

Before the Selwyn District Council

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*in the matter of:* Proposed Private Plan Changes 81 and 82 to the  
Operative District Plan: Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston

*and:* **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited** and  
**Brookside Road Residential Limited**  
*Applicant*

Statement of Evidence of Nicole Lauenstein (urban design)

---

Dated: 29 August 2022

---

Reference: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)  
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com  
T +64 4 499 5999  
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 993  
Wellington 6140  
New Zealand

Auckland  
Wellington  
Christchurch



## STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICOLE LAUENSTEIN

### INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Nicole Lauenstein. I have the qualifications of Dipl. Ing Arch. and Dipl. R.U.Pl. equivalent to a Master in Architecture and a Master in Urban Design (Spatial and Environmental Planning) from the University of Kaiserslautern / Germany. I was an elected member of the Urban Design Panel in Christchurch from 2008 to 2016 and am a member of the UDF (Urban Design Forum). Before moving to New Zealand I was a member of the BDA (German Institute of Architects) and the AIA (Association Internationale des Architectes).
- 2 I am director of a + urban, a Christchurch based architecture and urban design company established in 1999. I have over 25 years of professional experience in architecture and urban design in particular within the crossover area of urban development, master planning, and comprehensive spatial developments
- 3 I have practised as an Urban Designer and Architect for the first 8 years in Germany, Netherlands, England, Spain and Australia before re-establishing my own architectural and urban design practice in New Zealand. In both practices I have undertaken many projects combining the architectural and urban disciplines. Projects have been varied in scale and complexity from urban revitalisation of city centres, development of growth strategies for smaller communities, architectural buildings in the public realm and private residential projects in sensitive environments.
- 4 Prior to my arrival in NZ I worked for several European Architects and Urban Designers. I was involved in a range of urban studies and rural area assessments for the governance of the individual federal states in Germany, investigating urban sprawl of major cities such as Frankfurt, Darmstadt, Rostock, Berlin and the effect on the urban and rural character. This work included developing mechanisms and criteria to facilitate sustainable development. Other work for private clients consisted of the design of sustainable developments in sensitive areas with very stringent development guidelines.
- 5 My experience in New Zealand includes working on growth strategies for urban and peri-urban areas including rural and urban residential developments with a mixture of densities from low, medium to high. I have prepared several urban analyses, development strategies and design concepts for urban and rural residential areas within the Canterbury region (Lincoln, Rolleston, Tai Tapu, Ohoka, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Lake Hood, Ashburton), Akaroa as well as the wider South Island including developments in Queenstown, Wanaka, Invercargill, Marlborough Region, Hurunui District and Buller District.

- 6 My most recent urban design and architecture work includes:
- 6.1 Papa Otakaro Avon River and East/North Frame concept design, Christchurch Central City;
  - 6.2 Kirimoko residential development in Wanaka Stages 1 – 6;
  - 6.3 Urban analysis and strategic plans for Selwyn District Council Hurunui District Council, Christchurch City Council, Queenstown and Lakes District, Nelson and Buller District, Wellington CBD and Auckland City and the greater Auckland urban area;
  - 6.4 Masterplans for urban development in Lincoln, Rolleston, Taitapu, Amberley, Rangiora, Ohoka, Ashburton, Christchurch, Westport Wanaka and Queenstown, Auckland;
  - 6.5 Mixed Use development Hagley Avenue, Christchurch;
  - 6.6 New Tait Building and Masterplan, north-west Christchurch;
  - 6.7 Several commercial and residential 'rebuild' projects in Christchurch;
  - 6.8 Master Plans for post-earthquake Inner-City block infill and brown field conversions in Christchurch;
  - 6.9 ODP's for rebuild projects in the Christchurch CBD;
  - 6.10 Analysis and identification of Character Areas within Christchurch as part of the District Plan Review; and
  - 6.11 Several private plan changes in the Christchurch, Waimakariri, Hurunui, Selwyn, Westland, Buller and Lakes District Areas.
- 7 I have been involved in tertiary education and lectured in urban design at Lincoln University at both graduate and post graduate level. I am currently a guest lecturer at ARA Institute of Technology, teaching architecture and urban design. I have also delivered professional development workshops for both architects and urban designers.

#### **CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 8 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I note that in preparing my evidence I have reviewed the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in Part 7 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I have complied with it in preparing my evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to

consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

### **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 9 I am familiar with:
  - 9.1 The plan change application by Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited to rezone approximately 28 hectares of rural land in Rolleston to Living MD (*PC81*); and
  - 9.2 The plan change application by Brookside Road Residential Limited to rezone approximately 110 hectares of rural land in Rolleston to Living MD and Business 1 (*PC82*).
- 10 I have been involved in the revision of the ODPs and the hearing for PC73, and have been involved in the entire design process and the applications for rezoning for PC81 and PC82.
- 11 I have worked closely with Dave Compton Moen and have read his evidence in relation to the requested rezoning of the land on the western side of Dunns Crossing Road through the proposed Selwyn District Plan proceedings (Submitter DPR-0358 / DPR-0392) and his evidence for this PC 81/82 hearing. I agree with his statements, assessments and conclusions in all matters related to urban design, form and growth.
- 12 In support of the matters covered by Mr Compton Moen my evidence will deal with the following:
  - 12.1 Rolleston - Urban Growth and Form over time;
  - 12.2 Future growth and sequencing;
  - 12.3 The lay of the land and the new urban context for PC 81/82, including:
    - (a) The constantly evolving planning and urban design frame work; and,
    - (b) The evolving context and ongoing urbanisation around PC 81 and 82;
  - 12.4 Refinements to all ODP's; and
  - 12.5 The best urban design outcome for the area west of Dunns Crossing Road.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN DIRECTIONS**

