

BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER	the Resource Management Act 1991
IN THE MATTER	of Proposed Plan Change 78: East Rolleston
APPLICANT	Urban Estates Limited

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

URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE

Dated: 20 October 2021

Christchurch

Solicitor acting: G Cleary
Level 9, Anthony Harper Tower
PO Box 2646, Christchurch 8140
Tel +64 3 379 0920 | Fax +64 3 366 9277

A handwritten signature in dark green ink that reads "Anthony Harper". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

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) 2020-21 – 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) Trents Road, Prebbleton
 - (iii) Birchs Village, Prebbleton
 - (iv) Extension to Falcons Landing, Rolleston
 - (v) Rolleston Southeast
 - (vi) Holmes and Skellerup Block, 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 Estates Ltd (the Application) for a plan change to rezone approximately 63ha of Inner Plains Rural Zone land to Living Z, providing for approximately 750 dwelling sites at a density of 12 households per hectare. I prepared the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that was submitted as an update to the original application in April 2021.

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 December 2020 in relation to the proposal and updated in March 2021. 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) Rolleston's Urban Form and Growth;
 - (b) Connectivity and Walkability;
 - (c) Density and Character; and
 - (d) Landscape and visual effects.
- 4.4 In the preparation of my evidence, I have also reviewed the urban form of Rolleston 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 64¹ – Faringdon Southwest and Faringdon Southeast (42.32ha + 35.56ha, 969 households based on 12.45hh/ha);
 - Plan Change 70 – Faringdon Far West (63ha, 800 households – 12.7hh/ha);
 - Plan Change 71 – East Rolleston (53ha, 660 households – 12.7hh/ha);
 - Plan Chang 73 – Holmes and Skellerup Blocks (160ha, 2,100 households - ~12hh/ha);

¹ This Plan Change application appears to have been overtaken by a resource consent decision made by the Expert Consenting Panel under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 on 27 August 2021. That decision confirms a net density of between 12 and 13 hh/ha is achieved across both sites.

- Plan Change 75 – Falcon’s Landing Extension (24ha, 280households - ~ 12hh/ha).
- Plan Change 76 - East Maddisons Road (13ha, 150 households – 11.9hh/ha); and

5 ROLLESTON’S CONSOLIDATED URBAN FORM AND GROWTH

- 5.1 The growth of Rolleston Township has been well documented over the past twenty years, from a small settlement of a few houses around the State Highway and train station to the current footprint which extends 4km southeast from the State Highway. Since 2000 Canterbury’s population has increased from 493,000 people to 645,900 in 2020². An increase of 31%. For Rolleston the growth rate has been even greater, with Rolleston’s population growing from 9,555 in 2012 to 17,500 in 2017 based on the last census³.
- 5.2 The growth of the Town slowed in 2009-2010 with the Global Financial Crisis after high growth levels in the early 2000’s. At this time the Rolleston Structure Plan was finalised and released (2009) with the intention of identifying areas for residential growth. With the Canterbury earthquakes, the growth of the town commenced again and has continued to grow at a significant rate.
- 5.3 Residential growth typically focused along the southern edge of the State Highway and on either side of Rolleston Drive. Lowes Road at the time was the southern edge of higher density (still low density) development, with large lot residential properties located along the Road’s southern boundary. While a lot of these properties have now been intensified, the lack of connectivity south from Lowes Road is noticeable with most roads being cul-de-sacs that do not continue through to either Goulds Road or Oak Tree Lane. The section of Lowes Road between East Maddisons and Broadlands Drive is 1.115km with no intermediate through road. Broadlands Drive was constructed in 2010 with Clearview Primary School. The disbenefit of placing larger residential lots along the current edges of settlements is highlighted by the lack of connectivity along Lowes Road.

² <http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7979>

³ <https://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/123429830/plans-for-nearly-1000-new-rolleston-homes-opposed-over-transport-and-land-use-worries>

- 5.4 Growth of Rolleston to the east was and is limited by the Christchurch Airport's 50 dBA noise contour. To the north, residential growth is prevented by industrial land use and several issues created by the State Highway / motorway and the rail corridor.
- 5.5 To the south, the Faringdon development started in 2012⁴ jumping across Lowes Road and Foster Park, accessed from Goulds Road. Faringdon is continuing to develop the block bordered by Dunns Crossing, Selwyn and Springston-Lincoln Roads, including a block recently consented via the fast-track consent process. The Borough and The Greens (part of Faringdon) are located to the east of Springston-Rolleston Road. Selwyn Road is the southern edge of development with the Gammack Trust block⁵ preventing development further south.
- 5.6 In the south-eastern corner of Rolleston where PC78 is located, Braithwaite, Acland Park and Falcon's Landing developments are all nearing completion or are completed. Acland Park was an HAASHA (Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013) project approved in 2016 under the name of Chelsea Green. The development was for 888 households and includes a commercial area and associated open space. Acland Park is zoned Rural Inner Plains in the Operative District Plan and General Rural Zone in the Proposed District Plan. The final stages of Acland Park are currently in design with all other stages sold out, including the comprehensive and super lot sites. PC78, combined with PC75, will largely complete the south-eastern corner before development will likely 'jump' Lincoln Rolleston Road and Selwyn Road, to the east of the Gammack Trust block.
- 5.7 According to the Rolleston Structure Plan Development Sequence (2009), the south-eastern 'quadrant' was not due for implementation until 2041-2075. The Our Space 2018-2018 (2018) Figure 16⁶ also adopted the study area of the Rolleston Structure Plan
- 5.8 Overall, given the context described above, I consider that urban development should and will inevitably grow to the southeast of Rolleston

