

Before the Independent Commissioner
Appointed by the Selwyn District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a hearing on submissions to the Partially Operative Selwyn
District Plan Variation 2: Levi Road rezoning

Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited

Applicant

Statement of Evidence of David John Compton-Moen

7 March 2025

Applicant's solicitors:

Alex Booker | Sarah Schulte

Anderson Lloyd

Floor 2, The Regent Building, 33 Cathedral Square, Christchurch 8011

PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8141

DX Box WX10009 Christchurch

p + 64 3 379 0037

alex.booker@al.nz | sarah.schulte@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 My full name is David John Compton-Moen.
- 2 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.
- 3 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.
- 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) 2024 – Working for Carter Group to provide Urban Design and Landscape advice for Environment Court mediation for West Rolleston (previously PC73, 81 and 82) which includes provision for approximately 3,500 new dwellings and 4 commercial centres of varying sizes. Each centre was modelled to test how each one could be developed to provide for future residents' day-to-day needs.
 - (b) 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.
 - (c) 2021- current – Working with Reefville Properties Limited to prepare Urban design, Landscape and Visual Amenity evidence for the Homebase Private Plan Change from Residential Suburban to Large Format Retail Zone in Christchurch City. Our office is currently working on the Landscape detailed design and implementation.
 - (d) 2020- current – Working for Mike Greer Homes, I have worked on the master planning, urban design and landscape design for several Medium Density Residential and Mixed-Use Developments: Madras Square (+90 homes);

476 Madras Street (98 homes); 258 Armagh Street (33 homes); and 33 Harewood Road (31-homes).

- (e) 2020-23 – Working for several different consortiums, I have provided urban design and landscape advice for the following private plan changes in the Selwyn District:
 - (i) Lincoln South, Lincoln (PC69)
 - (ii) Southeast Rolleston, Rolleston (PC78)
 - (iii) Extension to Falcons Landing, Rolleston (PC75)
 - (iv) Trents Road, Prebbleton (PC68)
 - (v) Holmes and Skellerup Block, Rolleston (PC73)
 - (vi) South Skellerup Block, Rolleston (PC81)
 - (vii) Two Chains Road Block (B1 zone plan change), Rolleston (PC80)
 - (viii) Wilfield, West Melton (PC67)
 - (ix) Birchs Village, Prebbleton (PC79)
- (f) 2017-current - Acland Park, Rolleston – master planning and landscape design for a 1,000-lot development in Rolleston. This development is almost completely built out with only the small commercial centre to be built.
- (g) 2022- current - Harrow Green, Rolleston – provision of urban design advice for a residential development for 266 dwellings against the proposed MDRS rules. Our office is currently working on the landscape design of this subdivision.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

- 5 While this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is 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.

Scope of Evidence

- 6 This evidence is provided in support of Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited (**Foodstuffs**) request to rezone 157 Levi Road, Rolleston (the **Site**) from Medium

Density Residential Zone (**MRZ**) to Large Format Retail Zone (LFRZ), and insert a new Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) replacing DEV-RO1 – Variation 2 to the Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan (**POSDP-V2**). My role has been to provide urban design expertise. I prepared the Urban Design and Visual Impact Assessment attached to the Application as Appendix J.

- 7 I have visited the Site on numerous occasions, and I am familiar with the Site and area. I note that extensive work has recently been undertaken on the Site with the removal of hedges, partial construction of the PAK'nSAVE building and associated road improvement works. As noted above I have worked on several large-scale projects within Rolleston and have a good understanding of its growth and future urban form.
- 8 In preparing this statement of evidence I have considered the following documents:
 - (a) SDC RC216016 and in particular the landscape outcome provisions and related conditions of consent for the Pak'nSAVE development;
 - (b) The Evidence of Mr Tony Milne relating to landscape and amenity issues and proposed landscape mitigation measures;
 - (c) Te Tangi a te Manu – NZILA Landscape Assessment Guidelines;
 - (d) the Section 42A Report prepared by Mr Craig Friedel, dated 28 February 2025;
 - (e) the Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan (**POSDP**) and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions relevant to my area of expertise; and
 - (f) relevant submissions.
- 9 In the preparation of my evidence, I consider the following aspects to be key from an urban design, landscape and amenity perspective:
 - (a) In the preparation of my evidence, I consider the following aspects to be key from an urban design, landscape and amenity perspective:
 - (b) Current and future receiving character and Urban Form
 - (c) Character Change from MRZ to LFRZ and Visual Amenity Effects;
 - (d) Visual Dominance and Shading Effects;
 - (e) Connectivity and Walkability around and within the site; and
 - (f) Conclusions.

