

BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF

Clause 21 of the First Schedule of the
Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Plan Change 68 to the Selwyn District Plan
**URBAN HOLDINGS LIMITED/ SUBURBAN
DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED/ CAIRNBRAE
DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED** (Applicants)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID JOHN COMPTON-MOEN ON
BEHALF OF URBAN HOLDINGS LIMITED**

URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE

Dated: 08 March 2022

Christchurch

Solicitor acting: G Cleary/ R M Parsons
Level 9, Anthony Harper Tower
62 Worcester Boulevard
PO Box 2646, Christchurch 8140
Tel +64 3 379 0920 | Fax +64 3 366 9277
gerard.cleary@ah.co.nz

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Anthony Harper". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Anthony" and last name "Harper" clearly distinguishable.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is David John Compton-Moen.
- 1.2 I am a Director at DCM Urban Design Limited, which is a private independent consultancy that provides Landscape and Urban Design services related advice to local authorities and private clients, established in 2016.
- 1.3 I hold the qualifications of a Master of Urban Design (Hons) from the University of Auckland, a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Hons) and a Bachelor of Resource Studies (Planning and Economics), both obtained from Lincoln University. I have been a Registered Landscape Architect of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects('NZILA') since 2001, a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, since 2007, and a member of the Urban Design Forum since 2012.
- 1.4 I have worked in the landscape assessment and design, urban design, and planning fields for approximately 25 years, here in New Zealand and in Hong Kong. During this time, I have worked for both local authorities and private consultancies, providing expert evidence for urban design, landscape and visual impact assessments on a wide range of major infrastructure and development proposals, including the following relevant projects:
 - (a) 2021 – Working for Waimakariri District Council, I prepared Urban Design evidence to assist with Private Plan Change 30 – Ravenswood Key Activity Area (KAC) which sought to rezone parts of an existing ODP to increase the amount of Business 1 land and remove a portion of Residential 6A land.
 - (b) 2020-21 – Working with Waimakariri District Council to assist with developing structure plans for Kaiapoi, Rangiora Northeast, Rangiora Southeast and Rangiora West.
 - (c) 2020-21 – Working for Mike Greer Homes, I have worked on the master planning, urban design and landscape design for the following Medium Density Residential and Mixed Use Developments:
 - (i) Madras Square – a mixed use development on the previously known 'Breathe' site (+90 homes);

- (ii) 476 Madras Street – a 98-unit residential development on the old Orion Site;
 - (iii) 258 Armagh Street – a 33-unit residential development in the inner city;
 - (iv) 33 Harewood Road – a 31-unit development adjacent to St James Park in Papanui.
- (d) 2020-21 – Working with Waimakariri District Council, I have assisted with the development of four structure plans for future urban growth in Rangiora and Kaiapoi.
- (e) 2020-22 – Working for several different consortiums, I have provided urban design and landscape advice for the following recent private plan changes in the Selwyn District:
 - (i) Lincoln South, Lincoln
 - (ii) Southeast Rolleston, Rolleston
 - (iii) Birchs Village, Prebbleton
 - (iv) Extension to Falcons Landing, Rolleston
 - (v) Rolleston Southeast
 - (vi) Holmes and Skellerup Block, Rolleston
 - (vii) South Skellerup Block, Rolleston
 - (viii) Two Chains Road Block (B1 zone plan change), Rolleston
- (f) Acland Park Subdivision – master planning and landscape design for a 1,000-lot development in Rolleston (2017-current) immediately adjoining the plan change site.
- (g) Plan Change 57 by GW Wilfield Ltd to rezone existing Living 2 and Living 2A land at West Melton to Living (West Melton South) Zone, south of State Highway 73 at West Melton. Urban design advice to the Residential Chapter of the Selwyn District Plan Review (2017).
- (h) Graphic material for the Selwyn Area Maps (2016).
- (i) Stage 3 Proposed District Plan Design Guides – Residential (High, Medium and Lower Density and Business Mixed Use Zones) for Queenstown Lakes District(2018-2020).

