be made public, however they may be broadly summarised as part of any statements or findings on business and residential demand and supply.

There was a low level of response, with 41 separate responses received within the timeframe. However, most respondents indicated they are happy to remain in touch with regard to future contact about development matters, so there is opportunity for ongoing engagement.

Note: To supplement the online survey, and further support spatial and intensification planning work, face-to-face interviews were undertaken with a small number of developers. These delved further into understanding interviewees' experiences, aspirations and issues with land development matters.

## Responses

### 1. Respondents' development interests

Note: respondents could respond to more than one category

- 29 respondents identified as landowners
- 20 respondents identified as land owners and developers
- 1 identified as a developer only
- 1 respondent identified as real estate agent
- 2 respondents identified as 'other' (property consultant, new home builder)

### 2. Residential development

#### *Locations and influences*

##### *2.1 Intentions to acquire land for residential development*

- Christchurch (9)
- Banks Peninsula (1)
- Selwyn (6)
- Waimakariri (6)

##### *2.2 Specific areas/locations of interest listed*

- Rangiora (3), Central City (3), Harewood (3), Halswell (2), St Albans (2), Waikuku (2), Woodend (2), Addington (2), Belfast, Bottle Lake, Cashmere, Charteris Bay, Coutts Island, Darfield, Duvauchelle, Edgware, Fernside, Ilam, Kaiapoi, Kennedy's Bush, Lincoln,

Marshland, McLeans Island, Ohoka, Papanui, Pegasus, Prebbleton, Ravenswood, Riccarton, Rolleston, Shirley, Spreydon, Sydenham, Tai Tapu, Templeton, Upper Riccarton, Waltham, West Melton, Woolston, Yaldhurst.

### 2.3 Other preferred areas for development

Putting aside where land is available, preferred land for residential development: Christchurch City (8), Selwyn (5), and Waimakariri (5).

### 2.4 Main factors that influence undertaking residential developments

- Demand for residential new builds (9)
- Convenient transport options (8)
- Character of neighbourhood (8)
- City or District Plan Zoning (ability to build particular house types) (7)
- Cost of land (7)
- Proximity to amenities (shops, facilities, services) (6)
- Market values of residential new builds (5)
- Land currently available (6)
- Predictable consenting process (5)
- Good ground conditions (5)
- School zones (5)
- Ability to cost effectively connect to infrastructure (5)
- Increase in land value in the future (4)
- Other (3)
- Lifestyle factors (6)
  - *Individual comments: – Beaches, Waikuku Beach and outdoor activities nearby, friendly town, proximity to rural amenities, water ways, new primary school, great access via new northern bypass; relaxed environment of Woodend and easy commute; Rangiora is good for retirees and has enough shopping options*

## Types of development preferred – developers/land owners

### 2.5 Unit types considered for residential development

- Stand-alone detached single story dwelling (18)
- Single storey multi-unit complex (includes duplex, townhouse, terrace, semi-detached, attached units) (13)
- Stand-alone detached two storey dwelling (11)
- Three storey multi-unit complex (includes duplex, townhouse, terrace, semi-detached, attached units) (8)
- Apartment - Two to four storeys (6)
- Apartment - High rise four storeys or more with a lift (3)
- Retirement Village (2)
- Other (1)
  - *Individual comment: Small rural hamlet style providing small individual land area but with outlook over productive farms or 'unit title' farms'*

### 2.6 Main reasons for preferring these types of development

- High market demand (17)
- Good profit (4)
- It's our company model (4)

- Ease of building consent (1)
- Ease of resource consent (1)
- Other (10)
  - *Individual comments: Provides visual balance and variety to give character to our town; it's good to have hi-density housing close to service centres, better living conditions for families; we provide and wish to continue to provide larger lots – 600-850m2.*

## **Preferred housing attributes – buyers**

### *2.7 Attributes potential buyers are seeking in the location of their new home or section*

- House design (number of bedrooms, layout etc) (9)
- Lifestyle factors (e.g. near the beach or the hills) (8)
- Its streetscape, street trees and gardens (8)
- The character of the neighbourhood (e.g. the look and feel of the houses) (7)
- School zones (7)
- Section size (6)
- Landscaping (6)
- Proximity to amenities (shops, parks, community facilities) (6)
- Value for money in comparison with elsewhere in Greater Christchurch (5)
- Convenient transport options (3)
- Access to employment areas (2)

### *2.8 Housing type and number of bedrooms most commonly requested by buyers*

- 3 bedrooms (15)
- 2 bedrooms (15)
- 4 bedrooms (12)
- 1 bedroom (3)
- More than 4 bedrooms (3)
- Don't know (5)