- 10 I worked with the expert team to develop the new ODP which includes the following amendments:
- (a) Indicative positioning of the proposed trade retail footprints (excluding covered yards);
 - (b) Addition of a 10m wide landscape treatment (biodiversity strip) along the eastern boundary;
 - (c) Addition of a 3m wide landscape treatment strip along the Levi Road frontage;
 - (d) Addition of a 5m wide landscape treatment strip along the Lincoln-Rolleston Road frontage;
 - (e) Provision for the future connection (road) into the medium density residential area to the north-east at the southern end of the site;
 - (f) Provision for internal pedestrian connectivity; and
 - (g) Identification of two principal entrances and 6 supplementary entrance/exit points.
- 11 In my opinion, these provisions in the new ODP are necessary and appropriate to manage amenity and urban design effects of the proposed rezoning to ensure its compatibility with the adjoining residential areas. Photo-illustrations from four key viewpoints are contained with the attached Graphic Attachment prepared by our office to show the built form of the consented PAK'nSAVE and conceptual trade retailer (i.e. Mitre 10) development along with associated carparking and landscape planting. The 3D model was prepared based on the Indicative Concept Site Plan submitted in the request to vary the POSDP and the approved plans of the PAK'nSAVE consent to demonstrate likely built form. They include modelling of the proposed landscape treatments along both Levi and Lincoln-Rolleston Roads with vegetation shown after 10 years of growth to form a substantial 'buffer' or screen between the LFRZ and residential interface. The four photo-illustration viewpoints are representative of views that will be experienced from Levi and Lincoln-Rolleston Roads. Views from the adjoining MRZ area to the northeast were not obtained for two reasons:
- (a) The landowner (Gould Developments Ltd) along the length of this site supports POSDP-V2, and in particular supports the provision of the fencing and a 10-metre landscaped area along the entire boundary; and
 - (b) the 10-metre consented landscape treatment along this interface (which has also been brought down onto the new ODP and extended along the length of the boundary will successfully mitigate any visual amenity effects from this

direction by screening the PAK'nSAVE and future trade retailer building on the site once established.

- 12 I have also considered the additional changes proposed for the new ODP by the reporting officer and address these later in my evidence.
- (a) The additional Matter of Control for building design is not necessary but I accept that it will provide greater guidance for future decision makers.
 - (b) The 20m building setback is not necessary given the prescriptive requirements for layout and landscaping but is acceptable.
 - (c) There is no or little additional benefit of a mid-block connection in terms of accessibility or connectivity but instead raises safety public issues due to conflict with delivery vehicles/service areas.
 - (d) 1 tree per 5 carparks is standard practice and acceptable, however this can already be considered as part of the Resource Consent process (as further detailed in the evidence of Mr Milne).
 - (e) CPTED principles are already incorporated into CMUZ-MAT3 and are not needed to be incorporated into the ODP narrative.