- (j) Hutt City Council providing urban design evidence for Plan Change 43. The Plan Change proposed two new zones including a Suburban Mixed-use and Medium Density Residential as well as providing the ability for Comprehensive Residential Developments on lots larger than 2,000m² (2017-2019). The Medium Density Design Guide was a New Zealand Planning Institute Award winner in 2020.
- (k) Jacks Point and Henley Downs – Urban Design Advice for QLDC PDP Stages 1 and 2 (2016-2019).

1.5 I am familiar with the application by Urban Holdings Ltd (the Application) for a plan change to rezone approximately 67ha of Inner Plains Rural Zone land to Living Z, providing for approximately 820 dwelling sites, having prepared the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that was submitted as an RFI Response in December 2021. The density of the proposal will be around 12 households per hectare.

2 CODE OF CONDUCT

2.1 I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014, and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. Other than where I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

3 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

3.1 My evidence provides a summary of the key urban design and landscape aspects of the proposal and specific responses to issues related to amenity and character raised by submitters. It also responds to relevant matters raised in the section 42A report (the Officer's Report).

3.2 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed:

- (a) The Application;
- (b) National Policy Statement on Urban Development;

- (c) Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (July 2021);
- (d) Our Space 2018-2048;
- (e) NZILA Guidelines on Best Practice Guide - Landscape Assessment and Sustainable Management (2010);
- (f) Operative Selwyn District Plan;
- (g) Selwyn District Council Subdivision Design Guide (2009);
- (h) Submissions lodged in relation to the Application; and
- (i) The Officer's Report.

4 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 A Landscape and Urban Design Assessment was completed in October 2020 in relation to the proposal and updated in December 2020 in response to Council's RFI. The findings of that assessment are still relevant with one minor correction/clarification to the response to Policy B4.2.10(p11-12). This should read:

The proposed plan change promotes the ability for residential blocks to have a north-south aspect and varying between 80m – 120m. this provides block lengths that are small in scale to allow for walkability and easy navigation without overly relying on roading. The proposal is within 1km of surrounding developments.

- 4.2 The block length should range between 80-120m, not 800m-1200m.
- 4.3 The following aspects considered to be the main issues to be addressed in considering this proposal:
- (a) Prebbleton's Urban Form and Growth;
 - (b) Connectivity and Walkability;
 - (c) Density and Character (including village character); and
 - (d) Landscape and visual effects.
- 4.4 In the preparation of my evidence, I have also reviewed the urban form of Prebbleton and the way in which it is evolving as a township, taking into account not only this Plan Change, but also the other proposed plan changes, their density, and their roading network, currently lodged with Selwyn District Council being:

- Plan Change 72 – Trices Road, a 28Ha Plan change to change rural land to Living Z with a minimum density of 12hh/ha, resulting in approximately 290 households;
- Plan Change 79 – Birchs Village, a 37Ha Plan change to change rural land to Living Z with a minimum density of 12hh/ha, resulting in 400 households.

5 PREBBLETON'S URBAN FORM AND GROWTH

- 5.1 The growth of Prebbleton Township was somewhat stymied by Meadows Mushrooms until it moved from the township in 2011-12. The relocation of the factory, along with the Canterbury Earthquakes, has resulted in the growth of Prebbleton's population over the past 18 years as highlighted by these statistics¹:

Year	Resident Population
1996	1674
2001	1833
2006	2001
2013	2,772
2018	4,515

- 5.2 I note Mr. Cleese's comment at paragraph 36 of the s 42A Report that since 2018 the population of Prebbleton will have passed 5,000.
- 5.3 The Prebbleton Structure Plan (The Future of Prebbleton) was adopted by council in February 2010, prior to the Canterbury Earthquakes. At the time it was designed to provide a *'framework for guiding development over the next 30 years to achieve a high level of town planning and urban design.'*² The structure plan expected the village to grow by an additional 1,295 households by 2041, with a minimum lot size in the L1 zone of 800m².
- 5.4 The Structure Plan includes a table (Table 4) which outlines the town's Residential Development land already zoned, with an estimated potential sections of 560. It assumed the old Meadow Mushroom site would yield 85x800m² sections sometime between 2021-40. This site is currently under construction by Somerset

¹ <https://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-place-summaries/prebbleton>

² https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/22880/Prebbleton-Structure-Plan.pdf

Retirement Village offering 290 dwellings being a mix of villas, cottages and serviced apartments.

