

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 the Proposed  
Waimakariri District Plan

*and:* Hearing Stream 12D: Ōhoka rezoning request

*and:* **Carter Group Property Limited**  
(Submitter 237)

*and:* **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**  
(Submitter 160)

Supplementary statement of evidence of Nicole Lauenstein (Urban  
design)

---

Dated: 13 June 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



## **SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICOLE LAUENSTEIN**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1 My full name is Nicole Lauenstein.
- 2 My area of expertise, experience, and qualifications are set out in my statement of evidence dated 5 March 2024 for this hearing stream.
- 3 The purpose of this supplementary evidence is to respond to matters raised in the Officer's Report dated 31 May 2024 relevant to my evidence.

### **CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 4 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.

### **RESPONSE TO OFFICER'S REPORT**

#### **Policy Framework**

- 5 The reference documents as set out by Mr Nicholson in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10 are relevant and I agree with his overall approach to draw on the strategic directions they provide. However, I would differentiate their relevance and consider the CRPS to be of less relevance than the NPSUD or the Proposed District Plan – keeping in mind that the Proposed District Plan process is in train and the notified version is subject to change. I consider the NPSUD provides the most important document being an overarching national document applicable to all urban environments.
- 6 With regard to the NPSUD, Mr Nicholson summarised the key objective (para 4.2) is to 'provide well-functioning urban environments'. It might have been clearer to use the full objective which states that New Zealand 'has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future'. The full text of the objective shows that well-functioning urban environments involve more than the matter of urban form and access to public transport.
- 7 The following objectives are also relevant and must be taken into account when assessing the urban qualities of a proposal:

- 7.1 Objective 4: New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.
- 7.2 Objective 6: Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are: integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and strategic over the medium term and long term; and responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.
- 7.3 Objective 7: Local authorities have robust and frequently updated information about their urban environments and use it to inform planning decisions.
- 7.4 Objective 8: New Zealand’s urban environments: support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.
- 8 When assessing urban development proposals, the assessment should consider the wider breath of objectives, not just a select few.
- 9 Policy 1 requires that planning decisions contribute to well-functioning environments. In this case, the relevant urban environment is the Greater Christchurch area. It is important to acknowledge that each individual development need not necessarily provide all the Policy 1 elements needed for a well-functioning urban environment. Rather, it must **contribute to** and ensure the existing urban environment functions well. Otherwise, every development would have to provide employment, industry, higher education, public transport etc., and this is not realistic nor required.
- 10 Although Mr Nicholson says he draws on this document for guidance, he is selective in the elements he chooses to focus on and limits his assessment to certain parts of Policy 1 elements of a well-functioning urban environment. It is important to read the NPSUD as a whole with all its objectives and policies that are relevant to the subject proposal. Mr Nicholson seems to only consider Objective 1 in parts, Objective 3 in parts and with regard to Policy 1, his sole emphasis is on the lack of accessibility via public and active transport. Other aspects of these objectives and policies seem to have been disregarded. This approach leads to a narrow and skewed assessment of the proposal.
- 11 With regards to the CRPS, it is noteworthy that this document is over ten years old and now under review. Further, it does not give full effect to the NPSUD. For that reason, I would not consider the CRPS to be the most relevant document with regards to urban growth, particularly in relation to urban growth matters. The overarching and more general objectives as referred to in paragraph

4.5 of Mr Nicholson's evidence remain relevant given they encourage general 'good practice' urban outcomes.

