

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: DDS-14-13-02 / 240416059923

DATE: 16 April 2024

MEMO TO: Mark Buckley, Principal Policy Planner

FROM: Jon Read, Greenspace & Community Facilities Planner

SUBJECT: Proposed District Plan Rezoning Requests – submission 224 –
2 Ashworths Road, Mandeville

This memo records responses to the queries raised by Council's reporting officer for Stream 12C in relation to submission 224, 2 Ashworths Road. I have reviewed the Landscape and Visual Evidence prepared by Vikramjit Singh and Fraser Miller in responding to the questions.

1. Does the boundary treatment proposed for Large Lot Residential maintain rural character? (given that they are proposing 115 Lots)

The proposed boundary treatments will contribute to the maintenance of rural character given they will screen and/or soften views into the site; particularly along the boundaries of Dawsons Road and Ashworths Road and the southern boundary with San Dona. The proposed 5m wide indigenous planting strip along Ashworths Road is the minimum width required to effectively establish a sustainable indigenous plant community. This type of boundary treatment is generally appropriate for large lot residential, rural lifestyle and rural zones. Waimakariri District Council's Draft Natural Environment Strategy advocates the use of informal mixed native hedges/plantings in semi-rural and rural environments to help re-establish indigenous landscapes and wildlife within the District. I do not support the dense Leyland cypress shelter belt planting as proposed along the length of the Dawsons Road frontage. The creation of a long dense hedging strip is not conducive to spatial connection with the neighbouring Millfield residential development, nor safe and amenable pedestrian use of this portion of Dawsons Road. Icy roads may also become a long-term hazard due to winter shading.

2. Does a 20m building setback along Dawsons and Ashworth Rd mitigate character effects on the rural environment?

A 20m building setback along Dawsons and Ashworth Road will mitigate character effects in that it will provide greater scope for transitional boundary treatments and residential landscaping to soften the built form and its associated visual impacts from both outside and inside the zone. Potential noise decibel levels between the neighbouring zones will also be buffered to some degree. A setback is supported in this context.

3. Please comment on whether the statement about the intensity of development respects the rural setting in the north and east as in paragraph [74]?

The existing shelter belts and hedgerows adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site are not in a condition to mitigate the impact of the proposed residential density. The proposed riparian planting margin along the waterway will improve this interface between the development site and neighbouring rural land. At the northern boundary, the proposed native planting buffer strip will significantly offset impacts on the rural setting to the north. Lower density housing (via larger lots)

would be best located adjacent to these more sensitive boundaries. Relatively few rural zone dwellings are located close to these boundaries or directly impacted by the proposal.

4. In your opinion, do you consider shelter belts along road boundaries representative of rural activities or of small lifestyle properties?

Shelter belts are generally representative of rural activities; for stock shelter and as a traditional practice rooted in farming culture. They are also applicable to the 4ha rural lifestyle zone, to some degree. They are much less appropriate in a residential zone or lot boundary context. We prefer to see mixed species native planting strips, or lower informal native hedging. High and dense shelter hedges create a division rather than a connection within a wider community context that can create issues related to social barriers, traffic safety, pedestrian safety and landowner security e.g. CPTED see and be seen principle.

5. Does planting a 5m wide strip of riparian vegetation “naturalise” a channelised stream?

Five metres is a bare minimum width for a functional and ecologically sustainable waterside native plant community. If feasible, I advocate a 10-metre width along this boundary that could be vested in Council. This would allow for a wider planting buffer and an associated recreation access linkage path through this corridor to significantly improve the otherwise very limited off-road walking/cycling opportunities for residents. The narrower the vegetation buffer, the lower the level of nitrate removal via the riparian plants. Anything less than a 10m width will be beneficial, but not fully mitigate undesirable changes in water temperature and runoff which affect biodiversity within the waterway e.g. invertebrates and fish.

6. Is the list of trees in para [100] of Mr Miller’s evidence sufficient to provide diverse ecological habitat?

Yes, these tree and shrub species are generally standard hardy and appropriate species, with the exception of manuka. I recommend this site-sensitive species be replaced with hardier kanuka in anything other than regularly waterlogged conditions. NB: There should be some flexibility for mutually agreed changes in species at consent stage in response to prevailing conditions and circumstances at the time.