Receiving Urban Character

- 13 The receiving character of the area will likely undergo significant change following the rezoning of land to MRZ (refer to Figure 2 in the graphic attachment). To the immediate east of the site is largely vacant land but which has been purchased by a developer and is subject to DEV-RO12 which provides for MRZ development. The Site is relatively flat topography which is typical in character of the area. Overall, the topographical attributes of the receiving environment are low with no defining features.
- 14 Vegetation types are outlined in my original report and the evidence of Mr Milne. As noted above the underlying MRZ will result in significant change to the current vegetation and landcover patterns.
- 15 In terms of sensory qualities, the flat open geometric fields are back dropped by the Southern Alps to the northwest and the Port Hills to the southeast. The infrastructure and shelter belts, though disrupting the continual views, have become integral to the rural aesthetic and identity but have not been continued into recent suburban development. Recent residential development has typically removed long views, with buildings, vegetation and a more irregular road pattern restricting views. This has resulted in a lack of wayfinding or a sense of place, but will change over time as vegetation establishes. The natural characteristic of the

environment is considered to be modified, with a rural character transiting into urban as opposed to a natural character.

- 16 In terms of built form, the receiving environment now includes the consented PAK'nSAVE which is under construction and its consented landscaping. The MRZ zoning anticipates a high level of built development with dwellings up to 11m in height, a 50% site coverage and Height In Relation to Boundary standards. These provisions have been tested and could result in a household density of ~42hh/ha but a density of 15-20hh/ha is probably more realistic.
- 17 The closest commercial/retail area to the site is approximately 400m to the northwest, being The Warehouse (approximately 5,000m² in area), smaller retail shops and a surface carpark. The underlying zoning of this area is Town Centre Zone.
- 18 The proposed re-zoning to LFRZ is consistent with the current Urban Growth boundary for Rolleston with the ability to achieve an attractive, pleasant and high-quality urban environment. In my opinion a high-quality urban environment, or well-functioning urban environment, includes the provision of amenities which cater for residents' day-to-day needs. The site is well-connected to the existing town with a high level of connectivity and accessibility. The Urban Growth boundary and surrounding MRZ zoning on the adjoining land over time will become urban in character. It is likely to consist of a mix of standalone, duplex and terrace housing, supporting open spaces and internal street network.
- 19 From an urban form perspective, the placement of a LFRZ on the southern side of the state highway is not considered to create any adverse effects on urban form. The proposed rezoning, which would allow a trade retailer such as Mitre10, plays a Retail role servicing a domestic/residential need and will be frequented by local residents. This is very different to many of the activities on the northern side of the state highway which serve commercial or industrial needs and may not serve a local function.
- 20 As set out in my Urban Design and Visual Impact Assessment:
 - (a) The Sites' strategic location is visually prominent and significant as a town-wide landmark, justifying variation in local patterns and creation of a focal point;
 - (b) At a sub-regional level, the Site is well-positioned relative to primary access corridors from the nearby towns of Springston, Lincoln, Prebbleton and Templeton and relative to the town's southern growth. The Site's position on the major southern route into the town will appropriately emphasise this approach;

- (c) From an urban design perspective, the strategic and corner location of the site justifies a) an opportunity for variation in local patterns; b) a focal point; and c) memorable outcomes different to the context. The LFRZ will deliver these outcomes with quality landscaped edges.
- 21 The rezoning assists Rolleston in creating a consolidated and compact urban form by bringing additional amenities into Rolleston's current urban growth boundary. This also applies to a trade retailer like Mitre 10 collocating with the supermarket on site. Both activities are frequented by local residents providing convenient amenities, and both activities will strengthen the legibility of the site. The site is a strategic corner and with the proposed changes to stage highway 1 and the continued growth of Rolleston to the southeast its importance and level of movement will increase further.
- 22 The LFRZ is very much serving a residential or domestic 'catchment' as opposed to a commercial or professional/trade customer base which exists with the LFRZ area within Izone. The POSDP provisions that have been modified provide the key difference to what will establish on the site compared with that which is enabled in the existing LFRZ. The modifications to the provisions are site-specific and are designed to mitigate potential adverse effects on the adjoining and adjacent residential zones, noting that many of the provisions have been tested and were deemed acceptable through the PAK'nSAVE consent process. The consented PAK'nSAVE is currently under construction, and through the consenting process was considered to integrate with the surrounding residential environment. I consider that a future trade-based retail development enabled by LFRZ, and in accordance with the proposed ODP and landscape treatments, will similarly integrate with the receiving environment, including the PAK'nSAVE. This is consistent with the photo-illustrations prepared.
- 23 This includes restricting the range of activities on the site to, effectively, a supermarket (acknowledging that which has already been consented and is under construction) and a trade-based retailer, both of which are required to be >6,000m² GFA and located in accordance with the proposed ODP. The identification of indicative building footprints on the ODP differentiates the proposal from the existing LFRZ. Not only does the ODP reflect the operational and functional requirements of the intended activities (and in the case of the supermarket the consented building position), but it also responds to the residential setting of the site. Consequently, the proposal provides assurance that the two large footprint buildings will be generously setback from road boundaries, with appropriate landscaping / screening / acoustic treatment along the internal boundary with the adjoining residential zones to ensure visual dominance and noise effects are mitigated to an acceptable level.

