

**BEFORE 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 STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICOLE LAUENSTEIN  
ON BEHALF OF GW WILFIELD LIMITED**

**URBAN DESIGN**

Dated: 14 September 2021

---

---

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

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

---

1. I have peer reviewed the urban design related matters that relate to PC67 and provided evidence in support of the plan change application. I have also considered Mr. Nicholson's urban design assessment and statement of evidence (appended to S42 report) and Mr Tallentire's evidence for CCC and Ecan. where it relates to urban design matters.
2. This is a summary of the key points of my evidence:

**Urban Form (existing and future) and extent of development**

3. Main points of disagreement on this matter are:
  - future urban form and extent of growth
  - location of the centre of West Melton
  - the development pattern and sequencing of urban growth
  - definition of the southern boundary
4. I have analysed the growth pattern of West Melton and identified its potential future urban growth path and extent of development that will allow it to grow into a consolidated form and provide a well-functioning urban environment. This urban form consists of 4 similarly sized quadrants around a community footprint that is centred at the historic core, the main intersection, the commercial centre to the north of SH 73 and the domain, church and community centre to the south of SH 73.
5. I have analysed and explained in detail the growth patterns of West Melton over time and the rationale behind this pattern of development under the heading sequencing of growth. I consider the proposal to be a logical sequence of development for West Melton.
6. I do not consider the high voltage corridor to be a defensible southern boundary. For several reasons – it has no verticality or volume to it, no natural definition, no change in character , topography or landscape and it has already been successfully integrated into residential development providing a connecting reserve space/ green corridor.

## **Lower density and resulting residential character specific to West Melton as a choice**

7. Main points of disagreement on this matter are:
  - Character of West Melton
  - Need to allow for growth in this particular niche of the residential market
  - The ability of West Melton to accommodate and support this growth
8. I consider West Melton to have not necessarily a unique but definitely a different residential character to larger townships in the region such as Lincoln, Rolleston or even Prebbleton due to a combination of size and location. West Melton offers a choice of residential living that is not readily available and will under Canterbury Regional Policy Statement directive of 10hh/ha most likely not be possible to achieve around larger townships, or in proximity to district or regional centres. West Melton is well suited to provide this type of residential living as it is in keeping with the existing character.

## **Connectivity**

9. Main points of disagreement on this matter are:
  - The role of SH 7 connecting north and south
  - Importance of the south-east quadrant incl. PC67 to create interconnected residential environments
10. West Melton is gradually addressing the severance SH7 has been allowed to establish over time which has been exacerbated by the focus on residential and commercial development to the north creating a disconnect with the community and recreational facilities to the south. Further development in the southern quadrants will balance this out and support this gradual change from a state highway character to a main street character.

11. Completing the SE quadrant will also allow for improved connectivity within this quadrant and guide development and connectivity to the west.

### **Plan Change versus strategic, structural planning**

12. Main points of disagreement on this matter are:
  - Is a strategic structural plan required to ascertain the appropriate urban form and extent of development for West Melton ?
13. From an urban design perspective Structural Planning exercises and Plan Changes are both valid planning tools with public participation and contribution to the decision making process. They are not reliant upon each other, they can run concurrently, or independent of each other. The benefit of a plan change is that there is a certainty around land availability and willingness to develop, which at a structure planning level cannot be ascertained with certainty. Plan changes therefore often provide more accurate and up to date detailed information to base decisions on. With regard to the "bigger picture" plan changes can benefit from wider structural planning "vision" being in place, but at the same time they can inform the bigger picture thinking with the information they provide.