- 12 I would expect that the CRPS review will bring the document in line with the major directives of the NPSUD and other relevant national policies affecting urban development and growth.
- 13 In paragraph 4.6, Mr Nicholson singles out one aspect of good urban design principles namely connections via public and active transport. His evidence strongly focuses on connections to the wider urban areas of Christchurch, Kaiapoi and Rangiora using these modes of travel and downplays the proposals high quality connections including walking and cycling within the site, to the new commercial area and to the centre of Ōhoka, and the public transport connection to Kaiapoi and beyond.
- 14 At paragraph 4.8, Mr Nicholson sets out the Proposed Plan policy in respect of identification of new development areas. In regard to that policy, Ōhoka is a settlement or small township and an existing urban node which forms part of the wider Greater Christchurch urban environment. The proposal clearly connects to this existing urban area and promotes a coordinated pattern of development for Ōhoka by completing a currently lopsided and unconsolidated urban form.
- 15 The Proposed Plan policy in respect of new development areas aligns strongly with NPSUD Policy 1. I consider that the proposal is consistent with its requirements such that it contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.
- 16 In paragraph 4.7, Mr Nicholson refers to the Objective SD-02 and emphasises the need for consolidation and integration of new development into existing urban environments. The proposal achieves this by integrating and consolidating with Ōhoka. While the Proposed Plan identifies the primary areas for intensification as Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Oxford, this does not preclude Ōhoka as a suitable location for growth. This is particularly the case when considering aspects such as avoidance of natural hazards and other development constraints, and providing sufficient development capacity and housing variety and choice. These matters are relevant to urban design as part of the bigger picture considerations.
- 17 In summary, I consider that Mr Nicholson is overly selective with regards to the relevant planning documents, particularly in respect of the NPSUD. This narrows the scope required for a full urban design assessment of the proposal and results in an assessment that unduly focuses on the matter of accessibility to the wider urban environment (Christchurch, Kaiapoi and Rangiora) via public and active transport.

### **Analysis**

- 18 At paragraph 4.11 Mr Nicholson sets out the four urban design matters he addresses in his evidence:
- 18.1 Urban form;
  - 18.2 Connectivity;
  - 18.3 Accessibility; and
  - 18.4 Maintaining village character and amenity values.
- 19 For ease of reference, I have structured my evidence in a similar way. However, I raise several additional aspects, not considered by Mr Nicholson, so as to provide a more fulsome these matters discussion and assessment. Urban design is a complex discipline where individual aspects cannot be considered in isolation. Assessment of the quality and effect of a proposal requires a detailed understanding and holistic approach. It should not selectively focus on any single aspect.
- 20 Prior to his assessment, Mr Nicholson describes his understanding of the existing environment with a strong emphasis on the individual heritage items and the general history of Ōhoka, but does not provide an analysis of the existing urban form, the inherent urban structure and fabric of Ōhoka, the existing levels of connectivity or accessibility, and does not provide a full analysis of existing facilities. Further, he does not identify the existing core and its settlement character, nor the existing residential typologies, road layout and open spaces etc. These assessments have been undertaken by Mr Falconer and myself in our evidence in chief.
- 21 Mr Nicholson's classification of Ōhoka as semi-rural in paragraph 5.1 is arbitrary – it could equally be classified as peri-urban. These terms are better left unused unless they are properly defined. In the Waimakariri context, rural and urban elements coexist. All urban areas, regardless of their size, sit within a wider rural environment. The key difference is their function. The rural environment has activities related to primary production, that are in support of other rural activities, or that rely on the available natural resources. Urban environments have a strong residential focus and include a range of densities from apartment living to large lot residential. Ōhoka has a variety of residential densities, with a predominance of large lot, and as a settlement I consider it is urban in character.
- Urban form**
- 22 Mr Nicholson refers several times in his evidence to the ideal consolidated urban form being concentric, meaning with the centre located in the middle of the urban fabric. Ōhoka, as it has developed so far, lacks consolidation and concentric qualities. It is currently lopsided with most of its urban fabric concentrated north

of Mill Road and north and east of the centre, and limited urban fabric to the south and southwest of the centre. Further, large areas in close proximity to the centre remain undeveloped. The centre is a result of historic development but is not the geographic centre of the urban fabric. I discussed this in detail within my evidence in chief.