12.6 Similar to Mr Nicholson and Mr Compton Moen I have drawn strategic direction from relevant national, regional and district sources all of which provide overarching guidance on urban form, urban development and other related urban design matters. This includes:

- (a) The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPSUD);
- (b) the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS);
- (c) the Operative Selwyn District Plan (SDP), and to some extent the Proposed District Plan;
- (d) the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005; and
- (e) the Rolleston Structure Plan 2009.

## **SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE**

- 13 Planning and urban design directives at a national level clearly instruct and guide future urban development and intensification towards existing urban areas in particular around Key Activity Centres. Rolleston has been identified as the Key Activity Centre in the Selwyn District and can and needs to support such urban growth. Whilst not located in a future development area (FUDA), PC 81 and 82 are consistent with overarching objectives and policies of the Operative and Proposed District Plan and also assist in meeting the requirements for residential intensification and provision of additional development capacity anticipated by the NPSUD. .
- 14 The urban analysis of Rolleston and the assessment of urban growth options and constraints (refer to page 3 of the appendix in Mr Compton Moen's evidence) clearly show that the land west of Dunns Crossing is not only available and suitable for urban development, but is a natural growth sequence and is the only realistic direction of urban residential growth in Rolleston outside of infill development.
- 15 Since lodgement of PC 82 and PC 81 more information is available which gives a better understanding of the intensifying urban context surrounding these PC areas. This includes:
  - 15.1 a submission on PC 82 (Hill Street Limited) and various submissions to the Proposed District Plan review are seeking the inclusion of the land west of Dunns Crossing Road as urban areas;

- 15.2 the expected residential rezoning and development of the PC 70 land;
  - 15.3 clarifications on traffic related matters such as the intersection upgrade at SH1/Dunns Crossing Road creating the western entry into Rolleston, and the role of Dunns Crossing Road as a key entry and north-south distributor into Rolleston bringing with it an urbanisation of those roads;
  - 15.4 the proposed overpass to the I-Zone opening up pathways to a future fast commuter rail connection to Christchurch;
  - 15.5 further progress in urban infill development east of Dunns Crossing Road; and
  - 15.6 the recent decision to decline PC 73 due to concerns around odour and urban form which has been appealed and is currently in mediation.
- 16 Regardless of the outcome of PC 73 the environment adjacent to PC 82 will be predominantly of a residential nature, with a pocket of rural and L2 to the north, L3 or LZ to the south (PC73) and LZ or L1B to the east. The environment adjacent to PC 81 will be of a residential nature on two sides with either L3 or LZ to the north (PC73) and LZ to the east (PC 70).
- 17 Individually each ODP for PC81 and PC82 can be connected to existing residential areas and will work well on their own, regardless of whether PC73 is ultimately granted or not. Both provide good connections to the existing urban fabric and linkages to potential future development. Both have good access to local commercial centres and neighbourhood reserves as well as other community facilities, all within acceptable walking and cycling distances.
- 18 Small adjustments have been made to both ODPs, responding to changes occurring in the surrounding environment and in response to submissions, the Officer's Report and urban design statement by Mr Nicholson. These refinements improve the distribution of the local commercial centres across the entire area and associated greenspaces, and result in minor adjustments to the road layout as a flow on effect. The underlying design concepts, connectivity and accessibility however remain the same in principle.
- 19 All plan changes west of Dunns Crossing Road, including PC81/82 (and PC73), are owned by a single entity willing to develop and have no impediment to development such as multiple ownership and related boundary constraints, or integration of existing rural dwellings, access routes and established gardens. This makes the design process comprehensive, well integrated and cohesive and

above all provides a very high level of certainty that the design outcomes will be achieved.

- 20 Advising on urban design, in particular urban form, requires strategic oversight and PC81, PC82 and PC 73 should not fall victim to 'procedural constraints'. From an urban form, connectivity and accessibility perspective they should never be considered in total isolation from each other and in relation to only existing conditions. To best understand the contribution each individual PC makes to the wider urban fabric it should be seen as a key part of a cohesive, connected and compact strategy for urban growth west of Dunns Crossing Road, even if presented as individual ODPs and with slightly offset timelines.
- 21 When looking at all the residential rezoning proposals west of Dunns Crossing Road (i.e. PC 73, 82 and 81 and the possible urbanisation of the L2/rural pocket), a strong, cohesive overall development and growth strategy clearly presents itself. However, the risk of ending up with either two isolated L3 developments or a piecemeal mix of urban densities randomly interspersed with very low L3 densities still remains should these plan changes not proceed.
- 22 Without a doubt, the best compact urban form for this western edge of Rolleston, the best connectivity and accessibility and most certainty that development will result in a well-functioning urban environment will be achieved if all these plan changes work together. Both PC 82 and 81 make considerable contributions towards this and in particular PC 82 is a keystone linking the entire area together.
- 23 Any remaining concerns related to either technical matters such as the settling of the odour setback, procedural planning matters and temporary concerns around connectivity related to staging or timing can be resolved independently and they do not materially affect the urban form and inherent urban qualities of the PC proposals.