### *2.9 Property specific features that potential buyers are demanding*

- Internal garage (11)
- Living space orientated to the sun (11)
- Private outdoor space (10)
- Other off-road parking (8)
- Easy to heat (8)
- Freehold (9)
- Energy efficiency (6)
- Security (5)
- Lawn (3)
  - *Individual comments: Location is the most important. Buyers start with the location they want to live in. They then compromise on all the other factors.*

## **Smaller dwellings**

### *2.10 Likely impact of demand for smaller dwelling on type of development pursued now/future*

- Will have a large or some influence on them now (16); small or no influence (7)
- Will have a large or some influence on future development pursued (22); small influence (1)

### 2.11 Appetite to consider developing/offering based on growth forecasts suggesting there will be increased demand for small dwellings

- Smaller dwellings (1-2 bedrooms) (18)
- Single story dwelling that are easily accessible (14)
- Older-elderly person housing (8)
- Multi-unit attached developments (2-3 storeys) (6)
- Apartments (4-6 storeys) (5)
- Locations that may have greater appeal to buyers of smaller homes (e.g. where there is good public transport, close proximity to shops and parks etc) (5)
- Partnering with public and/or community housing providers (ie public and social housing) (4)
- Apartments more than 6 storeys (2)
- Retirement village (1)
- Other (1)
  - *Individual comment: Much of the demand for smaller 1-2 bedroom houses is to do with affordability not the actual size. If you could develop 3 bedroom houses in the suburbs on a reasonably sized section for under \$500k you wouldn't be able to keep up with demand.*

## Higher density living

### 2.12 Appetite to develop higher density residential living, in line with Government direction?

- Yes (15)
- No (4)

### 2.13 Interest in developing to residential building heights if the District Plan enabled it

- 3-4 storey (12)
- 5-6 storey (5)
- 6+ storeys (2)

#### Motivation

- Motivation to consider 3-4 storeys: High market demand (2), easy to sell (2), good profit (1), ease of building consent (1), it's our company model (1), other (2)
  - *Comments: 3 stories is high enough for residential dwellings, anything over 3 levels becomes too expensive to build especially if has car parking either in or under it.*
- Motivation to consider 5-6 storey developments: high market demand (2), good profit (2), it's our company model (1) other (2)
  - *Individual comments: It's what we need but too hard to [get] money at 10% - you risk too much and can lose it all. Also, funding this requires long lead time and large pots of cash which means you have to partner and then it's not worth it; I want to see good living environments in the country and town centre but risk is too high and banks want a lot of personal cash in it...funding, funding, funding....NZ is not really set up for it. Also, ownership model is harder with banks' LVR on apartments.*

#### Disinclination

- Disinclination to consider 3-4 storey developments: Difficult to get consent (2), low profit (1), other (4)
  - *Individual comments: Banks make it hard to fund, there are terrible examples of high density development apart from the cedar apartments in Wynyard Quarter.*

- Disinclination to consider 5-6 storeys: *Low market demand (5), low profit (2)*
  - *Individual comments: Difficult to get consent, zoning, doesn't fit company model (4); other (3) – out of keeping with pleasant natural scale of the residential environment we enjoy in Rangiora; not attractive and doesn't generate a community feel; feasibilities for apartments are difficult to get to work*
- Disinclination to consider 6+ storeys: *Low market demand, does not fit with company model, difficult to get consent, zoning (1 each)*

#### 2.14 Considerations people look for in buying in higher density residential developments

- Privacy between neighbours (achieved by landscaping or built design) (9)
- Private outdoor space (8)
- Natural light (7)
- The housing is well designed (6)
- Internal garage (6)
- Proximity to natural features (e.g. parks, river) (4)
- Streetscape, street trees and gardens (4)
- Character of the neighbourhood (look and feel of the house) (4)
- Landscaping (3)
- Ground floor bedrooms and bathrooms (1)
- Other (1)
  - *Individual comment: use our DCs to plant more street trees please!*

#### 2.15 Factors that deter people from buying in high density residential developments

- Lack of privacy between neighbours (9)
- Lack of natural light (7)
- Intensity of development (e.g. too high, crowded) (7)
- Lack of private outdoor space (6)
- Housing is not well designed (6)
- Lack of internal garage (4)
- Lack of streetscape, street trees and gardens – 3
- Lack of landscaping (2)
- Lack of ground floor bedroom and bathroom – 1

## 3. Greenfield development

### 3.1 Location of greenfield land

- Christchurch (4) (Cracroft, Yaldhurst x 2, Belfast, Halswell)
- Waimakariri (5) (Oakville, Ravenswood, Rangiora)
- Selwyn (1) (Prebbleton)

