

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS COMMISSIONER AT
SELWYN**

IN THE MATTER OF

Clause 21 of the First Schedule of
the Resource Management Act 1991
(Plan Change 67)

IN THE MATTER OF

GW WILFIELD LIMITED
(Applicant)

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF KIM MARIE SEATON ON BEHALF OF
GW WILFIELD LIMITED**

PLANNING

Dated: 14 September 2021

GREENWOOD ROCHE
LAWYERS
CHRISTCHURCH
Solicitor: Lauren Semple
(lauren@greenwoodroche.com)

Applicant's Solicitor
Kettlewell House
Level 3, 680 Colombo Street
PO Box 139
Christchurch
Phone: 03 353 0572

- 1 My name is Kim Marie Seaton. In my evidence I address planning related issues, including further amendments to the Proposal in response to the Officer's Report, and analysis of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD).
- 2 Matters raised in submissions and the Officer's Report have been addressed, including through:
 - i. the introduction of further amendments to the ODP, to improve pedestrian and cycle connections and "future proof" the road network for public transport;
 - ii. A new rule requiring a cycle/pedestrian path to be constructed on Weedons Ross Road, to assure direct connectivity to the town centre;
 - iii. A new rule requiring a legal instrument that in effect will need to be registered on new residential titles, specifying a range of greenhouse gas reduction initiatives.
- 3 Remaining areas of disagreement between myself and the Officer's Report, and Mr Tallentire for Christchurch City Council/Environment Canterbury, relate primarily to the question of whether or not the plan change will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD).

The Urban Environment and Significant Development Capacity

- 4 Whilst there is broad agreement among the planners that West Melton forms part of the urban environment, as part of the Greater Christchurch area, there is disagreement as to whether the proposal will add significantly to development capacity, per Policy 8 of the NPS UD.
- 5 I consider there are a range of factors that need to be considered in determining significant development capacity, including any distinguishing characteristics of the site, overall site size and yield, the type of product and existing capacity/demand. I note that those factors are in addition to consideration of whether the proposal will contribute to a well functioning urban environment, and whether there is sufficient infrastructure provision available. On the basis of Mr Colegrave and Mr

Sellars' evidence regarding the shortfall in housing capacity within Selwyn at all timeframes, I consider the proposal is significant in terms of providing additional supply. I consider the nature of the product, being a low density housing typology, is also significant, noting Mr Sellars' evidence as to the severe shortage of this type of product.

Well Functioning Urban Environment

- 6 Overall I have concluded that the proposal will contribute to a well functioning urban environment, including by provision of a low density housing typology that is not readily met elsewhere in the District. I have concluded that the site and proposal does provide for good accessibility, whilst acknowledging that public transport opportunities are currently limited but not absent, and West Melton does not in itself have many employment opportunities. In reaching this conclusion, I have relied in part on the evidence of Mr Metherell, Mr Compton Moen and Ms Lauenstein. Based on the evidence of Mr Sellars and Mr Colegrave, the proposal will clearly support clause (d) of Policy 1, in supporting the competitive operation of the land market.
- 7 Regarding Clause (e) and supporting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, I acknowledge that there will be an increase to some degree of greenhouse gas emissions arising from private vehicle trips, but that based on the evidence of Mr Metherell, the increase in emissions may not necessarily be significant. Factors mitigating against an increase in emissions include increasing use of electric vehicles and alternative modes of transport, ready accessibility locally to recreational opportunities and convenience shopping and increasing working from home opportunities. Further, the proposal provides, via proposed Rule 12.1.3.56A, for a range of sustainability initiatives designed to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. I note that Clause (e) does not require an absolute reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, nor do I consider this could be feasibly achieved in any township extension in any location, short of prohibiting private vehicle use.
- 8 Briefly in regard proposed Rule 12.1.3.56A, Mr Tallentire in his evidence has stated that the proposed rule is uncertain and unquantified with regard to offsetting greenhouse gas emissions. I accept that the extent to which the rule will reduce or offset greenhouse gas emissions is not

quantified, nor is it within my area of expertise to attempt that quantification. However, the measures listed in the proposed rule are, by my observation, commonly included in recommendations for the reduction of domestic greenhouse gas emissions, including in the documents referenced in my evidence. To that extent I am comfortable that the listed measures will assist in supporting emission reductions to some extent at least.

- 9 Regarding the certainty of the rule, I do not consider it would be helpful to make the rule overly prescriptive at the plan change stage, for example by specifying the volume of rain harvesting that must be required on each site. If Mr Tallentire is referring specifically to Clause (a)(iii), which specifies 'the requirement for each residential unit to achieve Homestar 6 as a minimum standard or a proven equivalent', I have borrowed that wording from the Christchurch District Plan, which contains three rules similarly referencing the Homestar standard. I consider the wording is sufficiently certain for the rule to be workable, whilst allowing for the possibility that the Homestar 6 standard may be overtaken in a few years by a preferred but equivalent standard.
- 10 I am happy to answer any questions concerning my evidence or the proposed conditions.

Kim Seaton

14 September 2021