

Before the Commissioner appointed by  
the Selwyn District Council

---

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of

Resource consent application for Foodstuffs (South Island)  
Properties Limited to establish and operate a PAK'nSAVE  
supermarket and associated access, loading, car parking,  
signage, earthworks and landscaping at 157 Levi Road,  
Rolleston (RC216016)

---

**Summary Statement of Andrew Burns**

1<sup>st</sup> August 2022

---

**Applicant's solicitors:**

Alex Booker  
Anderson Lloyd  
Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013  
PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8140  
DX Box WX10009 Christchurch  
p + 64 3 335 1231 | f + 64 27 656 2647  
e alex.booker@al.nz

**anderson  
lloyd.**

### Summary of evidence

- 1 My name is Andrew Burns. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence dated 18 July 2022.
- 2 I have provided urban design advice to Foodstuffs on the Rolleston PAK'nSAVE proposal since July 2021. That advice included site and context analysis, input into testing alternative options and final masterplan layout and reporting. I drafted the 'Urban Design Assessment' at Appendix K of the AEE and my evidence is outlined in a statement dated 18 July 2022.

### Summary

- 3 This summary addresses the key points from my evidence. Firstly, it presents a highlights package of the urban design assessment. Secondly, it identifies areas of agreement or disagreement with Ms Wolfer's urban design evidence for Council. Thirdly, it provides a response to matters relevant to urban design raised by Submitters and lastly responds to the s42A report on matters also within my expertise.
- 4 Subsequent to lodgement of my evidence I understand that affected party approval has been provided for that part of the 'PC71 land' immediately adjacent to the east boundary of the Site and therefore my evidence no longer considers effects on this property. It does still consider the future outcome of residential zoning for the PC71 area more generally.

### Urban design assessment – highlights package

- 5 Both Ms Wolfer and I agree on the general approach and methodology for urban design assessment of the Proposal. That approach is informed by a) urban design good practice; b) analysis of local and contextual conditions; and c) relevant planning provisions of the Selwyn District Plan (SDP). The assessment is structured around seven urban design topics and I highlight my key findings below.
- 6 **Topic 1 Town-Wide Urban Structure** – The strategic significance of the Site supports its suitability for development of a supermarket. Essential retail services are made accessible to local and sub-regional catchments, supporting consolidated, compact urban form. Both Ms Wolfer and I are satisfied with the location of the proposed supermarket.
- 7 I have considered the extant consent for a PAK'nSAVE in the TC and the relative merits of locating the Proposal in the Industrial Zone. I conclude that the proposed Site is preferable as it will support improved outcomes for the town centre (KAC) and is less isolated than the industrial area, offering better proximity to housing. This is an agreed matter with Ms Wolfer.

- 8     **Topic 2 Site Planning, Character and Urban Form** – A proposed high amenity open space acknowledges the visually prominent, landmark northwest corner of the Site. This open space mediates between the supermarket's setback, car parking and street edge. New pedestrian routes link with surrounding streets and shared paths and crossings improve the pedestrian environment for existing and future residents.
- 9     The character of the local context varies. While a typical low density suburban setting exists along Levi Road, to the east and west the environment is rural or rural-residential. A future housing environment of far greater bulk and height (up to 12m) in fully attached formation could occur as a permitted outcome (MDRS).
- 10    To mitigate effects on existing and future residential settings and to promote contextual integration, the Proposal provides deep, heavily landscaped setbacks. Both Ms Wolfer and I agree with this approach and its success in significantly reducing bulk and dominance. I also note that locating commercial frontages away from streets in preference for attractive landscaped edges is more appropriate to residential amenity values. Lastly, I am supportive of architectural refinements applied to the main façade and containment of rear servicing away from public streets.
- 11    **Topic 3 Amenity Effects on Residential Neighbours** – I have assessed effects of the Proposal on the amenity values of potentially affected residential neighbours to the north (Levi Road) and west (Lincoln Rolleston Road). Affected party approvals are provided for land directly adjacent to the Site to the south and east of the Proposal. Matters considered are bulk and visual dominance, overlooking and/or privacy and sunlight shading.
- 12    With respect to properties to the north of the Site along Levi Road, Ms Wolfer and I agree that effects on residential amenity will be acceptable. We note the configuration of these dwellings orientates living areas and outdoor spaces north away from the Site, contributing to protection of their amenity. Proposed avenue tree planting will mitigate perception of the supermarkets' bulk while allowing glimpsed views into the site offering appropriate legibility of the Proposal.
- 13    With respect to properties to the west of the Site along Lincoln Rolleston Road, I consider privacy effects on existing properties and future intensification to be acceptable due to avoidance of any direct overlooking. Bulk and visual dominance effects are acceptable due to the Proposal's deep setback, avenue planting (an agreed matter with Ms Wolfer) and additional façade and signage treatments. Sunlight shading over properties occurs for a very limited duration at mid-winter (from sunrise 8:03am to 8:45am). No shading occurs at mid-summer. At the autumnal equinox only the corner of 3 Lowes Road is shaded from 7:42am but is gone by 8:05am. I note that any proposed shading is less than shade cast by an

