

## SHORT SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

1. Private Plan Change 76 is a request made under clause 21 of Part 2 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA"). The application was lodged on 15 December 2020 and publicly notified on 2 June 2021.
2. The Proposed Plan Change seeks to rezone approximately 13 ha of Inner Plains land fronting on to East Maddisons Road , Rolleston, to Living Z (LZ) for urban residential purposes. Development will be in accordance with an Outlined Development Plan (ODP) and accompanying Narrative (see Appendix 1) which will be inserted as **Appendix E38** of the Township Volume in the Selwyn District Plan (SDP). The site will be referenced as one of 14 Living Z areas and the 'ODP' in Policy B4.3.9. It seeks to include specific matters relevant to implement PC76 in Policy B4.3.77 and requests any consequential amendments. The Site is recognised as a Future Development Area on Map A, and subject to the provisions of Policy 12, of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
3. The proposed rezoning would enable the creation of approximately 155 sections at residential densities of 12-15 households per hectare (HH/HA). All subdivision, development and activity standards for the Site will adopt those in the LZ Zone in the Operative SDP which helps maintain the integrity and simplicity of that document. There are proposed minor amendments to the SDP, including a new ODP and amendments to the objectives and policies to reflect the provisions of the ODP.
4. There are no submissions opposing the proposed rezoning. There were submission points relating to urban form and density, public transport, the point where the existing water race is terminated, traffic safety , and amenity effects of traffic. The Section 42A Report makes recommendations on these submissions and I generally concur with those recommendations.
5. The owners of 640 Maddisons Road have raised concerns about the effects of a proposed road exiting on to Maddisons Road directly opposite their property. The ODP has been amended to show this road as a pedestrian link, and Ms Williams covers this in her evidence. She also addresses concerns raised by the Ministry of Education relating to road safety for school children. Regarding the water race, my understanding is the requester is a significant way along the process of having the water race closed.

6. Mr Friedel has raised several matters concerning the Outline Development Plan (ODP) and Policy B4.3.77 which he has invited me to comment on or modify the following matters:
  1. Amend the plan and legend from 'indicative roads' to 'primary route' and 'secondary route'. This will ensure consistency with Appendix E38 of the SDP and ensures consistency with Mr. Collins transport related recommendations.
  2. Illustrate the pedestrian and cycling links to East Maddisons Road, which support Mr. Collins transport evidence to provide safe and convenient 'active modes' of transport throughout the Site.
  3. Submit ODP text as part of the evidence so that its appropriateness for inclusion in the SDP can be evaluated
  4. Reference the alignment of the existing water race on the ODP.
  5. The ODP is amended to remove the medium density housing adjacent to the indicative east to west aligned primary road directly adjacent to the Olivefields subdivision.
  6. Include additional cycle and pedestrian links from the south-western and south-eastern boundaries of the Site.
  7. Indicate a frontage upgrade along East Maddisons Road and to align the internal roads with the subdivisions on the opposite side of East Maddisons Road
8. Appendix 2 to his report provides an amended ODP that he considers addresses his recommended amendments to the ODP, and his consequential changes to Policy B4.377 are in Appendix 1 to his Report. I am supportive of these modifications subject some minor matters addressed by our Traffic Expert Lisa Williams, and Urban Design Expert Nicole Lauenstein and contained in their respective briefs of evidence. In my opinion they have adequately responded to the matters and incorporated most of the

amendments suggested. I have attached the requester's amended ODP to Appendix 1 of my evidence together with the narrative that was sought by the Section 42A Report.

9. Regarding the matters concerning public transport raised by the Canterbury Regional Council and Christchurch City Council, I agree with Mr Friedel that these issues are outside of the ambit of this Plan Change, other than the ODP ensuring that a potential bus route is enabled through the development which it does not through the ODP. These submitters have also sought a net density of 15hh/ha, however I do not consider that there is a statutory requirement to do this. Nor is there any statutory basis for the Plan Change to consider or enable social or affordable housing as part of this Plan Change, as sought by the two Councils.
10. I concur with Mr Friedel's overall conclusion at 8.58 of his Report. Specifically I consider that Plan Change 76
  - I. is in accordance with and supports the growth direction for Rolleston set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Selwyn District Plan;
  - II. promotes the social economic and cultural well-being of current and future residents of Rolleston by adding to land supply;
  - III. Gives effect to Change 1 of the CRPS and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).
  - IV. is in accordance with, and supports the objectives and policies of the other relevant planning documents;
  - V. is the most appropriate planning outcome for the using the land in a manner the promotes the purpose and principles of the RMA;
  - VI. supports the Council in carrying out its functions under Section 31 of the Act.