Important Additional Comments:

The size, location and density of this proposed Large Lot Residential Zone development triggers a Council requirement for a small neighbourhood park reserve to provide a public recreation and social gathering space for residents. Ideally this should be located for easy access close to Dawsons Road and and/or an internal road or green linkage. It should also be located to make it accessible to residents within the neighbouring Millfield residential development. The park land needs to be flat and well-drained, and of adequate size to cater for the population catchment. To achieve this, 0.5 hectares of reserve land vested in WDC is required. The proposed development is well outside the ‘500m and/or 10-minute walk’ requirement for viable easy access to a neighbourhood park or its equivalent, i.e. Mandeville Domain. The significant physical barrier of Tram Road also impacts this accessibility.

I also advocate additional green pedestrian linkages within the ODP area. This will help break up the built-form density of the residential lots and provide internal and external connections to support proven community demand for off-road walking routes and social interaction. There is an opportunity to achieve this via creation of an internal linkage that connects the internal road network to the NW corner of the site and the adjacent pedestrian cycle linkage connection out to Wards Road.

Various San Dona Submissions

In relation to section 12.1 Effects on Urban Form and Landscape Amenity points 109 to 114. The Planner asked would the present olive production character better align with rural lifestyle (4ha enabling primary production or large lot residential (5,000m² sections with no primary production)? Note that they don't have the same level of servicing (road widths and streetlights).

Greenspace advice/response: The viability of present and future olive production at San Dona is a key consideration. Without it, a change to large lot residential would not be significantly out of character with the surrounding residential environment. Increased impacts on rural character to the north-west may trigger a requirement for additional landscape interventions at the rural boundary. An increase in density will increase demand for recreational walkability around the area. This will be limited to roads, as no green recreational linkages are provided within the development or as connection points to potential future development to the north-east. This will be a community shortcoming in any change of density to Large Lot Residential.

Re levels of servicing: Under Council's current Greenspace levels of a service, a San Dona zone change to large lot residential would not automatically trigger a requirement for landscape enhancement of streetscapes within the development e.g. street trees.

308 Cones Road, Ashley

Landscape & Visual Report - David Compton-Moen

The Planner asked for advice on the following three areas.

Q: Do you agree that the proposed development of large lot residential (average 5,000m² sections) maintains the rural character of the site?

A: The rural character of the site in relation to rural productivity and working or farming the land may not be maintained. However, I believe the rural landscape attributes, values and aesthetic perceptions of the site are unlikely to be diminished or modified to a degree where they will no longer be in keeping with the surrounding rural character.

Q: Do you agree that the proposed large lot residential is consistent with the surrounding character of development in the wider area (Loburn Lea etc)?

A: Yes. The nature of the proposed rezoning is in keeping with the site characteristics of the wider Loburn Lea development area and is only separated from this development by Cones Road.

Q: Do you agree that the landscape mitigation measures proposed in section 4 are suitable to mitigate any effects?

A: Yes

Kintyre Lane, Ohoka

Landscape and Visual Report - Jeremy Head

The Planner has asked for advice in the following areas.

Q: Do you agree with the assessment that having large lot development in Block A could be interchanged with Block B? [Para. 23] of evidence.

A: I agree this is not highly significant overall to the proposed LLRZ residential layout of the wider site. It is compatible with the overall lot size requirements of the zone and the adjacent existing Hallfield development. The higher internal density will intensify the development level around existing landowners/residents and adjacent to the off-road recreational linkage network. This might reduce the potential semi-rural experience of the walking network for residents and visitors, but not to a significant degree. A key consideration will be the location of larger lots alongside Mill Road; and how this might affect the perceived status and character of this road in comparison with smaller sections.

Q: Do you agree with the removal of the "character street with landscape and planting provisions"?

A: The character street provision should remain as a requirement of the ODP if it was initially supported and/or approved by Council and/or community representatives at the time. This position is advocated by Council's General Manager of Community and Recreation. A final decision on the appropriate level of service treatment can ultimately be revisited and confirmed at resource consent stage if all parties agree. Landscape amenity at the Mill Road corridor is the primary focus of any landscape enhancement i.e. street trees.

Additional comment (Linkage network):

Activation of the recreation access linkage network as shown on the ODP is significantly dependent on existing landowner properties. Given this, how does the applicant propose to provide linkage connectivity in accordance with the ODP intent?