- 5.5 Table 5 of the Structure Plan outlines additional Potential Sections as a result of Land allocated through Change 1 to the RPS, providing an additional 682 sections, and a total Residential Capacity of 1,244 lots. The 682 sections are distributed across 4 ODP areas which have largely been developed as follows:
- 5.6 ODP AREA 1 (SP1) - BLAKES ROAD - Area 1 is zoned Living Z and includes 13.3ha of land with the intention of achieving a minimum density of 10 households per hectare but uses larger, lower density allotments along edges to integrate with existing rural residential (Living 1A4 and Living 1A6 zones) to the east and south respectively. This area is fully built out
- 5.7 ODP AREA 2 (SP1A) - OAKLEY DRIVE - Area 2 is 6.4ha lot which fronts Trents Road. This area is fully built out
- 5.8 ODP AREA 3 (SP3) – SPRINGS ROAD THROUGH TO TRENTS ROAD - Consisting of Farthing Drive and Nickel Drives as well as the Prebbleton Nature Park, this 15.1ha is fully built out and adjoins PC68.
- 5.9 ODP AREA 4 (SP2) – TOSSWILL ROAD - The largest of the ODP Areas, at 25.5ha, this ODP is located on the northeastern edge of Prebbleton and is being development by Suburban Estates. The all releases of 'Prevelles' are sold out with the final stage released at the end of 2021 and titles anticipated in early 2022.
- 5.10 All of the zoned land has now been developed. Lot sizes have decreased in recent years from the 'typical minimum of 800m²' to just over 500m² which was highlighted in the design of the final stage of Prevelles where most sections ranged from 500-700m² in size.

6 CONNECTIVITY AND WALKABILITY

- 6.1 Below, I outline how PC68 can contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.
- 6.2 Walkability and connectivity are key principles of the ODP, with a hierarchy of street types and connections provided throughout the area and linking into existing residential developments (through to Farthing Drive). The aim of the movement network is to provide a

range of modal options for residents, to reduce car-dependency for short local trips while recognising private vehicle use is necessary for longer trips. Both primary and secondary routes will generally provide pedestrian and cycle facilities on both sides of the road, street trees and parking.

- 6.3 Smaller tertiary streets (not shown) or local/neighbourhood streets will ideally be connected to create a permeable neighbourhood. These roads are not shown to allow future design flexibility at the final subdivision stage. The design of the local streets will encourage slow vehicle movements combined with pedestrian and cycle facilities, either separate or shared depending on the design of the street. Supporting the road network, off road pedestrian and cycle paths will connect through to existing networks where they exist.
- 6.4 Four Open green spaces are provided within a 500m walkable catchment within PC68, as per Selwyn District Council policy, integrated with medium residential areas as well as extending the existing playground space on the corner of Farthing and Sterling Drives.
- 6.5 Overall, the Plan Change is considered to meet the outcomes of Policy 4.2.10 of the Selwyn District Plan, being close to schools, shops (current and proposed), and recreational facilities. Medical facilities are anticipated to be operating within the town centre December 2022, approximately 1.2km from the ODP area.

7 DENSITY AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

- 7.1 A key consideration of this Plan Change is how it integrates with existing residential development adjacent to the west, noting that lot sizes proposed for low density developments have decreased over recent years with it being more desirable to provide greater housing stock.
- 7.2 I consider that the proposed Plan Change is consistent with current urban development practice in the inner areas of Selwyn District (close to Christchurch City) of creating densities of 12hh/ha and greater. I am supportive of this approach in Selwyn, having worked on Acland Park and seen the variation and diversity of lot sizes allowing a wider demographic entry into the housing market. In Acland Park a mix of Small Lot Residential, comprehensive lots

and 3 super lots were developed to provide a range of house types and house prices.