#### **ROLLESTON URBAN GROWTH AND URBAN FORM OVER TIME**

- 24 Mr Compton Moen provides a good, succinct summary of the growth pattern of Rolleston and I agree with his observations but would like to add some clarification around the unique and difficult urban form of Rolleston, the changes that were introduced by the Structure Plan and how this has influenced and solidified the layout, connectivity and the growth pattern of Rolleston.
- 25 Rolleston started as a small settlement centred around the SH1 but quickly grew into a township with a centre focused on the southern side turning its back to the highway corridor, this was further consolidated with establishment of the I-Zone to the north and all urban residential, commercial and community growth being guided

to the south, east and west but remaining south of the highway. The highway has since established itself as a hard northern boundary to the township.

- 26 Ongoing expansion created a more and more imbalanced urban form and a centre with limited growth capacity combined with issues around high amenity connections between residential developments and linkages to the centre. The Structure Plan introduced the bigger vision for Rolleston and it has since developed into a key regional township with a main commercial centre to the north and several well distributed sub-centres to the south east and west. The Structure Plan has also introduced a large centrally located reserve (Foster Park) with a variety of community, educational and recreational facilities creating a second central hub. The community footprint has therefore extended significantly southwards starting to balance out the original irregularly expanding and disconnected urban form.
- 27 Rolleston in its current form is still working on overcoming the limited connectivity within the older residential areas and the disconnect between the original commercial centre and the new community hub around Foster Park but it is clear when looking at the Structure Plan that the connectivity within the new areas and the east-west and south connectivity through Foster Park will assist greatly in creating a better functioning urban environment. However, due to the position of the original towncentre to the north in close proximity to SH1, Rolleston will most likely always have issues with consolidation of urban form and connectivity impacting on the function of the urban environment.

## **FUTURE URBAN GROWTH AND SEQUENCING**

### **Sequencing of growth**

- 28 Sequencing of development is not an exact science and can rarely be fully controlled or predicted as it is a result of many underlying conditions and pressures. This includes, but is not limited to:
  - 28.1 property size;
  - 28.2 location;
  - 28.3 ownership structure;
  - 28.4 land availability and suitability;
  - 28.5 historic development patterns;
  - 28.6 surrounding developments and sensitivities;
  - 28.7 landscape characteristics;



- 28.8 ground conditions and terrain;
  - 28.9 specific events;
  - 28.10 land use;
  - 28.11 market pressure;
  - 28.12 planning and zoning requirements;
  - 28.13 national and regional policies;
  - 28.14 individual circumstances;
  - 28.15 availability and capacity of infrastructure;
  - 28.16 transport and services;
  - 28.17 connectivity and access;
  - 28.18 competition;
  - 28.19 design trends;
  - 28.20 finances and budgets; and
  - 28.21 project timelines.
- 29 Along with these factors there is the desire to develop, or resistance to develop, on both a personal level, and as a community. Some of these parameters are controllable, measurable and visible, while others are less tangible. Some are interconnected, others are isolated issues, but all of these and many others not listed above will influence the sequence of development.
- 30 Anticipating and guiding larger scale development in our discipline is often done through structural, spatial and master planning. It combines strategic, spatial and structural design and planning. This process actually lays down a spatial structure for a town to grow into at its own pace/ sequence.
- 31 With regards to sequencing of development to achieve a consolidated urban form it would be ideal if growth was always centric moving outwards. However, that is utterly unrealistic, brings with it issues of efficiencies, and is in itself not organic nor sufficiently responsive to most of the issues driving development. Townships often develop in 'chunks' based on market pressure, ownership structures, personal circumstances of owners, landscape features, and land availability paired with planning and infrastructure guidance.