### 3.2 Status of greenfield development

- Development of the greenfield land is already underway (9)
- I intend to start developing the greenfield land in the next 1 - 3 years (4)
- I intend to start developing the greenfield land in the next 4 - 10 years (3)
- It will be more than 10 years before I begin developing the greenfield land (1)
- I intend on selling the greenfield land in the next 1-3 years (3) and (1) in the next 4-10 years
- I do not intend to do anything with the greenfield land (1)

### 3.3 Intention to develop in stages?

- Yes (10)
- No (6)

### 3.4 Timeline for land to be fully developed (when subdivision titles are granted)

- Stage 1 Less than 3 years (7)
- Stage 2 Less than 3 years (6)
- Stage 3 Less than 3 years (9)
- Stage 4 Less than 2 years (6)
- Stage 5 Less than 3 years (6)
- Stage 6 Less than 3 years (1)

### 3.5 Barriers to prevent or delay development of greenfield land

- District Plan rules are too difficult, restrictive or complicated (6)
- Difficult regulatory processes (e.g. consenting, plan changes) (4)
- Infrastructure capacity (3)
- Expected sales prices not high enough (2)
- Land type is difficult to develop (3)
- Costs (1)
- Market demand (1)
- Infrastructure timing (3)
- Finance (2)
- Tax implications (1)
- Natural hazards (1)
- No barriers (2)
  - *Individual comments: Land has some contamination, draconian laws around dealing with this it makes it difficult, even our consultants think the HAIL system is flawed; ODP has half the road on the neighbours' land, so[it's] difficult to develop our land without neighbours also developing.*
- Other (1)
  - *Individual comment: Ecan is the issue in consenting not the Selwyn Council*

### 3.6 Unit types considered for residential greenfield development

- Stand-alone detached single story dwelling (8)
- Single storey multi-unit complex (includes duplex, townhouse, terrace, semi-detached, attached units) (2)
- Two storey multi-unit complex (includes duplex, townhouse, terrace, semi-detached, attached units) (3)
- Stand-alone detached two storey dwelling (2)
- Retirement village (1)
- Other (4)
  - *Individual comment: Generous sized sections in desirable areas for wealthy families to provide for their households. 1200 - 1500m2 . There is currently no provision for these developments under the Waimakariri plan. This does not meet the policy requirements for a mix of residential developments catering to the various needs of households.*

### 3.7 Main reasons for these preferred dwelling types

- High market demand (7)

- It's our company model (2)
- Other (2)

### 3.8 Preferred section size

- 250-500sqm (5)
- 501-750sqm (3)
- 751-1000sqm (2)
- Under 250sqm (1)
- More than 1000sqm (1)

## District plans' enablement of development

### 3.8 Agree/disagree that the Christchurch District Plan enables development of a broad range of housing types in greenfield areas

- Agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Disagree / Strongly disagree (6)
  - *Individual comments: It's not about allowing for them - it's about enabling these, the rules and requirements are too tough and too much emphasis is put on good urban design, which is a subjective topic where council staff tend to be so far removed from reality that the process puts many developers off even trying; CCC needs to take a leaf out of Selwyn's book and be more accommodating and actually embrace more development within the suburbs and the central city.*
  - *Density requirements are too rigid and inflexible*
  - *It is focused on intensification and has minimum yield requirements.*
  - *Because it provides so little greenfield zoned land. It is obvious that the City Council prefers greenfield development to take place in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts.*
  - *No 1/4 acre sections*
  - *Does not allow or cater for larger sections, density requirements are unrealistic.*

### 3.9 Agree/disagree that the Selwyn District Plan enables development of a broad range of housing types in greenfield areas

- Agree (4)
  - *Individual comment: Their district plan is less complicated, they are trying harder to provide the necessary infrastructure to enable more development and they are slowly empowering their front line people to make decisions instead of having to refer issues up the line.*

### 3.10 Agree/disagree that the Waimakariri District Plan enables development of a broad range of housing types in greenfield areas

- Agree (3)
  - *Individual comments: Has more access to land. There is higher demand for new standalone housing than high density. WDC have already indicated they would like a range of high density and standard residential on our site.*
- Strongly disagree (1)
  - *Individual comment: Because they are insisting on higher medium to higher density developments that are more appropriate in Christchurch. Rangiora is a different market than Christchurch and it is therefore not sensible of right to apply the same limitations or restrictions. People choose to come to Rangiora for the spacious mix of housing and facilities that suit their lifestyle.*