Table C.12.1 Living Z rules (SDP) provides for:

Low Density: Average allotment size of 650m² with a minimum individual allotment size of 550m²

Medium Density (Small-lot): Maximum average allotment size of 500m², with a minimum individual allotment size of 400m²

Medium Density (Comprehensive): Maximum average allotment size of 350m², with no minimum site size.

- Comprehensive Medium Density residential development will be identified by a consent notice on the subdivision consent and will be located within Medium Density areas as identified on the ODPs - Appendix 38; and*
- Within a comprehensive Medium Density residential development, a section 224 certificate shall only be issued following the erection (to the extent that the exterior is fully closed in) of the dwellings that are to be subdivided.*

7.3 For the rural-residential interfaces along Trents and Hamptons Roads, I recommend that these road interfaces are treated as urban roads with dwellings addressing the street, with direct pedestrian access where possible.

7.4 Given the importance of Shands Road in the wider network with limited-vehicle access, I consider the proposal to provide larger sections of 1,500m² (minimum) appropriate. The installation of 1.8m high close board timber fences on any road frontages should be avoided where possible.

8 Aspects of 'village' character are discussed further below under submissions.

9 VISUAL AMENITY EFFECTS

9.1 The proposal would result in an overall change in character from open and rural-residential to one that is more dense and suburban in nature, noting that the receiving environment could be considered peri-urban. The management of bulk and location of the development will also help create a sense of openness through the centralisation of denser development. The highest likely effects after mitigation will be experienced by those existing rural and rural residential properties closest to the proposal along Trents and

Hamptons Roads. Though there is a change in the overall character of the receiving environment, a low magnitude of change is anticipated from these properties as the proposal will become an extension of existing development.

- 10 Overall, the scale and bulk and location of the proposal would allow it to appear as a natural extension of existing development within Prebbleton, with a very low magnitude of change anticipated.

11 MITIGATION MEASURES / DESIGN ASPECTS

- 11.1 A series of mitigation measures or design aspects are proposed to either avoid, remedy or mitigate potential adverse effects on urban design, landscape character, landscape values or visual amenity. It is recognised that some of these measures are difficult to 'quantify' or may be more appropriate at the subdivision stage, but I consider them important urban design measures to ensure a well-functioning urban environment can be developed.
- 11.2 (MM1) Provide a diversity of house size and lot size to provide choice, with higher density development located close to high amenity and business areas. This is provided for through the proposed location of both general (low) and medium density residential.
- 11.3 (MM2) Create streets which have a high level of amenity, provide for different modal allocation, and allow for an efficient use of land by having a street hierarchy with different road reserve widths depending on their classification. Encourage the use of low impact design techniques including grass swales. These considerations would be addressed through the detailed design and consenting of any subdivision proposal(s) within the plan change area.
- 11.4 (MM3) Create a well-connected walking and cycling network which combines with the green / blue network and existing facilities connecting to key destinations (school, childcare, town centre), prioritising walking and cycling with a mix of on-road, separate, and off-road facilities to promote active transport modes. Key connections are identified on the ODP and may be supplemented through additional connections provided for at the time of subdivision consent. This includes creating all-weather footpaths,

preferably shared, with a minimum width of 2.5m along Trents and Hamptons Road through to Shands Road. This would include extending the paths to connect to existing paths to ensure a high level of connectivity and accessibility to public transport routes.

- 11.5 (MM4) Avoid direct vehicle access onto Shands Road for individual properties to allow for a high-quality landscape treatment along this corridor and minimize potential effects on this arterial road.
- 11.6 (MM5) Provide a quantity of greenspace and facilities appropriate, in accordance with Selwyn District Council policy, for the future population with green links extending through the plan change area and connecting with adjoining residential and rural areas. This is provided for on the ODP.
- 11.7 (MM6) Solid fencing should preferably be restricted to rear and side yards to retain an open character along streets and existing roads or at a minimum front boundary fencing will have restrictions. Side fencing should not extend forward of the front wall closest to the street of a house or would need to be limited in height. Properties fronting Trents and Hamptons Road should directly address the road corridor in a positive manner with pedestrian access, i.e. have a Trents or Hamptons Road street address.