### **Future growth of Rolleston**

- 32 The areas originally identified in the Rolleston Structure Plan in 2007/2009 (RSP) and the Future Urban Development Areas (FUDA) are all clearly filling up with either development being completed, construction still in progress or are part of the way through a plan change process. This leaves only a few isolated areas of infill to the north of Selwyn Road to be resolved until the Structure Plan vision is completed. It is notable that almost all of the areas identified in the Structure Plan sequencing in 2009 have been developed or are in the process of development. However, they were developed in an altogether different sequence and in a much faster time frame than initially expected and set out in the Structure Plan due to influences outside of the control of the Council. For example, Figure 5.4 of the Structure Plan shows development areas of Rolleston anticipated to be developed in 2041-2075, which have already been developed. The sequencing noted in the Structure Plan is therefore significantly outdated.
- 33 I agree with Mr Compton Moen's conclusion with regard to the constraints around the town and the resulting remaining growth directions (refer to paragraphs 15-22, and page 3 of the Appendix of Mr Compton Moen's evidence). Most of these constraints are known attributes of Rolleston and provide a good level of certainty. To the east there is a possibility the airport noise contour constraint may retreat gradually over time with improvements in aviation technology which could provide some additional opportunities for residential development. These opportunities would however be limited as the proposed District Park identified in the Structure Plan creates an edge to development in this direction and versatile soils are also present in this location.
- 34 The Gammack Estate to the south of Selwyn Road is held in a perpetual charitable trust that prevents the land from being sold or subdivided for urban development, and requiring it to be used for agricultural purposes. As such, growth to the south is considerably constrained. The sewage treatment plant, resource recovery plant and State Highway 1 will remain impediments to development to the north and north-west and therefore present definitive and defensible 'boundaries' to development. As a result of the above mentioned restrictions, the next sequence of development is bound to jump across the roads to the south-east (across Lincoln Rolleston Road) and south-west (across Dunns Crossing Road) where there are no physical constraints to development. Although not identified as a FUDA, the western side of Dunns Crossing Road is a logical next step in the sequence of development within the urban growth pattern of Rolleston, as initiated by the Structure Plan.
- 35 Looking back at the specific history of development in Rolleston, the Structure Plan has set the overall directions for growth and all development since has followed in this direction. Plan Changes 81

and 82 are a logical next step in this sequence and a natural continuation of the existing Rolleston urban environment.

### **THE LAY OF THE LAND AND THE NEW URBAN CONTEXT FOR PC 81/82**

- 36 Since lodgement of PC 82 and PC 81 (and notable also since the decline of PC73) more information is available which gives a better understanding of the intensifying urban context surrounding these PC areas.

#### **Constantly evolving planning and urban design framework**

- 37 Over the past 2 years and in particular with the introduction of the NPSUD, the planning environment related to urban design and development has significantly changed with a clear direction and mandate at a national level in support of urban intensification and consolidation of growth around existing urban areas, in particular key activity centres. Rolleston has been identified as the largest key activity centre in the Selwyn District. It can and needs to support intensification and urban growth.

- 38 To respond to the main directives of the NPSUD and its ongoing refinements the authorities at the regional and district level are also reviewing and redefining their key planning documents. The proposed district plan review process continues to evolve and it is therefore difficult to assess proposals against specific details of these planning instruments that are subject to ongoing change.

- 39 However, the key overarching objectives and policies with regard to urban form concern: connectivity, accessibility walkability, residential density choice and amenity. In these regards, the PC 81 and 82 proposals are consistent with the Operative and Proposed District Plan requirements.

#### **Urban form and urban growth Rollestons west**

- 40 PC 81 and 82 are not part of a future urban development area (FUDA) and hence not considered an 'active' part of the 'official' urban growth strategy for Rolleston. But the history of growth rate and development pattern clearly shows that while the strategic planning documents provide good overall guidance on the direction of urban growth, this is often not fully in step with the reality on the ground.

- 41 In his evidence Mr Compton Moen clearly describes the current growth opportunities and constraints for Rolleston township and I concur with his assessment that given the context urban development should and will inevitably grow mainly to the west, jumping across Dunns Crossing Road. PC 81 and 82 are therefore a natural, in-sequence extension of the existing urban area.

- 42 In theory there are opportunities for development outside of the FUDAs either on the eastern side of Rolleston across Weedons Road or even stepping into pockets south of Selwyn Road. But when this scenario is overlaid with the location of versatile soils the growth direction towards the east and south is further emphasized as possibly not being appropriate for urban growth, leaving only the west as a feasible and more sustainable option.
- 43 Mr Compton Moen also identifies that Rolleston's growth rate is well above the predicted forecasts and the areas identified in the 2009 Structure Plan have largely been developed or are already subject of proposed Plan Changes. Considering this growth rate and the currently escalating costs of residential development due in part to a lack of residentially zoned land, it is critical to allow for further expansion of the urban area of Rolleston.
- 44 The fact that all plan changes west of Dunns Crossing Road, including PC81/82, are owned by a single entity willing to develop in a cohesive and comprehensive way. And the fact that there are no complicating impediments to development (such as multiple ownership and related boundary constraints, or integration of existing rural dwellings, access routes and established gardens) provides a very high level of certainty that urban form outcomes will be achieved.
- 45 Single ownership also allows the design process to be more comprehensive, well integrated and allows the sequencing of development stages to follow a logical pattern versus the need to accommodate conflicting individual ownership and property requirements. But above all the single ownership provides a clear overarching strategy for the entire area west of Dunns Crossing Road with cohesive urban design outcomes.

#### **DEVELOPMENT AROUND PC 81 AND 82**

- 46 The immediate urban context surrounding the PC81 and PC82 sites also continues to transition from a rural to an urban environment, which is evidenced by the following ongoing developments and proposed changes.