## **Additional support councils can supply to make development easier**

### *3.11 Council-specific comments*

- Christchurch City Council – individual comments
  - *Make lot sizes developer and market-led, not council requirement. Get the developer, CCC and community (e.g. residents associations) to create communities for mutual beneficial outcomes; remove a land covenant requiring live fencing; take away hurdles instead of putting more in place – [...change] from hindering to helping. No intention of putting fantastic growing land out of production and into housing.*
- Selwyn District Council – individual comments
  - *Process plan changes quicker. They are heading in the right direction and providing good helpful advice to consent applicants. Perhaps more internal resource (people) might speed up processing times but other than that, doing fine.*
- Waimakariri District Council – individual comments
  - *We would like to buy more land to develop however the difficulties we had to overcome with our last development have caused us to partly lose [confidence]. The Government has given clear direction to Councils to have an attitude of wanting to find a way to make things work for developers. [The Council needs to] show that they are serious about helping developers overcome the various challenges involved in developing land. This would not involve financial assistance but more along the lines of 'we have identified a problem however we are trying to find a good solution so the project is not held up'.*

## **4. Business land development**

### *4.1 Interest in business development*

- Industrial developments (4)
- Retail (4)
- Office (1)

#### Locations mentioned

- Christchurch City (3) - Avonhead, Harewood, Templeton, Yaldhurst, Central City, Hornby
- Selwyn (3) - Rolleston, Prebbleton, West Melton
- Waimakariri (2) - (Ravenswood, Rangiora, Kaiapoi)

### *4.2 Attraction of these locations*

- Market values of new build business premises in these locations
- Good ground conditions
- Good visibility

#### Attraction for **retail development**

- Proximity to customer base (workforce and/or residential areas)

- Available car parking
- Good visibility
- Access to transport network
- Demand for business development

#### Attraction for **office development**

- Demand for business development
- Available car parking
- Proximity to customer base (workforce and/or residential areas)

#### Attraction for **industrial development**

- Good ground conditions
- Existing business/industrial hub location
- Market values of new build business premises in this location
- Infrastructure available (wastewater etc)

#### *4.3 Barriers to development*

##### Main barriers preventing **retail development** in preferred locations

- Land availability
- Zoning
- District Plan requirements (density, urban design)
- District Plan requirements
- Surrounding business impact on development

##### Barriers to **office development**

- Surrounding businesses impact on development
- District Plan requirements
- Size complications (e.g. size or shape of sites; site amalgamation difficulties)

##### Barriers for **industrial development**

- Land availability
- District Plan requirements (density, urban design etc)
- District Plan requirements
- Zoning
- Impact of development on surrounding area

#### *4.4 Location factors influencing potential buyers or tenants' interest in business land/premises*

- Retail development: seeking strong returns from leasing the premises; close proximity/ease of access to transport networks; proximity to business cluster
- Industrial development: Strong returns; close proximity/ease of access to transport networks; proximity to business cluster; close proximity to employment markets (housing areas); few zoning restrictions to delivering the desired structure and business activity

#### *4.5 Greenfield business land - Selwyn*

- Location: Selwyn (1) (IPort Rolleston) – development of the land is already underway; not developing in stages
- Barriers to development: District Plan rules are too difficult, restrictive or complicated, market demand

Section size that potential buyers most commonly seeking in business greenfield: More than 1000 sq metres (1)

- Additional support from SDC sought? – Proactively engage with IPort as a major developer in the area

#### 4.6 Central city interest in Greenfield

- Yes (2)

#### 4.7 Current or previous involvement in development of land (including mixed-use) in the central city?

- Yes (1)
- No (1)

## 5. Central City - Christchurch city

### 5.1 Interest in developing in the central city

- Yes (5)
- No (0)

### 5.2 Current or past involvement in development of land (included mixed-use) in the central city

- Yes (4)
- No (1)

### 5.3 Areas in the central city where there is demand for increased building heights to accommodate business demand

- Yes (2)
- No (1)

### 5.4 Areas in the central city where there is demand for increased building heights to accommodate residential demand

- Yes (1)
- No (1)

## 6. Car parking - Christchurch city

### 6.1 Impact of removal of car parking requirement on viability or feasibility of development

- Some impact (11)
- Large impact (6)
- Low impact (4)
- No impact (9)
  - *Individual comments: We still provide car parks to satisfy tenant demand; low density development, so no issue; buyers of developed land want carparks, preferably garages; because I would not like to live in or build in a subdivision where the streets are dominated by parked cars, tradie trucks and vans; we provide enough carparks to meet customer needs; customers want carparking and are prepared to pay more for it; we prefer to do developments with reasonable car parks and garages in suburban areas; we can still build and include at least one part per house and it is a viable project.*

