

**Before an Independent Hearing  
Commissioner Appointed by  
Selwyn District Council**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** a Proposed Variation to the Partially  
Operative Selwyn District Plan  
(Variation 2) 157 Levi Road Rolleston  
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties  
Limited.

---

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF Gabriel Wilson Ross**

**Landscape Architect**

19 March 2025

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. My name is Gabriel Wilson Ross.
2. I provided a peer review of the application's landscape plan and accompanying landscape and visual effects assessment (LEA) prepared by Mr Milne along with commenting on relevant submissions as they related to landscape and visual matters and addressed them as part of my primary evidence.
3. Following this, I have reviewed Mr Milnes statement of evidence with supporting graphic attachment (GA). For completeness I have also reviewed the applicant's expert statements of evidence in relation to Urban Design, Transport, Acoustics, Architecture and as well as statements from representatives of Foodstuffs and Mitre 10.
4. From an overall landscape and visual effects assessment perspective, I am generally in agreement with the Applicants Landscape and Visual Assessment and supportive of the proposed landscape approach across the Site.
5. Within my primary evidence, I outlined eight recommendations for additional requirements to be attached to the Proposed Outline Development Plan (PODP), to provide greater certainty of achieving high quality, and well-integrated landscape outcomes. While the applicant has indicated a willingness to work with the majority of these recommendations, there remains some difference in views on some. My focus with respect to this Summary Statement, sets out these key areas of differences.

## **KEY AREAS OF DIFFERENCES RELATING TO LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL ASSESSMENT MATTERS**

### ***Lincoln-Rolleston Road 5m wide landscape strip***

6. This concerns the establishment of a consistent 5m landscape strip along the Lincoln Rolleston Road frontage.

7. I accept Mr Milnes point that the 5m landscape strip along the Lincoln Rolleston Boundary will be impractical to be installed consistently along the entire frontage given the obvious need to have breaks for vehicle access, coupled with the consented park area at the intersection of Lincoln Rolleston and Levi Roads. Despite this, I reiterate my view that to achieve adequate landscape and visual mitigation of the future built form which the proposed LFRZ would enable, it is important that the width and character of the existing landscape treatment applied within the PAK'nSAVE area be continued to the southern end of this road frontage. This level of consistent boundary approach will include trees of similar scale and density extending along the entire road frontage of both the PAK'nSAVE and proposed Mitre 10 sites.
8. A conceptual layout for the alignment of the future Broadlands Drive extension at the south end of the Site has been attached to Mr Lawn's<sup>1</sup> statement on behalf of Selwyn District Council. It would be helpful to clearly signal this screening requirement in the PODP to ensure the development is appropriately mitigated from viewers travelling north along the Lincoln-Rolleston Road Corridor.
9. The DCM Urban Design Assessment Figure VP4 illustrates a viewpoint from the vicinity of the proposed Broadlands Drive Extension intersection with Lincoln Rolleston Road. This indicates how the view of the south end of a LFRZ building will be largely unfiltered by the low foreground vegetation. The added potential for an outdoor materials storage area south of the building reinforces the need in ensuring appropriate screening planting along this southern edge.
10. Further, I note on the Bernard Johnston Architect Site Plan<sup>2</sup> that a stormwater basin is illustrated to the north of the proposed Broadlands Drive extension. The applicant will need to clarify how this basin will be accommodated at the resource consent stage with sufficient room for appropriate mitigation planting and how the

---

<sup>1</sup> Alastair John Lawn on behalf of Selwyn District Council

<sup>2</sup> A. -Concept Site Plan included as attachment to in the original application

residual land area north and south of the proposed road extension will be managed.

11. I suggest the wording of the ODP narrative is revised to: *'The Lincoln Rolleston Road landscape treatment including provision for a 5m landscape strip on the north side of the future primary road connection is to be designed and installed generally consistent with the consented landscape plan for the proposed supermarket development (RC216016).'*
12. Based on this, I maintain that a 5m wide landscape planted strip is required along this part of the Site.

### ***Tree Spacing Within Parking Areas***

13. I agree that 1 tree per 5 parking spaces is an appropriate measure for determining the overall numbers of trees to be required in the future development. My suggestion of 1 tree per three parking spaces was intended as a way to ensure the spacing of trees was distributed evenly through the parking area. This is generally consistent with the spacings along the treed rows within the consented supermarket parking areas.
14. In my experience, working on similar LFRZ projects, I also appreciate how trolley bays, pathways, and lighting tend to take precedence over tree layouts, leading to trees being clustered in the remaining available planting locations. While this can still achieve the required 1:5 numerical ratio, it can result in open viewing corridors to the built form that reduce the landscape and visual mitigation value. The key is to establish trees *evenly* across the parking areas.
15. To address Mr Milnes concerns around practicality I suggest that the requirement could be amended ODP narrative as follows:  
*'Require one tree per five parking spaces within the parking area. These trees shall be generally distributed evenly throughout the parking area with a spacing of approximately 7.5m or one tree per three bays where practical. Tree species within parking areas to be of medium or high-grade heights.'*

***Landscape Management plan for north-eastern biosecurity strip.***

16. I agree with Mr Milne that Landscape Management Plans (or Landscape Maintenance Plans) are typically addressed at a Resource Consent stage. In this instance I have recommended that this be required to specifically include measures to ensure appropriate security, pest, and weed control that is not typically addressed in standard Landscape Management Plans.
17. I have taken this position as the proposed 10m Biodiversity strip will be in a 'back of house location' and the additional acoustic fencing further screens this from view. In order to fulfil both the proposed landscape and visual mitigation requirements and maximise the biodiversity values, it will be important that pests and weeds are well managed along the length of this boundary. As I will discuss shortly, the CPTED integrity of the biodiversity strip will be reliant on the site managers ensuring as far as practical that the public do not access this area. For this reason, I suggest that regular checking of the security of this area is included in the maintenance schedule.

