

Before the Independent Commissioners appointed by the Waimakariri District Council

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**)

and

In the matter of Proposed Private Plan Change 31 (PC31) to the Waimakariri
Operative District Plan by Rolleston Industrial Development
Limited

Summary of evidence of Kim Thomas Goodfellow on behalf of Waimakariri District Council (as Submitter)

Dated: 9 August 2023

Andrew Schulte (andrew.schulte@cavell.co.nz)
Counsel for submitter

CavellLeitch 
LIMITED

AJS-434615-177-209-V1-e

Level 3, BNZ Centre
111 Cashel Mall
PO Box 799, Christchurch
T: +64 3 379 9940 F: +64 3 379 2408

Summary of evidence of Kim Thomas Goodfellow

1. My full name is Kim Thomas Goodfellow.
2. I am a landscape architect and masterplanner and work in my own company; The Goodfellow Group Limited which was established in 2013. I hold a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Lincoln University. I am a Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects and have more than 20 years' experience working in the areas of landscape architecture and urban development.

Summary of evidence

3. In summary, I consider the proposed Plan Change of 845+ dwellings is a residential subdivision density which is suited to an urban context, and is not consistent with the existing rural character of Ōhoka. This proposal will not maintain but instead significantly reduce the existing rural character of Ōhoka. In this regard I support my original assessment of the Plan Change.

Response to Applicant's witness comments

4. In response to the summary of evidence prepared by Dave Compton-Moen on Landscape, I have the following comments;
 - 4.1. In overall terms Mr Compton-Moen describes the PC31 proposal as '*more compartmentalised*' and as a '*high quality and high amenity development*'¹. Mr Compton-Moen also downplays the importance of site size and housing density and instead highlights the importance of '*other contributing factors e.g. a lack of kerb and channel, fencing typology, etc*'².
 - 4.2. The above comments of Mr Compton-Moen do not address the central issue of adverse landscape effects on the existing rural character of Ōhoka which will be irrevocably changed due to introducing a high density of dwellings (845+) which is not consistent with the Ōhoka settlement pattern, and since the proposed residential lots will no longer accommodate rural activities.

¹ Summary of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, Page 2.

² Summary of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, Page 2.

- 4.3. The PC31 proposal includes features that will enhance amenity. However, these features do not address or mitigate the loss of character which will occur in seeking to introduce 845 dwellings into the rural environment of Ōhoka and which are contrary to the following sections of the Waimakiriri District Plan:

Objective 14.1.1: ‘Avoid subdivision and/or dwelling house development that results in any loss of rural character or is likely to constrain lawfully established farming activities’.

Policy 14.1.1.2: ‘Maintain the continued domination of the Rural Zone by intensive and extensive agricultural, pastoral and horticultural land use activities’.

Policy 14.1.1.3: ‘Maintain and enhance the environmental qualities such as natural features, air and noise levels, including limited signage and rural retail activities that contribute to the distinctive character of the Rural Zones, consistent with a rural working environment’.

Policy 18.1.1.9 of the operative WDP to ‘maintain a rural village character comprising of low density living environment’.

- 4.4. I do not agree with Mr Compton-Moens statement: *‘the Plan Change is an appropriate response to its setting’*³, and it is my opinion that the proposal will have an adverse effect on the character of Ōhoka in the *moderate - high* range.

5. In response to the summary of evidence prepared by Mr Tony Milne, I have the following comments:

- 5.1. Mr Milne has the opinion the PC31 *‘density still represents that of a village scale (noting that, for example, Oxford is significantly more urbanised than the PC31 proposal, yet is still identifies as a village)’*⁴.

- 5.2. As mentioned above (4.2), the central issue in terms of landscape effects is the adverse effect on the rural character of Ōhoka which will occur with PC31. It is my view that discussions on what might (or might not) define a village, or

³ Summary of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, Page 3.

⁴ Summary of evidence of Tony Milne, Page 3.

comparisons with other locations, are not critical and thereby do not relate to the particulars of Ōhoka or respond to this central concern.

Conclusion

6. I support my original assessment of the Plan Change and consider that the proposal will have an adverse effect on the character of Ōhoka in the *moderate - high* range. If granted in its current form, the outcome of PC31 will be that the present rural character of the Ōhoka settlement will no longer exist and will be replaced with a suburb of housing density that is normally found in urban centres such as Christchurch or Rangiora.

Date: 9 August 2023

Kim Thomas Goodfellow