

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

Joint witness statement on urban design matters

Dated: 24 November 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



JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT ON URBAN DESIGN MATTERS

INTRODUCTION

- 1 This joint witness statement is written to identify the points on which the urban design/landscape experts agree and/or disagree in relation to the issue of urban design and landscape effects associated with the request by the Council to increase the odour control setback to 1,000 metres on the proposed Outline Development Plan (ODP) for private plan change 82 (*PC82*) to the Operative Selwyn District Plan (the *District Plan*).
- 2 The expert conferencing was held on Thursday 26 October, 2022. The participants were:
 - 2.1 David Compton-Moen – DCM Urban (for the Applicant);
 - 2.2 Nicole Lauenstein – a+urban (for the Applicant); and
 - 2.3 Hugh Nicholson – UrbanShift (for the Selwyn District Council (the *Council*)).
- 3 In preparing this statement, the experts have read and complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as included in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2014.

BACKGROUND TO EXPERT CONFERENCING

- 4 There are several aspects which the experts agree with which are outlined below and have been incorporated into the attached revised ODP. There are also some matters on which they disagree.

CONFERENCE OUTCOMES

Revised ODP

- 5 There is agreement between the experts that the revised ODP attached to this statement provides an acceptable and functional alternative to the original ODP. In other words the experts consider that the extension of the odour control setback does not compromise the integrity of the revised ODP.
- 6 The revised ODP does not change Mr Nicholson's opinion with regard to this request for a plan change (PC82). He considers that the revised ODP is poorly connected and creates an isolated block of land. He acknowledges that if PC73 was approved there is potential for a more integrated and connected outcome.
- 7 Ms Lauenstein and Mr Compton-Moen consider that the revised ODP would function better if PC73 were approved for higher density residential development, but believe that it would still function with the LLRZ provided the proposed connections through (between PC73 and 82) were implemented.

Potential Land Uses under Odour Control Setback

- 8 The experts agree that any potential land uses under the odour control setback need to be considered and agreed by the odour experts.
- 9 The experts agree that any potential land uses should avoid:
 - a. Attracting people into the setback for extended periods of time, and;
 - b. Attracting significant numbers of people into the setback.
- 10 There is agreement that the following land uses might be appropriate under the odour control setback subject to the agreement of the odour experts:
 - a. Forestry, either plantation or ecological;
 - b. Cemetery;
 - c. Low-intensity recreation eg. bike tracks, dog park, drone park, frisbee golf, golf course, orienteering, horse riding; and associated facilities i.e. public toilets, outdoor seating, lighting to pathways, car parking, bike stands,
 - d. Rural land uses that do not create reverse sensitivity towards the residential environment;
 - e. A combination of the above.
- 11 The experts considered light / heavy industrial uses but rejected these as not appropriate in this location given the existing hub to the north of SH1.

Further discussion points where no agreement was reached

- 12 The experts discussed the merits of the underlying zoning within the odour control setback from an urban design perspective but did not agree on a joint position.
- 13 Ms Lauenstein considers a residential zoning with a rule preventing the erection of dwelling would be most appropriate as this would allow the buffer area to be part of the ODP and provide public access to support adjacent residential development.
- 14 A residential zoning would provide better standards for roading and pathways, ongoing maintenance, appropriate street lighting levels

and generally achieve safer environments with more passive surveillance.

- 15 A residential zoning would also ensure the area remains accessible to public and is not be fenced off. Ms Lauenstein voiced concerns that removing the buffer area from the ODP and leaving it rural will create an isolated 34ha rural pocket with potential for reverse sensitivities due to unsuitable rural activities and limited to no access.
- 16 Mr Compton-Moen agreed and added that future proofing the area for residential development would be appropriate as it would allow the ODP to be developed in case the RRP were to move to a different location in the future or improve their methods which would reduce the potential for odour effects.
- 17 Mr Nicholson considers that the zoning should reflect the anticipated uses and that given residential activities are not anticipated within the setback in the foreseeable future, a residential zoning was not appropriate. In his opinion a rural zoning would facilitate the majority of the land uses that the experts considered were appropriate; and that roads along the edge of the odour control setback would provide an appropriate level of flexibility for future uses.
- 18 Recognising that zoning recommendations would involve a range of advice from other disciplines, the experts agreed that recommendations regarding the most appropriate zoning for the odour control setback should be considered by the planning experts.

Dated: 24 November 2022



David Compton-Moen



Nicole Lauenstein



Hugh Nicholson



OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PC82 (1:10,000)

ROLLESTON WEST, PLAN CHANGE 81 AND 82 HEARING