***Future pedestrian and cycle connection to the north-east.***

18. I acknowledge the applicant's experts have set out a transportation and acoustic rationale for not including a mid-block connection across the biodiversity strip. I will defer to Mr Carr and Mr Trevathan in these respects noting that Mr Trevathan states that there are design strategies available other than a continuous fence that can be used to achieve the noise limits at neighbouring sections.
19. Both Mr Milne and Mr Compton Moen conclude the added safety risk of public access conflicting with delivery and service vehicle traffic outweighs any benefit of this linkage.
20. I will defer to Mr Lonink's expertise in relation to urban design matters however, I note that I would expect that the PAK'nSAVE and Mitre10 facilities will provide positive local amenities for residents and become a local destination in its own right.

21. I agree from a site operational view it would be easier to manage the Site without allowance for this public connection and agree that the current concept layout for the Mitre10 provided by the applicant would present some safety challenges to achieve this. These are not the only considerations, however. The proposal will provide a local neighbourhood amenity set within a residential context. Convenient walking and cycle connections are important to encourage active transportation options and, in my view, the current ODP direction to provide these is a positive element that should be maintained.
22. I maintain my position that balancing operational and safety concerns with public access across the north-eastern boundary is a technical design matter and there are appropriate design measures available that the Applicants expert team could deploy to achieve this. This may include strategies such as:
- Modifying the footprint of the concept garden centre layout to allow sufficient space for a pathway connection and incorporating appropriate visibility splays.
  - Consider use of glazed or permeable façade treatments on the northern boundary of the proposed garden centre to allow views into and from this area over the pedestrian/cycle connection.
  - Clearly delineated high visibility pedestrian/cycle crossing points through elevated crossings, paving, colour, and textures.
  - Traffic calming measures included in the road design to limit delivery vehicle speeds to a suitable speed.
  - Flashing warning signs for delivery trucks activated by approaching pedestrians or cyclists when the automated gates on loading zones are opened.
23. As has been noted above and as outlined in my primary evidence, CPTED concerns would arise if the biodiversity strip became

frequented by members of the public, particularly when screened by the twin alignments of 2m tall acoustic fencing. While an appropriate level of regular surveillance and maintenance by the site managers will assist in managing this, in my experience it is difficult to keep the public from forming their own access in the long term if there is a desire line to do so. Incorporating a mid-block crossing in my opinion, will assist in reducing the potential for this to occur.

***Planting around the outdoor storage area.***

24. Outdoor storage and landscape supply yards can present additional visual clutter of a more industrial and commercial nature<sup>3</sup> that in my view are not compatible to the evolving MRZ residential context. I agree with Mr. Milne that taller street trees will be beneficial for filtering views of this area. However, considering the potential contents of the storage area—such as bulky storage bins and tall racking for lumber, often wrapped in plastic—I do not believe that low-level planting alone will provide adequate screening.
25. LFRZ-REQ5 under the PODP requires a fence, wall, or vegetation at least 1.8m in height for the full length of the storage area that is visible from the road. Given the likelihood of taller storage racking and bulk materials storage that may exceed 1.8m in height, I am recommending that it would be appropriate to require this screening to be at least 1.2m taller in this instance. I further recommend that this be implemented via planting rather than a solid fence which would be vulnerable to graffiti and present a less desirable hard boundary.
26. Within the 5m landscape strip this could be achieved with a row of taller growing shrubs such as *Pittosporum tenuifolium* or *Olearia paniculata* or similar species, along the fenced boundary of the outdoor storage area. The proposed mix of lower-growing shrubs and the street trees can be placed in front of this row. As long as the taller shrubs are maintained as a dense single row and

---

<sup>3</sup> As evidenced in Figure 4 photograph included in my primary evidence of the Papanui Mitre10 Mega outdoor storage area.

periodically trimmed, there should be minimal risk for entrapment or concealment outside of the storage area. Within the storage area itself, it is presumed that this will be secured fenced and monitored by staff.

## **Conclusion**

27. Overall, I remain supportive of the proposal and in agreement with the findings of Mr Milne in respect of the potential adverse landscape and visual effects having been reduced to an appropriate level.
28. I emphasise the importance of ensuring appropriate levels of mitigation planting are accommodated to the north of the future Broadlands Drive extension and note the applicant will need to clarify the landuse intent for the residual areas north and south of this road extension.
29. I remain broadly supportive of the need to retain a mid-block crossing to enable pedestrian and cycle access to the future residential zones to the north-east and note there are potential design solutions to address the concerns raised by Mr Milne.
30. I maintain there is the need to include taller planting to provide additional screening of any outdoor storage areas beyond the standard requirements provided for in the POSDP.

Gabriel Wilson Ross

Landscape Architect

Boffa Miskell Limited

19 March 2025