⁴ <https://www.faringdon.co.nz/developer/faringdon-history>

⁵ The Gammack Trust is a charitable Trust with a perpetual life with the Gammack Trust deed outlining that the land must be held for agricultural purposes and cannot be sold or subdivided for urban development.

⁶ <https://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/assets/Documents/greaterchristchurch/Our-Space-consultation/Draft-Our-Space-2018-2048.pdf>

with PC78 being a natural, in-sequence extension of existing urban areas (Falcon's Landing, PC75 and Acland Park). Rolleston's growth rate is well above the predicted forecasts, with the PC78 area identified in the 2009 Structure Plan coming 'online' well in-advance of the predicted dates in the Structure Plan.

- 5.9 The Rolleston Structure Plan has played an important role in directing the Town's growth and urban form. I am of the opinion that the Structure Plan is important as a guide for growth, but its relevance is reducing due to its lack of updating, particularly in terms of timing or staging. If the document were treated as a 'live' document, continually reviewed and updated to address current conditions then it would have more relevance and application.

6 CONNECTIVITY AND WALKABILITY

- 6.1 Below, I outline how PC78 can contribute to well-functioning urban environments.
- 6.2 Walkability and connectivity are key principles of the ODP, with a hierarchy of street types and connections provided throughout the area. 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. The ODP encourages connectivity using primary and secondary routes running through the area from west to east, with a primary connection linking Lady Isaac Drive (in Acland Park) to Lincoln-Rolleston Road (highlighted on Figure 4 of my attached figures). 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 run north-south to create a highly connected and 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. The layout of the blocks will have a predominantly north-south orientation where possible to maximise solar gain into rear yards (outdoor living spaces) of all properties. Supporting the road network, off road pedestrian and cycle paths will connect through to existing networks where they exist.

- 6.4 Open green spaces are provided within a 500m walkable catchment within PC78, as per Selwyn District Council policy. Existing playgrounds in Acland Park are in close proximity to PC78, along with the primary school currently under construction in Acland Park. A green link is proposed connecting to the existing link at the end of Kate Sheppard Drive.
- 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 located within the town centre, but given the growth of the settlement it is likely more medical facilities will establish in local neighbourhood centres (Acland Park, subject to consent).

7 DENSITY AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

- 7.1 A key consideration of this Plan Change is that PC78 is already 'marked' for future residential development. It is only the timing, density, character and rural interfaces which are of issue.
- 7.2 I consider that the proposed Plan Change is consistent with current urban development practice in Rolleston of creating densities of 12hh/ha and greater. I am supportive of this approach in Rolleston, 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 residential-rural interface, the key interface is along Selwyn Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road edge, noting that the eastern side of the Lincoln Rolleston Road is also included within the FUDA. I recommend that this Road interface is treated as an urban road with dwellings addressing the street, with direct driveway access where possible. Based on the existing edge treatment within Falcon's Landing and the likely similar edge treatment on the PC75 Lincoln Rolleston Road frontage, the edge treatment for PC78 is likely to include a 2.5m wide shared path, the undergrounding of services and the installation of street lights. The installation of 1.8m high close board timber fences should be avoided where possible.
- 7.4 The proposed density, with a 12hh/ha minimum, 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 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 Rolleston 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. The rezoning will result in noticeable change from the existing rural residential character, but I consider it is acceptable and, to a large degree, anticipated change.

8 VISUAL AMENITY EFFECTS

- 8.1 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 receiving environment is to maintain aspects of openness through the management of fencing and frontage upgrades along Lincoln Rolleston Road and Selwyn Road and the improvement of connectivity and accessibility throughout the wider site. The management of bulk and location of the development will also help create a sense of openness through the centralisation of denser development.

- 8.2 The highest likely effects after mitigation will be experienced by those existing residential properties closest to the proposal along Lincoln Rolleston and Selwyn Roads. Though there is a change in the overall character of the receiving environment, a low magnitude of change is anticipated from these residential properties as the proposal will become an extension of existing development. Motorists have a temporary view of the development and are anticipated to expect change in land from rural to suburban as they travel to/from Rolleston township.
- 8.3 Overall, the scale and bulk and location of the proposal would allow it to appear as a natural extension of existing development within Rolleston, with a low to very low magnitude of change anticipated.

9 MITIGATION MEASURES

- 9.1 A series of mitigation measures 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.
- 9.2 (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.
- 9.3 (MM2) Locate higher density towards the centre of the development, buffered by lower density development along the edges of the plan change. This is provided for through the placement of any medium density centrally, close to proposed open spaces.
- 9.4 (MM3) 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.

