

BEFORE THE

**Selwyn District Council HEARING
COMMISSIONER**

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

Requests by Rolleston Industrial
Developments Limited and Brookside
Road Residential Limited to rezone land
in Rolleston (PC81 and PC82)

FURTHER STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY ANDREW CURTIS

1.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My Name is Andrew Curtis, I am a Technical Director at Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP), with over 35 years of experience. My experience and expertise is set out in my primary statement dated 12 September 2022.

2.0 PURPOSE OF STATEMENT

- 2.1 In Minute 3, the Commissioner requested that various additional information was provided and included in paragraph 13 the following:

I do consider that further evidence and optional expert conferencing is required in relation to the design and ODP changes that would be recommended in the event of adoption of a 1000m setback for dwellings from the property boundary of the RRRP.

- 2.2 While, as clarified in Minute 4, this additional evidence is largely related to urban design consideration, including the design of the Outline Development Plan, I have been asked by Selwyn District Council (SDC) to comment on the suitability of some of the land-use options that have been suggested from an air quality (odour) amenity perspective.

3.0 COMMENT ON SUITABLE LAND-USES

3.1 Before addressing some of the land-use options that I understand have been considered, I would reiterate the point that I made in my evidence in chief. I consider that any land-use that increases the density of residential dwellings significantly increases the risk of reverse sensitivity odour effects in relation to SDC assets, and consequently my preferred option is to retain a rural zoning on the land.

3.2 However if the Commissioner is minded support a change to the zoning within the odour buffer, then I have some comments on the options that have been discussed by the urban designers.

3.3 In paragraph 69 of her evidence in chief Ms Lauenstein provides the following options:

Should a larger setback than 600m be required, the area of the plan change contained in this setback can still be used for other urban functions such as recreational and sport facilities, complementary business and commercial activities, or even clusters of low density residential development to reduce the potential for complaints.

3.4 Firstly and fundamentally, with respect to Ms Lauenstein's comment, I would not support any option such as low density residential that resulted in any potential to increase the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.

3.5 If recreational or sports facilities were permitted, they should not be ones, like athletic tracks or tennis courts, where people are likely to be present for extended periods of time (refer further below).

3.6 I understand from Mr Nicholson that since the hearing the urban designers have discussed the following potential options for land use within the 1 km odour buffer:

- Potential land uses should avoid attracting people into the area for long periods or attracting large numbers of people;
- Forestry - either plantation or ecological;
- Potential for Cemetery;
- Low-intensity recreation – e.g. Bike tracks, dog park, drone park, frisbee golf, golf course, orienteering, horse riding; and
- Rural land uses.

3.7 I agree, with one exception, that the various land uses that are outlined above are all ones that would be appropriate within the odour buffer and consider the first bullet point to be the key principle when considering what might be appropriate to minimise the potential for odour reverse sensitivity effects.

- 3.8 A good example of an odour buffer that follows these principles is the Waitākiri/Bottle Lake Forest Park that surrounds the Burwood Landfill north of Christchurch, which contains extensive tracks for mountain biking, horse riding and walking.
- 3.9 I would not support the use of the land for a cemetery, as while this land-use generally follows the principles in the first bullet point cemeteries are normally considered to be highly sensitive locations, albeit that they relatively infrequently used, due to the typically elevated emotions of people when they are present.
- 3.10 Another example of a land-use that I consider that would not be appropriate would be venues that are used for public gatherings such as wedding venues.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 I consider that a rural zoning is the most appropriate type of land use to be undertaken within the odour buffer to minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity on SDC assets.
- 4.2 However if the Commissioner considered that a different zone were appropriate I consider that it would need to be one that ensured that potential land uses avoided attracting people into the area for long periods or attracting large numbers of people.

Andrew Curtis

24 November 2022