#### **Changes to SH1 / Lowes road / the flyover and the changing role of Dunns Crossing Road**

- 47 A major upgrade is proposed at the SH1 and Dunns Crossing intersection creating a new western gateway. This major entry point into the township will divert traffic southwards along Dunns Crossing Road and onto Lowes Road, the main east-west connection across Rolleston. It will also provide an alternative route to the I-Zone and generally easier and safer access to SH1. This upgrade to the intersection and gateway formation will have a strong impact on the northern portion of Dunns Crossing Road with related upgrades of

road standards to an urban level, increased traffic flows and generally increased activity. It also improves access to the north west of Rolleston supporting development and accelerating urbanisation.

- 48 Lowes Road has undergone a full transition from a rural road to a primary urban road and connects the entire northern part of Rolleston in an east-west direction from Dunns Crossing Road to the Weedons Road/SH1 access and the proposed Park and Ride. Lowes Road also provides the main vehicular connection to the town centre and to the facilities (community education and recreation) in Foster Park.
- 49 As a result of the western gateway on SH1 the intersection of Lowes and the northern part of Dunns Crossing Road will also need to be upgraded to a similar urban standard which will introduce a fully urban street appearance to this area in front of the PC73 Holmes block, the primary school, the L2 area all the way to the southern edge of Brookside Park and along part of PC 82.
- 50 Due to the urban intensification to the east of Dunns Crossing Road the once rural character of the road corridor is fast transitioning to an urban character with direct property access, driveways, smaller building setbacks changes to boundary vegetation, urban fences, streetlights and other typical urban commodities such as formed footpaths and several side roads offering views into residential neighbourhoods.
- 51 This transition is a good example of gradual urbanisation along road corridors and shows that roads do not present discernible and defensible boundaries for urban forms. The reason that roads are often mistaken for boundaries is due to their dominant visual representation on two dimensional plans as black lines. This does not however translate into strong discernible boundaries in the real three dimensional world. To the contrary, roads are by nature connecting elements, as they facilitate movement and provide access to adjacent land on both sides of the road. Roads themselves do not provide sufficient verticality to create visually discernible boundaries.
- 52 In addition to these local road and transport related changes better access to the IZone for all of Rolleston will be facilitated by the new flyover, an overpass for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, in a central location across SH1. This new connection does not only create a safe and direct route to places of work and commerce, it would also provide a direct access to a possible future fast commuter rail connection to Christchurch.

- 53 Both SH1 interventions are indicators of the fast paced growth Rolleston has experienced and will have a lasting impact on the urban functioning and character of the township itself.

**PC73**

- 54 PC 73, a request for rezoning of L3 zoned land on the Holmes and Skellerup Block to LZ was recently declined and is now under appeal and going through a mediation process to try and resolve two outstanding issues, the appropriate odour setback and the disagreements related to urban form. At the time of the decision making for PC73 the full extent of information from PC82 and PC81 was not available to the Commissioner and although I disagree with the outcome from an urban design perspective, it is understandable that this lack of a more all-encompassing urban form overview at the time and the unfortunate coupling of the odour setback and urban form debate led to this decision.
- 55 Due to the appeal process and ongoing mediation a final decision is still pending which leaves some uncertainty with development options for the PC73 site ranging from a very low density L3 to LZ. However, regardless of the outcome of PC 73, development on PC 73 land will be of a residential nature.

**Rural pocket / L2 area**

- 56 The small L2 enclave and remaining pocket of rural land north of Brookside Road is not part of the land held by the owner of PC 73, 81 and 82 and has therefore not been included in PC 82. At the PC 73 hearing a large number of the residents who own land in this area sought through submissions to have their land included in the rezoning to LZ. This shows that there is a willingness of some owners to further intensify development on their land.
- 57 As part of the refining of the PC82 design concept that underpins the ODP I have investigated the development potential of this area in more detail and can confirm that intensification of the L2 zone to an urban level is possible. This would include the introduction of a small green space and a finer grain road layout with direct north-south and east-west linkage through the site.
- 58 The adjacent pocket of rural land will be reduced to some extent by the required odour setback but sufficient land would remain to create linkages through the site flanked by residential development to ensure good connectivity to PC 73 and PC 82.
- 59 This small L2/rural area is not really a productive rural proposition. Considering its location, it is only a matter of time before it is developed into an urban environment.

### **Ongoing in-fill east of Dunns crossing**

- 60 Areas east of Dunns Crossing continue to intensify with a variety of urban infill developments of various scale including PC 78 which has recently been approved. The areas north of PC 70 are nearing completion with only very small pockets remaining.
- 61 A key issue for the entire area between Goulds Road and Dunns Crossing Road is the lack of connectivity particularly in an east-west direction. The council has worked hard on resolving this issue step by step with each pocket of infill development and created a few possible linkages onto Dunns Crossing Road.
- 62 PC 82 has responded to that by picking up every possible connection and pulling these right into and through the Site as well as creating a fine grain of roads and shared pedestrian/cycle ways that facilitate multiple direct routes onto Dunns Crossing Road and a strong diagonal route leading to Brookside Park. It also facilitates easy access for the residential community east of Dunns Crossing Road to the proposed local commercial centres.