- 24 Within the Site, the provisions provide for a higher level of pedestrian and cycle movement than would typically be associated with a LFRZ. This is consistent with the 'domestic' nature of this LFRZ where it is designed to service and assimilate with the surrounding residential street frontages, with these movements only proposed to be restricted where the loading areas are located.
- 25 The landscape design also allows for the 'avenue' planting outlined in the Rolleston Structure Plan to be achieved.
- 26 The scale of the building footprints are not dissimilar to the nearby Warehouse building being only a 5-minute walk away. Its proposed location physically separates but is within walkable distance of the main commercial centre and is considered appropriate, complementing the role of the centre as opposed to competing with it. It is not dissimilar to how the Papanui Mitre10 relates to Northlands within Christchurch City. A trade retailer such as a Mitre10 would not be appropriate in the middle of a town centre main street environment but equally I do not consider the activity to be Industrial restricted to an urban edge or industrial area. Supermarket and trade retailer activities are ideally situated where they can service the greatest number of people within an urban catchment, on well-connected transport routes.
- 27 Any interface effects with the adjoining residential areas are considered below.

Character change from MRZ to LFRZ and Visual Amenity Effects

- 28 In terms of urban character values, the rezoning will result in a low magnitude of change when compared to the MRZ which includes the consented PAK'nSAVE development and a suite of landscape consent conditions. The greatest change will be a change in bulk and location and style of buildings on the south-eastern corner of the site which will be larger, taller and commercial in character compared to the existing permitted residential dwellings. This change in character is not viewed as adverse as it is continuing with the commercial character created by the consented PAK'nSAVE development and I consider it can be mitigated by adopting the same mitigation as reflected in the consent conditions placed on the PAK'nSAVE development.
- 29 For the southern portion of the site, views from residential properties are screened to the northwest by the consented PAK'nSAVE store and associated landscape treatments. Trees are consented at a density of 1 for every 5 carparks and with the 3m wide landscape strip with one tree for every 10m of road frontage along the Levi Road frontage combined with the distance to the Mitre10 portion being over 200m, I consider any adverse amenity effects from these residents or road users to be Very Low or Indiscernible because of the consented building and landscape treatments already present in the existing environment.

- 30 The future residents on the southwestern side of Lincoln Rolleston Road will have views across the road to a 5m wide landscape strip with tree planting. This is discussed in detail in the evidence of Mr Milne. The proposed building footprint shown on the ODP for the intended trade retail / trade supply activity is setback approximately 12.3m from the road boundary at its closest point and the majority of the building being over 20m from the road boundary (discussed further below at [52]). Given the level of landscape treatment proposed combined with the building setback and the intervening road corridor, I consider any magnitude of change to be Low.
- 31 I have assessed the impacts on the future residents on the land to the east of the site below under Visual Dominance and Shading effects given their shared boundary.
- 32 Overall, the rezoning sits well in the receiving environment as the largest potential adverse effects which would occur on the boundary adjoining the MRZ can be successfully mitigated.

