

Before an Independent Hearings Panel  
Appointed by Waimakariri District Council

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*in the matter of:* Submissions and further submissions on Variation 1 to  
the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

*and:* Hearing Stream 12: Rezoning requests (larger scale)

*and:* **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**  
(Submitter 60)

Statement of evidence of Jeremy Phillips (Planning) on behalf of  
Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited

---

Dated: 5 March 2024

---

Reference: J M Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)  
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com  
T +64 3 353 4130  
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 2510  
Christchurch 8140  
New Zealand

Auckland  
Wellington  
Christchurch



**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JEREMY PHILLIPS ON BEHALF OF  
ROLLESTON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

**INTRODUCTION**

- 1 My full name is Jeremy Goodson Phillips. I am a senior planner and Director practising with Novo Group Limited in Christchurch.
- 2 I hold the qualifications of a Bachelor of Science from the University of Canterbury and a Master of Science with Honours in Resource Management from Lincoln University, the latter attained in 2001. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, a member of the Resource Management Law Association and a member of the Institute of Directors. I have held accreditation as a Hearings Commissioner under the MfE Making Good Decisions programme since January 2010 and have held endorsement as a Chair since January 2013.
- 3 I have 21 years of experience as a resource management planner, working within and for territorial authorities, as a consultant and as an independent Hearings Commissioner. I have particular experience in urban land use development planning in Greater Christchurch, predominantly as a consultant to property owners, investors and developers.
- 4 Of relevance to these proceedings, I have had extensive involvement in respect of the Proposed Selwyn District Plan and associated Variation (IPI) process, providing evidence for submitters on a number of chapters and rezoning proposals, where implementation of the NPSUD and the RMA was a key consideration. I was also extensively involved in the hearings on the Replacement Christchurch District Plan and have provided evidence on Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan (an 'IPI').
- 5 In a Greater Christchurch context, I have significant experience in all forms of land use planning under the Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans for projects ranging from small scale residential developments and individual houses, through to large scale residential, commercial and civic projects including Te Kaha, Te Pai, The Crossing, Riverside Farmers Market, large-scale suburban retail and industrial developments, and residential, commercial and industrial greenfield rezoning, subdivision and development projects. Through that experience I have an excellent practical understanding of the application and implementation of District Plan provisions in the region and the plan development process.
- 6 To date I have provided evidence on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan in regards Hearing Stream 10A: Future Development Areas and Hearing Stream 12: Rezoning.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 7 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I note that in preparing my evidence I have reviewed the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in Part 9 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with it in preparing my evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 8 My evidence relates to the submission filed by Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited ('RIDL') (Submitter 60) (also referred to collectively as 'the submitter' throughout this evidence) on Variation 1 to the proposed Waimakariri District Plan ('PWDP' and 'Variation 1'). The submission sought that the submitter's land at Ōhoka be identified as a new residential zone in the Proposed Variation.
- 9 This evidence:
- 9.1 Summarises the relief sought by the submitter.
  - 9.2 Refers to and adopts the planning evidence of Mr Timothy Walsh ('Mr Walsh') and the associated technical evidence he refers to, on PWDP Hearing Stream 12, insofar that this evaluates and supports the identification of the submitter's land at Ōhoka as "a new residential zone" as provided for in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the 'Amendment Act').
  - 9.3 Addresses the appropriateness of the Medium Density Residential Zone ('MRZ') applying to part of the submitter's land.
- 10 In preparing my evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
- 10.1 The submissions filed by RIDL on the PWDP and Variation 1.
  - 10.2 The evidence prepared by Mr Walsh and other experts, dated 5 March 2024, concerning the submitter's requested relief to rezone the subject land at Ōhoka.
  - 10.3 The relevant statutory planning documents, including the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act'), and the NPSUD.

## **EVALUATION**

### **The Relief Sought**

- 11 The submitter opposes the Rural Lifestyle zoning (RLZ) proposed for several Ōhoka properties and instead seeks a combination of zoning that would enable approximately 850 households, local services, and either a school or retirement village on the subject land. Noting this and that the site is not subject to any Qualifying Matters in the proposed Variation, RIDL's submission on Variation 1 sought that the submitter's land at Ōhoka be identified as a "new residential zone".
- 12 In particular, the submission sought a MRZ, Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ), Local Centre Zone (LCZ), and Open Space Zone (OSZ) in accordance with the plans and Outline Development Plan (ODP) included with the submission. This zoning was consistent with the relief sought by the submitter in their submission on the PWDP, with the exception of the MRZ which would apply instead of the proposed General Residential Zone (GRZ) over part of the land.
- 13 The particulars of the relief sought by the submitter in their submission on the PWDP are set out in detail in the evidence of Mr Walsh and I refer to and adopt that description.

### **Evaluation of Rezoning Generally**

- 14 The planning evidence of Mr Walsh for Hearing Stream 12 and the associated technical evidence he refers to provides extensive evaluation of the requested rezoning of the land. Whilst that evidence does not consider the appropriateness of MRZ for part of the site (a matter my evidence addresses below), the balance of his evidence is relevant to this submission and the merits of rezoning the land for urban purposes and identifying it as a new residential zone. In that regard, I refer to and adopt his evidence in full.

### **Evaluation of MRZ for Part of the Land**

- 15 As set out in the evidence of Mr Walsh, the proposed Settlement zoning (SETZ)<sup>1</sup> over the majority of the land (being the relief sought by the submitter in their submission on the PWDP) is relevant in terms of the density and quantum of residential development enabled and it is therefore material to the assessment of relevant issues including road network capacity, infrastructure capacity, and character and amenity. In the absence of evidence that assesses the implications of enabling increased density by way of MRZ, I am unable to conclude that this zoning is appropriate for parts of the subject land.

---

<sup>1</sup> Or GRZ, noting Mr Walsh's evidence concludes that either SETZ or GRZ could appropriately apply.

- 16 Notwithstanding, in reliance on the evidence of Mr Walsh for Stream 12, I remain of the view that identifying the submitter's land at Ōhoka as a "new residential zone" as provided for under the Amendment Act is appropriate.

### **CONCLUSION**

- 17 In conclusion, I am unable to conclude that MRZ zoning is appropriate for parts of the submitter's land at Ohoka. However, based on Mr Walsh's evidence for Stream 12, I remain of the view that identifying the submitter's land at Ōhoka as a new residential zone is appropriate.

Dated: 5 March 2024

---

Jeremy Phillips