## 6.2 Impact of removal of car parking requirement on reduction of number of on-site parking intended to provide

- No (17)
- Yes (2)
- Location dependent (7)
  - *Individual comments: examples given - 'inner, inner city', Belfast Business Park.*
  - *I would have minimum in town centres but want some sort of public transport that enables population to get around.*

## 7. Final comments by individual respondents

- *We have had difficulty with Council's inconsistent messaging around options for development of our land.*
- *Good productive soils are being lost needlessly to industrial and residential development.*
- *CCC have the growth and timing of developments wrong and are going to run out of growth options especially greenfield.*
- *The lack of consistency, constantly changing direction of the Selwyn district town planning prevents any developer setting long term plans.*
- *Are waiting to develop land in Harewood but having been waiting on Christchurch City Council for over two years to sort out stormwater treatment [at site]. The Council are holding up development of land due to them not spending up front on services to the area. Would like update on construction date for this. Developers' contributions should be kept at a minimum so developers can begin developing.*
- *I am concerned that the Greater Christchurch Partnership seems to be limiting the area/zoning for residential development in Waimakariri while expansion of Christchurch and Selwyn are encouraged to expand, particularly at Rolleston.*
- *I would like to see more hi-density housing in the greater Christchurch area with their own community spaces e.g. provision for vegetable gardening and spaces for meeting socially*
- *The current Regional Policy Statement and a lack of a long term (30-50 year) spatial plan for the GCP area is a major handbrake for sensible, efficient and sustainable development*
- *My main concern is that Selwyn and Waimakariri are not treated as suburbs of Christchurch and similar rules applied. Both areas have unique desirable environmental features and a sense of community that is quite different to what you would find in a city. For this reason more flexibility needs to be provided in development guidelines to allow this environment to prosper. For instance a minimum lot size of 450m2 in residential 2 zoning will generally encourage higher density smaller housing because there is more profit for the developer. Therefore there is no reason to insist on an upper limit e.g. 10 lots per hectare. The market will go where demand is so if the predictions you are basing your modelling on are correct the small houses will be built because of demand. Eliminating the restrictions on lots per hectare would however allow for some larger, higher priced and more desirable sections to provide a healthy balance which these towns desperately need. We request that the minimum lot size be reduced in Residential 2 zone in Waimakariri to 450m2 with no upper limit or lots per hectare restriction.*
- *There is a significant lack of greenfield land available for development. I am concerned this survey did not touch on the major issues of affordability, land availability, strict density requirements, planning issues and delays, all of these being drivers of cost.*

## 8. Real estate sector responses

- Real estate (1)
- Land owner and developer (1)
- Other (1)

### *8.1 Attributes potential buyers are seeking in the location their new home or section*

- School zones
- Proximity to amenities (shops, parks)
- Character of the neighbourhood
- House design (number of bedrooms, layout etc)
- Lifestyle factors (e.g. near the beach or hills)

### *8.2 Housing type and number of bedrooms most commonly requested by buyers*

- 2 bedrooms
- 4 Bedrooms

### *8.3 Property specific features people are seeking*

- Private outdoor space
- Internal garage
- Easy to heat
- Living space orientated towards the sun
- Freehold
- Energy efficiency

### *8.4 Most important considerations for people looking to buy in higher density residential developments*

- Privacy between neighbours
- Proximity to natural features (e.g. park, river)
- Housing is well designed
- Streetscape. Street trees and gardens
- Natural light
- Ground floor bedrooms and bathrooms
- Internal garage
- Character of the neighbourhood
- Private outdoor space
- Landscaping

### *8.5 Key factors in deterring people from buying in high density residential developments*

- Lack of privacy between neighbours
- Intensity of development (e.g. too high, crowded)
- Lack of private outdoor space
- Lack of natural light
- Housing is not well designed

### *8.6 Business types interested in providing developments for*

- Retail, in Christchurch city (Parklands)

### *8.7 What makes this area attractive?*

- Market value of new build business premises in this location
- Proximity to customer base (workforce and/or residential areas)

*8.8 Main barriers to developing in this area?*

- District Plan requirements (density, urban design)
- Zoning
- District Plan requirements

*8.9 Interested in central city development*

- Yes (1)

*8.10 Currently or have been involved in central city development including mixed use?*

- Yes (4)
- No (1)

*8.11 Any central city areas where there is demand for increased building heights to accommodate business development OR residential development?*

- Yes (2)
- No (1)

*8.12 Impact of car parking requirement on viability or feasibility of development*

- Low impact (2)

*8.13 Does the removal reduce the number of on-site parking you intend to provide as part of your development*

- Yes (1)
- No (1)