Visual Dominance and Shading Effects

- 33 In terms of visual dominance and potential shading effects, the proposed building setback of 10m (LFRZ-REQ4) will mitigate any potential effects from the change of the maximum height limit from 11m (MRZ) to 15m (LFRZ) when combined with the MRZ Height in Relation to Boundary (HIRB – MRZ-REQ5) requirements. The LFRZ has a more restrictive HIRB (2.5m +45degrees) requirement when adjoining a residential zone than if the site were to be MRZ. If the MRZ zoning were to remain on the site, the HIRB requirements applied to the shared eastern boundary would require any dwellings taller than 4m to start angling back from the boundary at an angle of 60 degrees. This results in the 11m maximum height not being reached until just over 4m from the site boundary, but is closer than any LFRZ building proposed (minimum 10m setback and a more restrictive HIRB requirement).
- 34 Any potential effects are further mitigated by the proposed 10m wide biodiversity planting strip along the eastern boundary, which is to be maintained at a maximum height of 8m. I have reviewed the landscape and building setback mitigation measures prepared by RMM, outlined in Mr Milne's evidence, and agree these measures are suitable to address any adverse on future neighbouring residential properties to the north.
- 35 It is anticipated that any future development of the Site, given a change in zoning, will similarly reflect the consented bulk and location of structures on the PNS portion of the site. The proposed biodiversity strip planting along the residential boundary adjacent to the site will help to maintain the existing character and will assist in screening the development from these residences.

- 36 Overall, I consider that the proposed provisions outlined in Mr Allan's planning evidence ensure that any LFRZ development, including the PAK'nSAVE and trade-retail, on the site will be compatible with the surrounding MRZ zones from an amenity and urban character perspective.

Connectivity and Accessibility

- 37 The site is highly connected to the existing road network, being on the corner of two arterial roads. Pedestrian accessibility has been incorporated into the design to ensure the proposed surface carpark does not create a barrier to pedestrian movement. While the proposal will create an impermeable boundary along its eastern side for a distance of just over 500m I do not consider this to have adverse effect on future pedestrian connectivity to the east. Future pedestrians will have the option of travelling north to Levi Road or south to the future road connection at the southern end of the site. The proposal does not create any discernible increase in walking distances to key destinations including the High School, Foster Park or the Town Centre. I have read the evidence of Mr Metherell, Transport, also with particular regard to walking distances and I do not have any concerns regarding accessibility. I agree with the findings of Mr Metherell.
- 38 The site is located within a walkable distance of the TCZ which is considered a positive aspect of the site. TCZ are typically not designed for large format retail (despite these activities being permitted in the TCZ), which have more of a car-based customer focus and require large areas of surface carparking, but the respective zones do benefit from being in relative close proximity to each other. LFRZ can have a detrimental effect on the fine-grain nature of TCZ if poorly integrated. While most people using the LFRZ site will be travelling by car given the nature of the products sold there is also strong pedestrian connectivity within the Site. The Site also links with multi-modal links adjacent to the site.
- 39 The land located in between the proposed LFRZ and existing TCZ is occupied by established residential development in accordance with its historical residential zoning, and now zoned in the POSDP for medium density residential (MDZ). The fully developed nature of the land, and the fragmented ownership of the multiple properties, means the land is neither available nor viable for commercial development (other than perhaps small scale home-based commercial activity).
- 40 The policy and rule frameworks in the POSDP are protective of the different roles of clearly distinctive and distinguishable commercial and residential areas. The CMUZ and TCZ policies that protect the function and viability of the TCZ are bolstered by the RESZ policies that protect the predominant character of residential zones from non-residential activities that will undermine the viability of commercial centres or the urban form of residential zones. Reinforcing this policy framework are rules that treat commercial activity in the MRZ as a non-complying activity. This

robust framework allays any concern that the proposed rezoning might instigate 'commercial creep' between the LFRZ and TCZ. For the foregoing reasons, that is an extremely unlikely scenario.

