

Before the Independent Hearings Panel  
at Waimakariri District Council

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*in the matter of:* Proposed private plan change RCP31 to the Operative  
Waimakariri District Plan

*and:* **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**  
*Applicant*

Supplementary evidence of Dave Compton-Moen

---

Dated: 5 September 2023

---

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



## **SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF DAVE COMPTON-MOEN**

- 1 My full name is David John Compton-Moen.
- 2 My qualifications and experience are set out in my evidence in chief dated 3 August 2023.
- 3 My supplementary evidence addresses additional matters arising from the PC31 hearing, in particular the maintenance of landscape areas and the likelihood that the proposed landscape treatment strips and landscape areas shown in association with the proposed stream enhancement will be enough to ensure successful establishment of landscape areas.
- 4 I have also considered whether the 'reduced ODP' attached to **Mr Walsh's** supplementary evidence would be appropriate from a landscape perspective.

## **MAINTENANCE AND LIKELY SUCCESS OF LANDSCAPE STRIPS**

- 5 There were several general comments made by submitters regarding the potential lack of future maintenance of the proposed landscape treatment areas as shown on the ODP. I understand the concern of these submitters and it is my experience that the lack of, or poor maintenance of planting can result in unacceptable landscape outcomes. It is also my experience that this can be effectively managed through appropriate rule frameworks and future consenting requirements. I understand a five-year maintenance period for planting has now been incorporated into the ODP text and/or rules (refer to the Supplementary evidence of **Mr Walsh**) and I consider this to be more than enough to ensure successful establishment of landscape areas. This is longer than the typical 2-year (48-month) maintenance period that is usually specified as being sufficient.
- 6 The species outlined in my evidence are commonly found in the Ōhoka district and were selected for their known ability to establish easily on the site. They are also readily available from local nurseries in the large numbers that would be required. To ensure greater flexibility for Landscape Treatment C, it is recommended that the following species are also added to this mix:
  - 6.1 Pittosporum eugenioides (Tarata, Lemonwood);
  - 6.2 Pittosporum tenuifolium (Kohuhu, Black Matipo);
  - 6.3 Griselinia littoralis (Broadleaf);
  - 6.4 Kunzea ericoides (Kanuka); and

## 6.5 Leptospermum scoparium (Maunka).

- 7 The exact breakdown and composition of the planting of Landscape Treatments A, B, and C will be submitted to council for approval during the subdivision stage. The same would apply for reserves and riparian margins developed as part of the green/blue network within the plan change site, and with respect to these I note the ODP text states "*Plant species in the new reserves and riparian margins shall include native tree and shrub plantings. The plant species selection process shall involve consultation with local Rūnanga.*"
- 8 In association with the maintenance period, I consider that a detailed landscape management plan is required, preferably prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect. Landscape management plans are not uncommon with proposed plan changes such as this, being submitted at Engineering Approval Stage. A management plan would provide direction on the establishment of planting, weed and pest control, replacement planting, irrigation and the like. In my opinion, a requirement for planting within the landscape areas to achieve an 80% canopy cover within the five-year timeframe would also be appropriate.
- 9 The maintenance of the landscape treatment areas will ensure a high landscape amenity outcome is achieved and in doing so, the treatment areas will assist with the integration of the PC31 area within its setting.

## THE 'REDUCED ODP'

- 10 Having assisted with the development of the 'Reduced ODP' for PC31 (contained in the supplementary evidence of **Mr Walsh**) I consider that, from a landscape perspective, it responds appropriately to the application site's attributes, sensitivity, and the surrounding environment. The same landscape mitigation measures would apply with the exception of Landscape Treatment B along the southern-most boundary, and the planting of the southern side of the South Branch of the Ōhoka Stream, which would no longer be required.
- 11 I am also of the opinion the 'Reduced ODP' contributes to the well-functioning urban environment for the same reasons as the full proposed ODP would as set out in my evidence in chief.

## CONCLUSION

- 12 I am confident that the proposed landscape mitigation measures are appropriate to address the visual amenity and rural character concerns that have been raised. The proposed landscape treatment strips and landscape areas shown in association with the proposed

stream enhancements will also add significant positive ecological and amenity benefits to the site and village.

- 13 The proposed 5-year maintenance period and the requirement for a Landscape Management Plan will provide further certainty of the success of all of the proposed landscaping components of the plan change site.

Dated: 5 September 2023

**Dave Compton-Moen**