12 COUNCIL'S SECTION 42A REPORT

- 12.1 I have reviewed the Council's Section 42a Report prepared by Mr. Cleese. I am in agreement with his conclusions, highlighting the following aspects.
- 12.2 (Para 128) The growth areas identified in the Prebbleton Structure Plan have been developed to their full potential with ODP4's (Prevelles) last release sold out and under construction.
- 12.3 (para 154) I agree that it is not appropriate to retain a rural outlook along either Trents or Hamptons Road, and that properties along these roads should positively address these roads. Providing larger lots on these roads could possibly have a negative outcome in the long-term as Prebbleton extends out towards Shands Road.
- 12.4 The benefit of the scale of this ODP is that it allows for a more comprehensive approach to development, providing a high level of connectivity and a considered placement/inclusion of open space.

While in some situations rural residential development is appropriate, I agree with Mr Cleese that RRS14 is out of date (Para 270) and, likewise, I do not consider a Living 3 zoning appropriate due to the policy approach coming from central government to provide greater housing stock.

- 12.5 (para 160) I agree that 12hh/ha is a suitable minimum density. This level of density is considered a positive change from the 10hh/ha previously proposed in the Living Z zone. The increased density is consistent with other residential developments in Prebbleton and Rolleston to provide greater development capacity. The density is higher than the recommended density in the Township objectives and policies for the Living Z zone, but is considered appropriate for Prebbleton to meet the outcomes desired by the NPS:UD (2020). Any amenity effects on existing residents and the ability to create well-functioning urban environments for future residents can be successfully mitigated through the proposed Outline Development Plan.
- 12.6 (para 272) I agree with Mr Cleese that the properties at the Trents Road gap, the Shamy property and the two small lots on Hamptons Road should be included with the plan change area so that Shands Road becomes the logical edge for urban growth at this point in time. I do note however that the property at the corner of Hamptons and Shands Road is held by the Council for roading use, so a rezoning to residential is likely to achieve very little. The other Hamptons Road property (184) is residential in scale.

13 SUBMISSIONS

- 13.1 I have read the submission relating to the following aspects:
- (a) Provision of infrastructure including schools, roads and shops;
 - (b) The retention of Village character, rural amenity outlook and interface with rural amenity;
 - (c) Appropriateness of the proposed density.

a. Provision of infrastructure including schools, roads and shops

- 13.2 The provision of infrastructure, medical rooms and community facilities, such as a school are typically not identified at the ODP

stage but 'appear' during the subdivision stage or at later date as demand dictates. For the provision of schools, this is a matter for the Ministry of Education to establish and is not typically identified on an ODP or proposed by a developer. The provision of a new school is typically 3-4 hectare in area, could result in the loss of 40-60houses but is not precluded from happening by the development of this ODP.

- 13.3 Road upgrades for greater levels of traffic are outlined in the evidence of Mr Smith. In urban design terms, the proposed ODP provides a high level of connectivity, a hierarchy of street types and the provision of shared paths.
- 13.4 In terms of shops, Prebbleton Commercial area is anticipated to continue growing, supported by the growing residential population. In my experience, commercial development follows residential as opposed to the other way around.

b. The retention of Village character, rural amenity outlook and interface with rural amenity;

- 13.5 All of the aspects which provide Prebbleton with a Village-like character to the town-centre will be unaffected by the Plan Change. The old church, large established trees and the character of the existing shops on Springs Road all contribute positively to Prebbleton's character and none will be affected by the proposal.
- 13.6 Prebbleton already has a suburban feel in many locations as opposed to a semi-rural town character, but with high amenity and high walkability. Similar to what is happening in Rolleston and Lincoln, Prebbleton is and will develop small commercial nodes within the wider settlement which provide further amenities and services to local residents.

c. Appropriateness of the proposed density

- 13.7 I outline this in Section 7 of my evidence and paragraph 12.5 in my response to the Section 42a report.