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles

41 The 10m-wide landscape buffer and associated acoustic fencing will be implemented and maintained by the operators occupying the LFRZ. Indeed, this is a requirement of RC216016 in respect of the supermarket portion of the site. The landscape buffer separates the residential boundary from the servicing areas associated with the intended activities on the site. RC216016 prevents the public from accessing this area as it relates to the supermarket operations, and the same will apply for the future trade-based retail activity given this area will also only serve a servicing and delivery function, i.e. no customer access. There will be no public access into this area and it will be fenced to prevent access by the public.

42 There are four key overlapping CPTED principles, being¹.

Surveillance – people are present and can see what is going on

43 The landscape buffer strip on the north eastern boundary will be fenced to prevent public access into the Site for public safety reasons. The area is immediately adjacent to the service / loading areas of both activities, meaning people will be present and will have elevated views into the space from trucks. Mitre10 is a family orientated business with high staff ratios to serve customers, resulting in a staff being present on site.

Access management – methods are used to attract people and vehicles to some places and restrict them from others

44 The service / loading area of the consented PAK'nSAVE is immediately adjacent to the landscape buffer strip and has been designed to ensure the public do not enter this space. Further, the required fencing along the eastern boundary ensures people will be restricted from entering into the planted area. The new ODP extends these boundary treatments the full length of the eastern boundary, ensuring similar restricted access will apply to the future trade-based retail activity.

Territorial reinforcement – clear boundaries encourage community 'ownership' of the space

45 The landscape buffer strip and adjacent servicing / loading space is private and its design will discourage the community from entering the space or from having a

¹ Ministry of Justice, National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in New Zealand - Part 1: Seven Qualities of Safer Places (<https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/cpted-part-1.pdf>)

feeling of ownership over the area. This is important from both a safety and operational perspective.

Quality environments – good quality, well maintained places attract people and support surveillance

- 46 All landscape areas will be maintained by the owners / operators of the respective activities with a high level of stewardship. This is visible in other LFRZ developments where a high level of care and maintenance is apparent, very different from industrial areas.

Matters raised by submitters

- 47 I have read the submissions which relate to Amenity and Urban Design. The following general concerns were raised:

- (a) Increased built form and density
- (b) Inclusion of an LFRZ south of the state highway
- (c) Loss of amenity

- 48 These issues have all been addressed in my evidence. For the reasons explained in my evidence I don't consider these are any issues for the following reasons:

- (a) All of the Submitters in opposition are physically separated from the Site;
- (b) The area is anticipating a higher level of built development with residential buildings up to 11m in height or 3 storeys extending further to the east and south;
- (c) The Plan Change site is approximately 7.3ha with the PNS development occupying approximately 4.62ha of the site. Based on an indicative bulk and location plan prepared by Rough and Milne in 2022 it would be possible to over 112 dwellings or ~42hh/ha within the parameters set by the MDR Zone Standards on the remainder of the site. A density of 15hh/ha is more likely, resulting in approximately 40 dwellings;
- (d) In terms of the proposal being located in IZone, the proposed Mitre10 is a store which typically caters to residential or domestic, rather than trade, customers. With PNS, the activity is considered compatible with a residential environment noting it is common for Large Format Retail developments to be adjacent to or near residential areas, with any interfaces managed through different edge treatment where necessary. Existing LFR and residential areas co-existing in Christchurch include:

