

Before the Independent Commissioners appointed by the Waimakariri District Council

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

and

In the matter of Proposed Waimakariri District Plan: Ōhoka Rezonings
(Hearing Stream 12D)

and

In the matter of Further submission by the Oxford Ōhoka Community Board
[submitter 62] to the Rolleston Industrial Developments
Limited [submitter 160] and Carter Group Property Ltd
[submitter 237] submissions to Rezone land at Ōhoka

**Supplementary Brief of evidence of Nick Boyes on behalf of the Oxford-Ōhoka
Community Board (as Further Submitter) - Planning**

Dated: 18 October 2024

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

CavellLeitch >
LIMITED

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

Supplementary Evidence of Nick Boyes:

Introduction

1. My name is Nicholas (Nick) Boyes. My qualifications and experience as a Planner were set out in my evidence in chief.
2. I prepared an expert planning brief of evidence for the Oxford Ōhoka Community Board as a further submitter dated 13 June 2024, a summary brief of evidence dated 1 July 2024, and participated in the Hearing Stream 12D Planning Expert Witness Conferencing (which produced a Joint Witness Statement “JWS” for Planning, dated 30 August 2024).

Scope of evidence

3. The scope of this supplementary evidence is to describe my position on the key planning matters following expert conferencing. In that regard this evidence confirms the statements regarding my position as set out in the S42A Report Addendum prepared by Andrew Willis dated 9 October 2024.
4. There was general agreement on the majority of the matters considered in the planning conferencing. However, as set out in the Planning JWS concluding comments (paragraphs 84 to 87), the key areas of disagreement are whether the proposal contributes to a well-functioning urban environment, the extent to which sub-markets (within the larger urban environment) need to be assessed, and the level of substitutability across alternative supply options for urban growth to meet the overall objectives of the NPS-UD.

NPS-UD Objective 3

5. I remain of the view that the proposal does not meet subclauses (a), (b) and (c) of NPD-UD Objective 3. Specifically, the subject site is not in or near an existing centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities (clause a), the area is not well serviced by existing or planned public transport (clause b) and there is not high demand for housing or business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment (clause c).

Housing Demand and Substitutability

6. It is acknowledged that the submitter’s evidence demonstrates a demand for housing at Ōhoka. However, this demand relates to the

existing Ōhoka settlement. The evidence of Richard Knott and Kim Goodfellow sets out that the urban environment resulting from the proposed re-zoning is of a different character and amenity to that evident today¹. On that basis it cannot be assumed that any demand for housing within the existing Ōhoka Village will simply transfer to the development resulting from the proposed re-zoning.

7. As recorded in the JWS (paragraphs 37 and 38) I consider that the proposed urban density sections are interchangeable with those found in alternate urban locations, such as Rangiora, Kaiapoi, and Woodend (and potentially elsewhere in the Greater Christchurch urban environment). In this regard I note that whilst a Settlement (SETZ) zoning is proposed, in reality the allotment size and resulting character is similar to that of the General Residential (GRZ) zone found in those alternative growth locations already identified within the Waimakariri district:

Zone	Minimum Allotment Area	Internal Square	Frontage (excluding rear lots)
GRZ	500m ²	15m x 15m	15m
SETZ	600m ²	15m x 15m	15m

Well-Functioning Urban Environment

8. I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the proposed rezoning contributes to a well-function urban environment.
9. As summarised in paragraph 67 of the S42 Report Addendum, I consider this is principally due to the relatively remote location, which results in development not having good accessibility, especially for public and active transport. As a result the proposal relies on private motor vehicles with resultant transport network issues and relatively greater GHG emissions when compared to the alternative growth options which are either better connected along transport corridors, or provide better accessibility between housing and employment and community services (as set out in Policy 1(a)(c) of the NPS-UD).

¹ Evidence of Richard Knott, para 16.2, 16.5, 20, 32, 35, 37, 55 and 57; Evidence of Kim Goodfellow, para. 20, 28 and 29.

Conclusion

10. Following expert conferencing, I still consider that the development is not well-connected along transport corridors that can safely and sustainably support the level of growth proposed.
11. In my view the demand for additional development capacity resulting from the proposed re-zoning is not sufficiently different to that already offered elsewhere in the market so as to justify the use of Policy 8 of the NPS-UD. I consider there are better alternatives available to provide for any additional capacity that might be required to otherwise meet the outcomes set out in the NPS-UD.
12. In that context I conclude that the proposed rezoning does not contribute to well-functioning urban environments as described in Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.
13. In the absence of the ability to rely on the opportunity provided by the NPS-UD, I consider the rezoning must be considered against the applicable planning provisions to determine whether they are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. There appears to be little disagreement that rezoning would not give effect to those provisions.

Date: 18 October 2024

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'N Boyes', written in a cursive style.

Nick Boyes