

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF

The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or
the Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Hearing of Submissions and Further
Submissions on the Proposed Waimakariri
District Plan (**PWDP** or **the Proposed Plan**)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Hearing of Submissions and Further
Submissions on Variations 1 and 2 to the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Submissions and Further Submissions on the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan by
Doncaster Developments Limited

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF VIKRAMJIT SINGH
IN RESPONSE TO OFFICER REPORT
ON BEHALF OF DONCASTER DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED
REGARDING HEARING STREAM 12E**

DATED: 2 August 2024

Presented for filing by:
Chris Fowler
Saunders & Co
PO Box 18, Christchurch
T 027 227 2026
chris.fowler@saunders.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Vikramjit Singh Bharaj. I am an Urban Designer/ Architect
- 2 I have prepared a statement of evidence regarding Hearing Stream 12E in support of the submissions of Doncaster Developments Limited (**Doncaster**) to rezone approximately 11 ha in northwest Rangiora, adjoining Lehmans Road from Residential 4A Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (**MRZ**) subject to an Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) through the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (**PWDP**) and Variation 1 to the PWDP.
- 3 My qualifications and experience are set out in that statement. I confirm that this supplementary statement of evidence is also prepared in accordance with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct.
- 4 On 22 July 2024 the Waimakariri District Council (**Council**) released an Officer Report for Hearing Stream 12E prepared under section 42A of the RMA containing an analysis of submissions seeking residential rezoning and recommendations in response to those submissions (**Officer Report**).
- 5 The Officer Report recommends that the Doncaster rezoning submission be rejected. My supplementary evidence is filed in response to that Report.

SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

- 6 In my supplementary evidence I address the following matters:
 - (a) those parts of the Officer Report that address matters within scope of my expertise, with particular emphasis on matters where there is a difference of view between myself and the Officer Report.
- 7 In preparing my supplementary evidence I have:
 - (a) Reviewed the Officer Report and the Appendices to that Report relevant to my area of expertise;
 - (b) Reviewed the Urban Design matters raised in the Officer Report Appendix G – which includes an Urban Design Memorandum (**Memo**) by Mr Edward Jolly;
 - (c) Reviewed my Evidence in Chief (**EIC**) filed earlier on behalf of the Doncaster.

CONTEXT AND APPROACH

- 8 As mentioned, the Officer Report recommends decline of the Doncaster rezoning submission. A range of reasons are given for this recommendation, some of which relate to my area of expertise.
- 9 The approach I have adopted in this supplementary statement of evidence is to identify those parts of the Officer Report (including Appendices attached to that Report) where I disagree with the Officer Report and to explain my reasons for disagreement.

RESPONSE TO OFFICER REPORT

- 10 From an urban design perspective, Mr Jolly (*Appendix G - Urban Design Memorandum to the Officer report*) is generally supportive of the future development as shown on the ODP for this Site. Further to that, under the heading 5.1.2 North West Rangiora Development Area- Assessment – “Urban Design” at [329] of the Officer report there are two matters raised in relation to Urban Design that I wish to address. I set these out following:
- (a) The open space reserve area (Local Purpose Reserve in the ODP) proposed along the southeast boundary is aligned with the transmission pylons. This will have reduced opportunities for use from future residents for recreation.
 - (b) There is a need for a more centrally located neighbourhood green space within the Site to complement the reserve.
- 11 I respond to each of these two matters following.

Open reserve area along transmission line will have reduced opportunity for recreation.

- 12 At [329] of the Officer report which is simply re-stating Point 6 of the Urban Design Memo, questions the opportunity of use from future residents of the Open reserve area along the transmission lines, suggesting it will serve more as a buffer for the infrastructure development rather than provide true recreational use.
- 13 I disagree. It is intended the open reserve area along the southeast boundary would have a high-quality landscape treatment. It is my observation that this can assist in the acceptance of an open space zone under transmission lines

which in turn can encourage active use. This is quite typical for urban situations.

- 14 From an urban design perspective this would be an efficient use of land and can assist in the softening of utilitarian nature of the infrastructure with a resulting high quality landscape outcome. Shown below are some images of a similar open reserve area in Yaldhurst, Christchurch where good quality landscape is well used by residents and part of the urban landscape.



Figure 1: Rannoch Drive, Oaks Reserve, Yaldhurst. An open reserve area along transmission lines



Figure 2: Saddlers Lane, Yaldhurst with walking and cycle tracks along transmission lines

- 15 Moreover, the proximity of this open reserve space to the existing development in the south potentially enables access options to a wider population. This could foster community involvement and promote health and recreational activities.
- 16 In terms of Urban Design this large consolidated open reserve area augmented with open grass spaces, walking and cycling tracks, and storm water management would present an amenity opportunity and will be a good asset for the surrounding built form development and the northwest edge of Rangiora.

Need for a centrally located neighbourhood park to support residents.

- 17 At [329] of the Officer report and at Point 6 of the Urban Design Memo the need for a more central park within the proposed development is raised/addressed.
- 18 I agree with this part of the Officer report for the provision of a more central neighbourhood park. However, determination of the size of the park is a matter which can be detailed at the subdivision consent stage to align with the final lot numbers and configuration of future subdivision enable by a re-zoning.
- 19 Furthermore, it is my understanding that the neighbourhood park will be designed to reflect the council's guidelines and Council reserves control of this through the future subdivision process. The updated ODP is attached as Appendix 1 with this supplementary evidence.

CONCLUSION

- 20 Overall, the Officer Report indicates that the Council is currently not supportive of the evidence regarding Hearing Stream 12E of Doncaster's submission on the PWDP to rezone the Site from RLZ to MDRS.
- 21 The Officer's Report and the supportive Appendices raised very few matters in relation to urban design matters. These have each been addressed above.
- 22 The Commissioners can take heart that Councils Urban Design Expert and I both consider the Site is well suited and positioned for urban expansion. Furthermore, Mr Jolly is supportive of the submission in relation to overall Urban Design outcomes, and that there are no Urban Design related reasons to decline the rezoning of the Site.

23 Thank you for the opportunity to present my evidence.

Vikramjit Singh Bharaj
2 August 2024

APPENDIX 1– REVISED ODP LAYOUT