### **Brookside park and local primary school**

- 63 Brookside Park and the local primary school with a role of 700 pupils are both part of the wider urban fabric as they service the surrounding residential community.

### **Status and relevance of PC 70**

- 64 PC 70 requests the rezoning of land to the south-east of Dunns Crossing Road opposite PC 81 from rural to residential LZ. This PC application is currently being processed under the COVID fast track programme and is expected to be approved in due course. The site sits within a FUDA indicating that it is earmarked for urban development so development should be anticipated. I note that Mr Phillips elaborates further on the status of this land in his evidence.
- 65 In preparing PC 81, the available details from PC 70 in particular connectivity and road alignments were considered and directly responded to making sure that both PCs work well together.
- 66 However, I do not consider this plan change to be reliant on the establishment of PC 70 in advance of development on the PC 81 land. PC 81 has direct access to Dunns Crossing Road and Goulds Road and from there several options to connect to the towncentre, Foster Park and other local commercial centres in Faringdon and PC73 and PC82. Internally PC 81 provides all other relevant urban amenities, recreational spaces etc to support a LZ or MD residential environment. As elaborated on by Mr Phillips, the living zoning also allows non-commercial community facilities to establish such as preschools, retirement villages etc.

### **Waste and sewage management areas**

- 67 The sewage treatment and waste management areas to the north-west of PC 82 trigger odour related reverse sensitivity issues with residential areas and present a clear and permanent block to urban development.
- 68 Based on the expert opinion of Mr Van Kekem and Mr Iseli the appropriate setback for residential activities to mitigate against the effects of odour from the Pines Resource Recovery Park (*PRRP*) is 600m. This setback only remotely touches the far north-west corner of the PC 82 site and has no impact on the ODP layout. PC81 is unaffected by this.
- 69 I understand it is the current position of SDC that they consider a larger setback is appropriate from the PRRP. A larger setback would cut into the PC82 ODP at the north west corner in a circular motion. However, I do not consider this an issue from an urban form perspective. 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.
- 70 Urban form is not solely defined by residential activity. These alternative functions are integral parts of the urban fabric and are considered part of the overall compact urban form. Wherever the odour setback line finally lands is a purely technical matter and is not connected to the issue of urban form, nor changes my views on urban form. There are several tools and urban design techniques to allow us to respond to such technical matters without impacting on the essence of the urban fabric or form. In the case of a larger setback the ODP is capable of being amended in a way that still results in good urban form and connectivity as the extent of urban development would only slightly contract.

### **Refinements to all ODPs**

- 71 As a result of all the above, the environment adjacent to PC 82 will be predominantly of a residential nature, with rural/L2 or MDR development to the north, L3 or MDR to the south and LZ or MDR to the east. The environment adjacent to PC 81 will be of a residential nature on two sides with either L3 or MDR to the north and LZ or MDR to the east (PC 70).
- 72 Part of my role as an urban designer on this project is to ensure that the underlying design that informs the ODP is flexible but also responsive to any changes in the surrounding environment so that the final design fits well into the existing urban fabric.



- 73 Small adjustments have been made to both ODPs as part of ongoing refinement, responding to changes occurring in the surrounding environment and in response to the Officers Report and urban design statement by Mr Nicholson, as well as submissions raised.
- 74 These refinements improve the distribution of the local commercial centres across the entire area and associated greenspaces, and result in minor adjustments to the road layout as a flow on effect. The underlying design concepts, connectivity and accessibility however remain the same in principle.
- 75 The changes are as follows:
- 75.1 Slightly increased size of the local centre adjacent to Brookside Park to ensure it forms a built edge to the park providing not just services but also contributing to the sense of place, providing passive surveillance (eyes on the street) and activating the public space.
  - 75.2 Adjustment to the location of the internal local commercial centres in PC 82 and associated green spaces to achieve the best possible distribution throughout the entire western edge.
  - 75.3 Refinement of the pedestrian /cycle network in line with the commercial nodes to ensure it is continuous, interconnected, direct and logical and provides a high amenity and safe environment for all users.
  - 75.4 Refinement to the road layout to better align with the internal changes and create a more direct network.
  - 75.5 Respond to the realignment of Goulds Road and extend the north south route southwards to connect to it PC 81.
  - 75.6 Additional intersection upgrade and pedestrian crossing on Dunns Crossing Road and Brenley Drive to ensure intersections are logically spaced and assist in reducing travel speeds and emphasise to the eastern neighbourhood.
  - 75.7 Introduction of rural/urban gateways on Brookside and Selwyn Road.

#### **BEST URBAN DESIGN OUTCOME FOR THE AREA WEST OF DUNNS CROSSING ROAD**

- 76 Without a doubt, the approval of PC81, PC82, PC73 (and ideally the residential rezoning of the rural/L2 pocket) represents the best urban outcome for the West of Dunns Crossing Road. It creates a compact urban form for this western edge of Rolleston, offers the best connectivity and accessibility and provides the most certainty.

It also best aligns with national, regional and district urban development policies and objectives.