- (i) Northlink, 100/148 Langdons Road, Papanui (Commercial Retail Park Zone);
 - (ii) Mitre 10, 54 Harewood Road, Papanui (Commercial Retail Park Zone); and
 - (iii) Homebase, 215 Marshland Road, Shirley (Commercial Retail Park Zone).
- (e) I consider that there are benefits in providing a LFR area close to residential properties where the intended activities have a strong domestic nature and where any potential adverse effects can be successfully mitigated. LFRZs are commercial zones, as opposed to Industrial zones;
- (f) I do not consider that the proposal will have a detrimental effect on the amenity of adjoining and nearby residential properties with the implementation of the proposed provisions. Extensive amounts of landscape planting is proposed along boundaries. In my experience, additional landscaping will both be proposed and required within carpark areas and to soften buildings at the resource consent stage. Site coverage is relatively low combined with large building setbacks when compared to the anticipated built form of the MRZ zone;
- (g) As outlined above it is not necessary to physically separate residential and LFRZ where they can successfully co-exist. Retail activities, such as Mitre10 can co-exist with it possible to mitigate any potential adverse effects on residential amenity. Larger setbacks, positioning of buildings and edge treatments can all assist with mitigating any effects without needing to physically separate the zones. All of the LFRZ examples outlined above co-exist with residential areas;
- (h) I consider that the proposal's location is suitable for its domestic audience without detracting from the Town Centre's purpose and intent. The TCZ already has two supermarkets and a Mitre10's is not typically located within a TCZ. Town Centres throughout New Zealand usually have a finer grain retail and hospitality component which is supported by larger format stores on or near to the edges of the centre. The relationship between Rolleston TCZ and the proposed LFRZ is no different in this respect.

Matters raised by the Officer

- 49 I have read the Section 42A Report prepared by Mr C. Friedel (Consultant Planner) and the supporting expert Urban Design and Landscape Evidence prepared by Mr Lonink (Consultant Urban Designer) and Mr Ross (Consultant Landscape

Architect) respectively. There are 5 key aspects which are of particular importance/relevant to Urban Design:

- (a) Additional Assessment Matter under CMUZ – MAT3 as a Design Control for future buildings;
- (b) The inclusion of a 20m minimum building setback from road boundaries;
- (c) Accessibility and connectivity around and through the Plan Change area;
- (d) The landscape requirement for 1 tree per 5 carparks;
- (e) The requirement for a full CPTED assessment, including a Lighting Plan to be provided for the approval of SDC as part of the PREC13 ODP.

CMUZ – MAT3 (Additional assessment matter b.)

Includes a façade design that utilises varied materials and building modulation and applies appropriate extents and levels of colour palettes to integrate the building the adjacent residential environments.

- 50 CMUZ-MAT3 outlines Matters for Control or Discretion which currently requires any building to '1c. Takes account of nearby buildings in respect of the exterior design, architectural form, scale and detailing of the building.' I consider this provides sufficient control for future decision-makers to review any future building proposals in a manner which ensures its design respects its receiving environment. The consented PAK'nSAVE is a good example of this, while it went through a Resource Consent process, where colour use including the use of corporate colours, modulation in form, and material variation have all been influenced by the surrounding residential character. I refer to the evidence of Mr Johnston in terms of Architectural design and detailing.
- 51 The additional Matter for Control is largely a replication of Matter 1c but with greater detail and more site specificity. While I don't think it is necessary, I consider that its addition is acceptable as it will provide greater clarity of what design quality should be achieved.

The inclusion of a 20m minimum building setback from road boundaries

- 52 I do not consider the 20m building setback necessary from an amenity or urban design perspective as the proposed landscape treatment and road corridor separations are sufficient to mitigate potential adverse effects, especially when compared to a built development in a MRZ.
- 53 However, the client is willing to accept that any building within the 20m setback of a road boundary will trigger a Resource Consent requirement. The current concept

plan shown on Figure 1 would trigger this standard as the proposed building comes within ~12.3m of the road boundary. The proposed breach would be 0.2% of the total Plan Change area or 0.6% of the Mitre10 site. The breach is largely due to the wedge shape of the site as it narrows south-eastwards along Lincoln-Rolleston Road, forcing the building into the road setback for a length of 26m. At the detailed design stage and with appropriate landscape treatment, the lesser setback on ~5% of the 600m long road frontage would be acceptable and I have no concerns that this rule is included. The proposed building platforms outlined on the ODP provide a positive degree of certainty as to where built development will occur.