- 23 Mr Nicholson neglects to mention that the existing school is 2km from the centre and not connected to the urban fabric of Ōhoka, and that the current connectivity and accessibility of most residential areas within Ōhoka are vehicle orientated. The area that provides a sense of community is the cluster of features at the intersection of Mill and White Roads including the community hall, the shop/petrol station/workshop and the domain.
- 24 The Site itself is rural but contrary to the description in paragraph 5.6 of Mr Nicholson's evidence, it only has one neighbour with true rural productive activities and is surrounded on three sides by properties that are residential in nature. They are rural in appearance due to the landscape treatment along the road edges, but are residential in function given their built form, building typologies, and land use. Lifestyle blocks, while larger in size, have a similar function as large lot residential.
- 25 Mr Nicholson provides the correct generic definitions of consolidation, unified form etc., but these cannot be applied generically to the existing Ōhoka urban fabric. Based on the lack of consolidation and compactness of the existing urban form, the proposal would provide significantly beneficial consolidation for Ōhoka. It would contribute to a more consolidated form by filling areas to the south of Mill Road while maintaining the centre adjacent the domain and heritage features in a central location. This will be supported by the proposed commercial area creating a strong core for the township.
- 26 Mr Nicholson's approach of using two indicators (i.e. the walkability buffer and proportion of connecting site boundary) to identify and assess consolidation and urban form is not an accepted urban design practice and is overly simplistic. Walkability can provide some insight into interconnectivity of urban fabric but is primarily a tool for assessing walkability, pedestrian connectivity and pedestrian accessibility (i.e. distances from and access to destination by foot). In a similar vein, a cycling buffer can provide insight into cycling connectivity and accessibility. In this case, the road layout and movement network details are more relevant and need to be taken into consideration to gain a better understanding. When overlaid these buffers drawn around destinations, green spaces, schools, commercial areas etc. will provide a picture of interconnectivity that can be indicative of consolidation within an urban fabric, but they have no real bearing on the overall urban form.

- 27 The walkability buffers as used by Mr Nicholson only provide an assessment of pedestrian accessibility and connectivity and are used to test walking access to day-to-day facilities such as dairy, smaller shops, school, etc. If applied correctly across the entire area of Ōhoka, they clearly show how the proposal will meet this test. To provide an accurate assessment of the walkability of the proposal within the context of Ōhoka these buffers also need to be added around the new commercial centre, the potential school location and all key green spaces and destinations of the proposal. When applied to the proposal as well as the existing Ōhoka destinations, where it falls short is walking access to a secondary school, tertiary education and the remote workplaces.
- 28 Furthermore, in denser urban environments i.e. Kaiapoi, Rangiora and cities such as Christchurch, all these facilities we use on a daily basis are not necessarily always within a walking distance or even a cycling distance. Within the context of Ōhoka, and most other urban environments within the district, the expectation is to have a primary school, a local park and other smaller recreational areas, a dairy and smaller shops and maybe a café within a walkable distance. Secondary and tertiary education, workplace, sport facilities and other major recreation areas, dog parks, specialist shops and medical care etc. are often not within a walkable distance and will require the use of a vehicle or public transport. Therefore, although walking buffers can be helpful tool, they are not on their own a key determinant of a consolidated urban form. A more in-depth analysis is required.
- 29 The second indicator Mr Nicholson uses to identify and assess consolidation and urban form (proportion of connecting site boundary) is not an accepted urban design practice.
- 30 Figure 1 and paragraph 6.9 of Mr Nicholson's evidence shows a theoretical diagram that oversimplifies the relationship between urban growth and urban form, and lacks context. The shaded blocks A, B, C and D are all showing different stages or parts of urban growth in an ongoing and often dynamic process.
- 30.1 'A' typifies growth via infill development which occurs in closer proximity to the centre as urban areas mature or as brownfield sites become available, or smaller sites are amalgamated, or large residential lots intensify. In all circumstances 'A' fills a 'hole' in the fabric.
- 30.2 'B' could be considered infill development or fringe development depending on context. It can be the last portion of a big development (fringe) or a large residential site that intensifies (infill). The nature of 'B' is that it completes the existing urban form – 'B' is akin to bridging a gap.
- 30.3 'C' is typical growth on the fringes of a township that due to its location in this diagram has two connecting sides.

30.4 The form of 'D' is often the result of timing or sequencing. There are often parts of an urban area that, for a number of reasons, extend outwards.