14 CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

- 14.1 The key Policy within the Canterbury Policy Statement (CRPS) of relevance to my expertise is Policy 6.3.2: *Development Form and Urban Design*

6.3.2 Development form and urban design

Business development, residential development (including rural residential development) and the establishment of public space is to give effect to the principles of good urban design below, and those of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005, to the extent appropriate to the context:

1. Tūrangawaewae – the sense of place and belonging – recognition and incorporation of the identity of the place, the context and the core elements that comprise the [sic] Through context and site analysis, the following elements should be used to reflect the appropriateness of the development to its location: landmarks and features, historic heritage, the character and quality of the existing built and natural environment, historic and cultural markers and local stories.

2. Integration – recognition of the need for well-integrated places, infrastructure, movement routes and networks, spaces, land uses and the natural and built environment. These elements should be overlaid to provide an appropriate form and pattern of use and development.

3. Connectivity – the provision of efficient and safe high quality, barrier free, multimodal connections within a development, to surrounding areas, and to local facilities and services, with emphasis at a local level placed on walking, cycling and public transport as more sustainable forms of

4. Safety – recognition and incorporation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the layout and design of developments, networks and spaces to ensure safe, comfortable and attractive places.

5. Choice and diversity – ensuring developments provide choice and diversity in their layout, built form, land use housing type and density, to adapt to the changing needs and circumstances of the population.

6. Environmentally sustainable design – ensuring that the process of design and development minimises water and resource use, restores ecosystems, safeguards mauri and maximises passive solar gain.

7. Creativity and innovation – supporting opportunities for exemplar approaches to infrastructure and urban form to lift the benchmark in the development of new urban areas in the Christchurch region.

14.2 The explanation to the above Policy notes that urban design input can take place through the development of outline development plans, creation of development controls for zones, or at a finer grained level through the resource consent process.

- 14.3 In my opinion the ODP, as amended, satisfies the requirements set out in Policy 6.3.2. In particular, there are no features of particular heritage or landmark value that are compromised by the development of the PC 68. In addition the form of development as laid out in the ODP meets the requirements for connectivity and integration with existing and proposed urban development.

15 CONCLUSIONS

- 15.1 The proposed Plan Change proposes a minimum density of 12 hh/Ha. This is higher than the recommended density in the Operative District Plan Township objectives and policies for the Living Z zone, but is considered appropriate for Prebbleton to meet the outcomes desired by the NPS:UD (2020) and consistent with RESZ-O3 objective:
- 15.2 A range of housing typologies and densities are provided for to ensure choice for the community and to cater for population growth and changing demographics.
- 15.3 Any amenity effects on existing and future residents can be successfully mitigated through the proposed mitigation measures. The proposed ODP provides a high level of connectivity and is consistent with the context and character of the receiving environment, and does not preclude future connectivity/growth.
- 15.4 In terms of landscape character and values of the area, subject to the mitigation proposed, the proposal will result in a low magnitude of change on the existing rural landscape character and values. Medium density areas will be 'internalised' within the development with lower density development providing a buffer with adjoining rural areas. The site will change from one rural and open in character to one which is more suburban in nature, with the change partially mitigated through fencing controls and landscape planting.
- 15.5 In terms of visual amenity, the rural and rural-residential properties will experience a change in the openness of views across the space, noting that many of the adjoining properties are surrounded by well-established shelter belt and boundary plantings restricting views out. Adjoining suburban residential properties, current and future, overlooking the Plan Change area

will have a mix of open, partial, and screened views of future development. Changes to the experience of these residents is considered very low given the character of existing views and existing boundary treatment.

- 15.6 In terms of creating well-functioning urban environments, as per Policy 8 of the NPS:UD, the Outline Development Plan addresses each of the Selwyn District Plan's Objectives and Policies in B4: Growth of Townships to ensure a high level of amenity, connectivity and accessibility.
- 15.7 Development of the PC68 is directly consistent with the urban design aspirations and requirements of the CRPS, in particular Policy 6.3.2.

David Compton-Moen

08 March 2022