- 77 The urban design benefits to the surrounding urban area with this outcome are that it:
- 77.1 assists in forming a neighbourhood around Brookside Park and providing activation making it safer;
  - 77.2 upgrades Dunns Crossing Road to an urban standard;
  - 77.3 introduces local commercial centres to support the wider neighbourhood;
  - 77.4 introduces a variety of open recreational spaces;
  - 77.5 adds variety, choice and capacity to the residential housing market;
  - 77.6 creates a community around the existing primary school;
  - 77.7 provides a fine grain pedestrian and cycle network;
  - 77.8 adds amenity landscaping to the Dunns Crossing Road corridor; and
  - 77.9 creates new linkages and relationships with the growing urban development east of Dunns Crossing Road.
- 78 Any remaining concerns related to either technical matters such as the settling of the odour setback, procedural planning matters and temporary concerns around connectivity related to staging or timing matters can be resolved independently as they do not materially affect the urban form and inherent urban qualities of the PC proposals.

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMITTERS**

- 79 Hill Street Limited's submission is in support of the proposed plan changes and seeks that PC81 and PC82 be allowed to proceed subject to an ODP that continues to include roading connections to the land that constitutes the remainder of the block to the Selwyn Road/Edwards Road corner.
- 80 The ODPs for PC 82 and 81 provide direct opportunities for vehicular, cycle and pedestrian connection along all its boundaries including to Hill Street Limited's land in the corner of Edwards and Selwyn Road. It therefore does not prevent future urbanisation/connectivity to that site.

- 81 Other submissions by have been covered by Mr Compton Moen in his evidence and I concur with his assessment.

### **RESPONSE TO OFFICER'S REPORT AND URBAN DESIGN STATEMENT**

- 82 I have reviewed the parts of the Council's Section 42a Report as they relate to urban design matters and have reviewed the Urban Design and Landscape Evidence prepared by Mr Hugh Nicholson. I have taken the liberty to bundle my comments around the following topics:

82.1 areas where Mr Nicholson raises concerns or makes suggestions for improvements that have either can be addressed or already have been addressed through the refinement of the ODPs; and

82.2 areas where I disagree with some of Mr Nicholson's observations and conclusions.

- 83 I agree in principle with the strategic directions set out in Mr Nicholson's evidence and also agree with his summary descriptors for the NPSUD, CRPS, District Plan and other related documents such as the RSP, however, I disagree with several of the conclusions he draws when applying these directions as a whole and in detail to PC81 and PC82.

#### **Improvements to the ODPs**

- 84 Mr Nicholson stated his general support for the proposed layout of the PC 82 ODP. The suggested improvements of a dedicated cycle way on Brookside Road and a specific rural residential interface have been included.

- 85 With regard to PC 81 the proposed extension of the north-south route has already been added as part of our own review process. The additional pedestrian cycle crossing, suggested upgrades to the road standards, the shared pedestrian cycleway, property access and speed regulations can all be added to the ODP narrative.

#### **Areas where I disagree with some of Mr Nicholson's observations and conclusions**

- 86 Mr Nicholson states that the PC81 and PC82 plan change areas sit outside the future development areas (FUDA) and are therefore inconsistent with both Our Space 2018-2048 and the CRPS.
- 87 Mr Nicholson also states that the approval of PC81 and PC82 would be out-of-sequence with residential growth envisaged in the District Plan and the Rolleston Structure Plan.
- 88 As covered in my paragraphs on future urban growth and sequencing the FUDAs are nearly all completed or subject to plan changes. The

extent of the FUDAs were based on a growth pattern as laid out by the Structure Plan, including the indicative numbers and sequencing, all of which have been superseded and have been shown to be out of sync with the real sequencing of development.

- 89 The urban limit or delineation, the numbers and the time lines of sequences are not the real issue here. It is the actual growth rate that has created these discrepancies coupled with ownership structures, a willingness or unwillingness to develop, financial constraints and other limiting factors making development complicated, such as infill or integration of existing dwellings to name a few.
- 90 Mr Nicholson then follows on with consideration of whether this out-of-sequence development could result in adverse effects for Rolleston with regard to accessibility and connectivity and compactness of urban form. His conclusion is that both PC 82 and PC 81, in isolation would not achieve a sufficiently compact form and would lack connectivity and accessibility. It seems that within this context Mr Nicholson does not consider the L3 areas to be part of the urban form and looks at each PC individually, rather than considering them within their context. I do not agree with this approach. When looked at in context, PC81 and 82 provide good accessibility, connectivity and compactness with the rest of Rolleston.