MDRS compliant residential scenario on the Site. I would also note that MDRS-enabled housing on the Lincoln Rolleston Road properties would most likely cast similar or greater shade. These are points of agreement with Ms Wolfer.

- 14 As noted earlier, affected party approval has been provided for the property adjoining the eastern boundary of the Site. However, the PC71 land extends beyond this property and therefore I have also considered effects on this wider area. Overall, I am comfortable that the Proposal will not inhibit residential development under PC71. The Proposal will support multi-modal connections between PC71, Lincoln Rolleston Road and Levi Road and promote walkable access to essential retail for future residents. I also note that the proposed building position and orientation of the supermarket is well-considered in that it creates a 'back-to-back' arrangement along the eastern interface, ensuring an appropriate outcome for residential development.
- 15 **Topic 4 Architectural Concept and Design** – Ms Wolfer and I agree that District Plan provisions for the Business 1 Zone are helpful and appropriate to assess the Proposal. These address the design quality of commercial buildings that are relevant to residential integration<sup>1</sup>.
- 16 Turning first to the main southwest frontage, this will have an appropriate level of visibility from the street and is complemented, not 'screened', by landscape. The architectural façade components have been refined and subdivided through detailing as sought by both Ms Wolfer and myself. This design offers relational-scale qualities to residential settings and, along with signage reduction, is a successful outcome for a supermarket building in this context.
- 17 A good level of activation and glazing of the main façade is achieved. Additional glazing has been introduced at the southern corner and the southeast facade to better engage with users though shelving limits views in / out. Along with additional feature lighting this will convey the appearance of a more active edge and help improve perceptions of safety.
- 18 The secondary northwest façade along Levi Road is setback 50m from the street and is 100m in length. Articulation of this length would be gratuitous, and I agree with the use of an avenue of 15m tall deciduous trees and underplanting to enhance the street edge. Additional glazing has been provided to the northwest stair corner and at the Click 'n Collect entrance that will help convey activation, though as a proportion of overall façade length activation is limited.

---

<sup>1</sup> Matter of discretion 16.10.2.1 (a) contributes to visual variety, including in relation to the architectural modulation and detailing proposed. Principle 4.1 Scale and size relational qualities – break up large buildings into smaller modules, longer facades broken into modules; Principle 4.6 Landscape is important to create a pleasant ambience and can mitigate adverse visual effects.

- 19    **Topic 5 Streets and Spaces** – Levi Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road corridors are likely to fulfil ‘Urban Connector’ roles with an emphasis on movement functions. However, the Proposal will enhance the ‘place’ role of these streets, improving the pedestrian environment for residents. Seven pedestrian street connections are proposed and 3 multi-modal connections. I consider this to provide a high level of local connectivity. I recommended a Condition of Consent to confirm the specific design of the seven pedestrian access points (to ensure these are open, inviting and well-lit).
- 20    Overall, the design and layout of movement across the Site and with its context provides a safe and accessible environment. On the advice of Ms Wolfer, improvements have been made to the southern pedestrian access and a further cycle parking facility provided to the northwest facade.
- 21    I have influenced the provision of a quality publicly accessible open space at the important northwestern corner. In my experience, it is relatively unusual for supermarket developments to invest in such spaces.
- 22    **Topic 6 Safety** – An assessment against CPTED guidelines has been carried out and concludes that the Proposal establishes conditions that will deliver suitably safe streets, paths and on-site car parking. I consider that an appropriate balance has been struck between the need for planting that mitigates bulk while providing for openness, visibility and safety.
- 23    The northwest and southeast frontages offer limited overlooking. CCTV will be important as well as managed planting to ensure sight lines. The Staff car park is not overlooked and safety for staff after hours or when dark will rely on CCTV and / or security staff accompanying staff to car parks.
- 24    **Topic 7 Signage** – Consideration has been given to further integration of building signage into the overall composition of the Southwest elevation, including reduction in sign size. I am comfortable that the signage is less dominant than originally proposed and aligns with SDP provisions.
- 25    Pylon signage along Levi Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road is proposed to be 6m tall (2m wide). Both Ms Wolfer and I agree this will create acceptable outcomes.