- 9.5 (MM4) 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.
- 9.6 (MM5) Provide a quantity of greenspace and facilities appropriate 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.
- 9.7 (MM6) Solid fencing should preferably be restricted to rear and side yards to retain an open character along streets and existing roads (in particular Lincoln Rolleston and Selwyn 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. This is a matter that would be incorporated into developer covenants, that manage and implement specific design outcomes sought within the Plan Change area.

10 SECTION 42A REPORT AND EVIDENCE OF MS GABI WOLFER

- 10.1 I have reviewed the Council's Section 42a Report as well as reviewed the Urban Design / Town Planning evidence of Ms Gabi Wolfer. We are largely in agreement that the proposed Plan Change is consistent with the objectives, policies and provisions of the operative Selwyn District Plan relating to urban design, noting the following.
- 10.2 I agree with the recommended changes to the ODP plan and text as follows which will lead to a greater level of future connectivity with Acland Park and to the east over Lincoln-Rolleston Road(future development) while not precluding connectivity to PC75 (if approved) and possible future development on the eastern side of Lincoln Rolleston Road. An updated ODP is attached to Ms Harte's evidence and also shown here (Figure 4 of the attached figures) as it relates to PC75 and Acland Park.

10.3 The changes are:

- (a) The ODP and Policy B4.3.77 are amended to indicate the need for a frontage upgrade along Lincoln Rolleston Road and Selwyn Road.
- (b) The ODP Plan is amended to illustrate the walking and cycling routes within the site, including the north-south and east-west cycle routes, Although the routes differ slightly on the updated ODP from the Council's proposed ODP, the same outcome is achieved from an urban design perspective. A key link is the cycle and walking connection to Te Rōhutu Who School
- (c) The catchments for the two reserves are 500m radii.

10.4 I am in disagreement though regarding the inclusion of the existing water race in the ODP and referenced in supporting text. The water race is a minor element of the existing landscape character and not of a scale or importance worthy of protection. This is supported by the majority of ODP's which have been developed in Appendix E38 of the Selwyn District Plan⁷ which do not reference the water race. The inclusion of a water race into a development can be evaluated at the subdivision stage, as a matter of discretion.

10.5 In terms of 12hh/ha versus 15hh/ha, I am in agreement with Mr Craig Friedel⁸ that a minimum density of 12hh/ha is appropriate for PC78 at this point in time, increasing from the current 10hh/ha in the Living Z zone. Working on Acland Park, following the realisation that large stormwater reserves were/are not necessary in Rolleston, the density of housing was increased to provide greater diversity. The result was a density of approximately 14hh/ha, up from the initially anticipated 11hh/ha. For this extension to Falcon's Landing, to achieve 15hh/ha, a large proportion of the development would need to be Medium Density (Comprehensive) as opposed to being 'a part' of the 'typology mix'. I consider that, in this Plan Change, that the minimum of 12hh/ha is a more appropriate level, ensuring a optimal use of the site while allowing an appropriate typology mix to be developed.

⁷ Section 42a Report, Outline Development Plan, paragraph 7.24 (pg.17)

⁸ Section 42a Report, Analysis - Density, paragraphs 7.12, 7.13 (pg.14)

11 CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

11.1 **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.*

- 11.2 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.
- 11.3 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 78. 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, including connections to development of the balance of the FDA at East Rolleston such as Acland Park, PC75 and land currently utilised for low intensity market gardening.

12 SUBMISSIONS

- 12.1 There is one submission which relates to amenity or urban design aspects, this being PC78-002 – Christchurch City Council’s submission. This requests a minimum density of 15hh/ha compared to the current proposal of 12hh/ha. From a character perspective, the difference between 12hh/ha and 15hh/ha is often not overly discernible, but achieving 15hh/ha does require a greater proportion of medium density housing.
- 12.2 Attached in Figure 5 is an example showing a typical block developed at different densities (10, 12, and 15 hh/ha).

13 CONCLUSIONS

- 13.1 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 Rolleston to meet the outcomes desired by the NPS:UD (2020) and consistent with RESZ-O3 objective:
- 13.2 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.
- 13.3 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.

- 13.4 In terms of landscape character and values of the area, subject to the mitigation proposed, the proposal will result in an acceptable 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.
- 13.5 In terms of visual amenity, the rural 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.
- 13.6 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.
- 13.7 Development of the PC78 is directly consistent with the urban design aspirations and requirements of the CRPS, in particular Policy 6.3.2.
- 13.8 In terms of landscape character and values of the area, subject to the mitigation measures proposed, the proposal will result in an acceptable magnitude of change on the existing rural-residential landscape character and values. The existing character of the PC78 area is already modified with no natural features of note. The partially open character of the site will change to a character which is more compartmentalised into smaller units, but which can be partially mitigated through fencing controls and reserve and streetscape planting to retain a high level of amenity (items which are sorted out during the subdivision consenting stage).
- 13.9 In terms of visual amenity, the adjacent rural properties will experience a change in the openness of views across the space. Adjoining suburban residential properties, current and future, overlooking the Plan Change areas

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

13.10 In this regard the proposal is considered consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020.

David Compton-Moen

20 October 2021