#### **Accessibility**

- 91 Mr Nicholson has assessed the accessibility of both PCs and considers PC82 to have moderate accessibility and PC 81 to have low accessibility.
- 92 My concern here is that Mr Nicholson places too much emphasis on the accessibility to facilities within the Rolleston towncentre. He does not sufficiently consider the finer grain distribution of neighbourhood centres and local centres and the fact that PC 82 will provide two local commercial centres. He also does not allow for the possibility of community based activities being introduced within the ODP under the LZ zoning. The wider external destinations are mostly related to either work or education, whilst recreation and community activities can readily be found within the ODP.
- 93 Connections to all destinations outside of the ODP areas will be facilitated via several linkages to Dunns Crossing Road which will contain a dedicated cycle way running in both directions (separated from the road carriageway) and dedicated footpaths on both side. It will provide continuous cycling and walking infrastructure. As Dunns Crossing Road is a major arterial road, alternative internal north-south routes are also available leading to Brookside Park to connect into the wider Rolleston network.
- 94 Additional routes to key recreational areas in Foster Park, important educational facilities and to southern neighbourhood centres will also

be possible with developments to the east creating more permeability and new connections between Dunns Crossing Road, East Maddisons Road and Goulds Road, an area that has been literally impermeable in the past.

- 95 In closer proximity, West Rolleston Primary School and the large Brookside Park, both located on Dunns Crossing Road will support the growing community in this western part of Rolleston.
- 96 Distance is only one aspect of many when assessing accessibility. My concern is that this single aspect has been given too much emphasis in Mr Nicholson's assessment. Accessibility needs to be assessed with more consideration for amenity of movement corridors, type of movement (walk, cycle, car, bus) and the frequency of visiting a destination i.e. a daily trip to the dairy, school or park versus a weekly trip to the supermarket or a monthly trip to a movie theatre.
- 97 Our life styles, working environments, people regularly working from home, travel habits and related expectation with regard to acceptable distances to travel by foot, bike etc are changing fast. The introduction of e-bikes and e-scooters allow us to commute further, faster and with less effort.
- 98 Creating high amenity environments with dedicated, direct walking and cycle routes that are safe assist and 'extend' accessibility as they can change people's perception. Within a well-designed dedicated network walking or cycling slightly longer distances to work or school on a daily basis becomes part of daily recreation, exercise and social interaction.
- 99 Both PC 82 and 81 are designed around such high amenity fine grain pedestrian and cycling networks integrated within the green network, which is evident in the ODP's.

#### **Urban form and connectivity**

- 100 My main concern here is that Mr Nicholson looks at both PCs in isolation and sees them as 'peninsula developments'.
- 101 He does not sufficiently account for the ongoing urbanisation along the eastern edge of Dunns Crossing Road, the changes to the western access to Rolleston and gives little weight to the fact that PC 70 is located within a FUDA where development is directed towards and urbanisation is anticipated.
- 102 The PC 73 land, even if PC73 is ultimately declined, will still bring a residential character albeit of a low density and extend the urban form of Rolleston westwards. In the event that PC73, PC81 and PC82 were to all be declined, this would definitely result in an urban form that lacks compactness and connectivity.

- 103 In the event that PC 81 and 82 are approved, but not PC73, this will still provide some major improvements to the compactness of the urban form of this part of Rolleston, removing the sense of isolation for the L3 areas and facilitating major improvements to connectivity into these areas and into the developments to the east of Dunns Crossing Road. It would also introduce two local commercial centres to support the growing north west neighbourhood.
- 104 In several areas in his evidence Mr Nicholson alludes to the conundrum that PC 81 and 82 would benefit from PC 73 being approved and that it would also be beneficial to include the rural/L2 pocket into this urban envelope.
- 105 If we add to that, the likelihood that the decision on PC 73 with regard to urban form and connectivity may well have been different if it could have been considered within the context of PC 81/82 shows the full extent of this conundrum. It leaves us with a classic 'chicken or egg' situation, the perpetual cycle. For PC 81 and 82 however the full picture on urban form, connectivity and accessibility is available and can and should be taken into consideration.
- 106 I therefore disagree with Mr Nicholson over his narrow assessment of PC 81 and 82 and the Planning Officers recommendation to decline the applications partly on this basis.
- 107 Finally, the potential issue of an odour setback further reaching into PC82 beyond the 600m is a technicality that can be addressed it does not impact on urban form outcomes.

### **CONCLUSION**

- 108 The NPSUD sets the scene, Rolleston is a Key Activity Centre in the CRPS and District Plan, and urban growth and infill development is therefore to be provided for and directed to this township under these statutory documents. There are very few areas where this growth can be accommodated along the town perimeter.
- 109 When taking all relevant aspects into consideration the area west of Dunns Crossing Road is the most suitable and possibly the only feasible option to accommodate this type of urban growth.
- 110 A single underlying urban design concept underpins all 3 residential rezoning proposals west of Dunns Crossing Road (PC 73, 82 and 81) and ideally all 3 plan changes would be approved. The best possible urban design outcome this particular hearing can achieve is the approval of PC 81 and 82 regardless of the outcome of PC 73.
- 111 Both PC 81 and 82 are needed to create a compact urban form that will go a long way towards mitigating the effects of an ill-suited L3 environment should PC 73 be declined in the end. And, PC81 and 82

would put pressure on the L3 environments to be as permeable and interconnected as possible.

- 112 In the case that PC 73 was approved (even with odour line adjustments) PC 81 and 82 will complete the compact urban form and contribute to a well functioning urban environment.

Dated: 29 August 2022

---

Nicole Lauenstein