**Matters raised in evidence of Ms Wolfer**

- 26    In my opinion. Ms Wolfer and I agree on all substantive matters, including:
- (a)    the strategic (town-wide) location of the Proposal that supports a compact and consolidated urban form for Rolleston.
  - (b)    the position of the supermarket building on the Site and specifically the use of deep setbacks and landscaping to mitigate effects on neighbours.

- (c) the appropriateness of comparing the effects from potential future residential development under the new Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and other Matters) Amendment Act (**EHS Act**) and the Medium Density Residential Standards (**MDRS**).
  - (d) the reduction in dominance of building signage and further architectural treatment to the southwest façade.
  - (e) the reduction in pylon signage height to 6m and limited duration of illumination at night.
  - (f) additional glazing along parts of the northwest, southwest and southeast facades (pages 16, 17, evidence of Ms Wolfer). Though the extent and nature of the glazing provides limited activation.
  - (g) the provision of a second bike parking facility at the northwest façade.
- 27 Ms Wolfer and I disagree on a specific matter related to the extant PAK'nSAVE consent in the TC. I do not consider this matter to be of significance as it does not alter either of our overall conclusions around the suitability of the Proposal.

#### **Matters raised in Submissions**

- 28 I note that no expert evidence on urban design has been provided on behalf of the Submitters and therefore the summary below only relates to the original submissions during notification. I have read the planning evidence of Ms Laird for Submitters 43 and 44. I note her paragraph 47 incorrectly refers to my evidence on the matter of sunlight shading. She states that shading generated from a development permitted by the NPS-UD and EHS would be less than the Proposal. In fact, shading from an MDRS-compliant outcome would be greater than that of the Proposal, as documented in my evidence (paragraphs 75, 79).
- 29 I have considered all Submissions relevant to urban design and identified five common topics: Relocation to the Izone; Loss of residential character and amenity; Sunlight shading; Signage; and, Port Hills Vista. I disagree with the majority of those Submissions with the exception of signage where I partly agree and confirm pylon signage height has been reduced to 6m and better integration of building signage has been achieved.

#### **Matters raised in SDC's Officer Report (OR)**

- 30 I have reviewed the OR and note points of agreement but also a number of points of disagreement between Ms Anderson's conclusions, the evidence of Ms Wolfer and my own statement. Principally that the OR determines the existing environment to be 'intact' and on that basis finds the Proposal to be incompatible with Policies relevant to environment, character and amenity. My analysis and that of Ms Wolfer

conclude that the Proposal is appropriate to its location and provides acceptable mitigation of effects on residential amenity.

- 31 The OR describes the area as having the quality of “quietness”. I disagree in that the context is heavily influenced by the arterial (urban connector) roads that provide strategic access for Rolleston. A Local Access Street or cul-de-sac would be more commonly understood to be ‘quiet’. Further, when considered alongside the level of intensity that could result in future from MDRS permitted development, I disagree with the analysis of the area as “quiet”.
- 32 I agree with both Ms Anderson and Ms Wolfer that the Proposal will not create an alternative centre. However, the OR further states that the proposed supermarket will result in fragmentation of the KAC and is inconsistent with the RPS. From a purely urban design perspective the Proposal provides access to essential retail services for local neighbourhoods, encouraging walkable patterns and is well-located on strategic access routes, promoting consolidated, compact urban form.

### **Conclusion**

- 33 A framework for urban design assessment has been development that addresses a wide range of matters appropriate to the full discretionary status of the application. Ms Wolfer and I agree on the approach to assessment.
- 34 Seven topics have been identified that cover a range of matters from subregional and town-wide considerations to site planning to detailed assessment of local effects on residential settings to CPTED and signage. Overall, the Proposal performs well against these matters, and it is a point of agreement with Ms Wolfer that the Application has acceptable effects on the environment, including on existing and future residential amenity.
- 35 I conclude the Proposal can be supported from an urban design perspective.

**Andrew Burns**

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August 2022