Accessibility and connectivity around and through the Plan Change area

54 The shared boundary with future residential development to the northeast (MDR) is approximately 500m in length, noting that a shared pedestrian/cycle link (part of the Future Primary Road) is now proposed by the Applicant at the southeast end of the site. While this 'block' length is longer than would usually be designed, it does not create any adverse effects in terms of connectivity or accessibility for the following reasons:

- (a) The block shape does not create any longer walking distances to key destinations being the town centre (via Levi Road), bus stops on Masfield Drive (No.5 Rolleston Express) or the Rolleston to Lincoln Shared Path (on Lincoln-Rolleston Road);
- (b) The road layout of the northeast site does not need to rely on the Plan Change site for access with the exception of the link provided at the southeastern end of the site.
- (c) From a CPTED and safety perspective, it would not be appropriate to have a pedestrian/cycle link through the middle of the site where conflicts with delivery vehicles/service areas would occur. The PAK'nSAVE development is consented with the loading areas on the northern side of the building, allowing truck movements to be physically separate from publicly accessible areas.

The landscape requirement for 1 tree per 5 carparks

55 This requirement is standard for LRFZ in Christchurch City and is considered appropriate to provide additional tree canopy across the site. This is a matter that can (and will, in my experience) be considered as part of the existing provisions. However I do not consider that it is necessary to stipulate 'typically spaced at one tree every three parking bays' as outlined in the PREC13 ODP provisions as this is unnecessarily prescriptive when the carpark design will need to account for the shape of the lot and building placement.

The requirement for a full CPTED assessment, including a Lighting Plan, has been provided for the approval of SDC as part of the PREC13 ODP

- 56 This requirement is a double up of CMUZ-MAT3 1e. which requires CPTED principles to be incorporated into a design and is not necessary. It is accepted that a certain level of detail is required to assess CPTED principles, best achieved at the Resource Consent stage when all aspects of the design are known to a greater level of detail. Publicly accessible carparks are required to meet NZ Standards for light levels. There is no benefit to adding CPTED principles as an ODP Criterion when ODP's are a high-level spatial tool.

Conclusion

- 57 The new ODP and amended POSDP provisions provide a well-considered approach for rezoning the site to LRFZ from MRZ and mitigating any potential adverse effects from being adjacent to future residential development.
- 58 The anticipated receiving environment is urban, recognised by Rolleston's Urban Growth Boundary, the MRZ zoning of the area that was subject to PC71 and the consented PAK'nSAVE development.
- 59 I consider the proposed rezoning to LFRZ from MRZ to be an appropriate change for a site on a busy intersection with no adverse effects on the area's anticipated receiving environment or Rolleston's wider urban form. The nature of the proposed activities, being more retail than industrial in character, are well-suited for being close to residential and commercial (town centre) uses.
- 60 The degree of change for existing and future residential properties in visual amenity terms are considered to be Low, Low to Moderate, at most with the proposed landscape mitigation measures addressing any concerns.
- 61 In response to the S42A Report, I conclude the following:
- (a) The additional Matter of Control for building design is not necessary but accept that it will provide greater guidance for future decision makers.
 - (b) The 20m building setback is not necessary given the prescriptive requirements for layout and landscaping. The Applicant is comfortable to accept this rule as a consent trigger for detailed assessment at resource consent stage where consideration should be given to the wedge shape of the Site and recognise that only a small breach of this proposed setback will occur, and is subject to detailed landscape design on the boundary.
 - (c) While the internal boundary length creates a long block, providing a mid-block link to the Site does not provide any additional benefit in terms of

accessibility or connectivity but instead raises safety public issues due to conflict with delivery vehicles/service areas.

- (d) 1 tree per 5 carparks is standard practice and acceptable but is not required to be specifically included in the plan change. The carpark design will need to account for the shape of the lot and building placement as part of detailed design.
- (e) CPTED principles are already incorporated into CMUZ-MAT3 and are not needed to be incorporated into the ODP narrative.

David Compton-Moen