- 31 All are natural patterns of urban growth, there will always be some infill development and some that will extend the urban form temporarily until neighbouring areas catch up. In almost all urban environments you will find examples of all four growth typologies to be present at the same time – owing to the complex nature of urban growth patterns. To deduct from this diagram that urban growth ought to share 50% of boundary with the existing urban fabric makes no sense. It is a theoretical construct lacking in context.
- 32 Mr Nicholson applies this theoretical construct to Ōhoka and introduces density consideration which further convolute the issue. In paragraph 6.12 he identifies the length of the shared boundary between the existing fabric of Ōhoka with the Site as 0.98km or 17% of the total boundary of the Site. In my view, this technique is not useful in any urban assessment, and I do not understand its relevance.
- 33 In paragraph 6.13 Figure 2, Mr Nicholson diagrammatically attempts to show the linear extent of the contact between existing and proposed while and also indicating differences in density. Again, I challenge the validity and relevance of this technique and do not consider it assists in determining the urban form impacts. I do not agree that "a consolidated site would generally have higher proportions of the boundary of the site adjoining the existing settlement". This represents a reductionist approach that misunderstands and undermines the complex and organic process of urban growth patterns that are unique to location and context.
- 34 I consider the graphic representation of my urban analysis of the inherent urban structure and growth pattern of Ōhoka as per my evidence in chief is more useful. Ōhoka has grown in the past 10-15 years solely in a north and northeastern direction - all north of Mill Road. To complete this currently unconsolidated form, development to the south and southwest of Mill Road is important. It will balance out the existing lopsided form and position the historic node in a more central position so that it can sit at the heart of the settlement supported by a new commercial node.

### **Connectivity**

- 35 While Mr Nicholson's definition of connectivity (see paragraph 7.1) is correct, it does not only apply to city-wide networks, it is applicable at all scales. This connectivity extends across the site boundaries and therefore needs to be considered at various scales including:

35.1 Internal connectivity within the site;

35.2 Opportunities to connect to the existing fabric of Ōhoka along the immediate edges;



- 35.3 Opportunities to improve connectivity beyond the site within Ōhoka; and
- 35.4 Connectivity within the Greater Christchurch urban environment, in particular Kaiapoi, and Rangiora within the district and Christchurch.
- 36 The internal connectivity and the connections to the existing fabric of Ōhoka along the immediate edges are of a fine grain and tailored to walking and cycling with an emphasis on directing movement to the centre of Ōhoka, the new commercial hub and the domain. The proposal elevates pedestrian and cycle movement above vehicle movement through dedicated green/blue network corridors. There are several safe yet discrete vehicular entry and exit points onto the surrounding streets that are in keeping with the character of Ōhoka. All existing destinations in Ōhoka have been interconnected with the site/proposal.
- 37 This high level of connectivity between the proposal and the centre of Ōhoka provides additional access to amenity for the existing residents opening up the commercial area and the entire green network along the various waterways and polo field. This level of access to the landscape amenities and the ability to interconnect different areas of Ōhoka has until now only partially been realised with a single walkway along the northern stream that connects through to Bradleys Road. The proposal will encourage further connections and with more people using the streets and the walkways it will improve safety.
- 38 Once leaving Ōhoka, connecting to other areas such as Christchurch will require the car or a mixture of bike/car and bus. Mandeville, Rangiora and Kaiapoi are all within cycling distance and with the growing trend of e-bikes, commuting to work and school using this mode of transport is becoming more achievable over larger distances. Commuting cyclists in Christchurch regularly travel 6-10 km in 20 to 30 minutes, and this is often faster than using a car due to traffic. I consider that there are opportunities to incorporate safe cycle routes from Ōhoka to the closest adjacent urban areas either via alternative slower roads or via integrating separate bike paths into the wider parts of the berm within the road corridor (as per Council's planned cycle network).
- 39 I disagree with Mr Nicholson's assessment in paragraph 7.6 that the good level of internal connectivity (and within the existing settlement) is undermined by the isolated location of the Site and the lack of pedestrian, cycle and public transport connections on the rural roads connecting the site to existing town centres and the wider district. From my own experience, traffic on Mill Road and roads leading to Rangiora is reasonably light making it reasonable safe to cycle. The road network provides for appropriate vehicular connectivity and the proposal includes a public transport connection to Kaiapoi.

### **Accessibility**

- 40 As Mr Nicholson states, accessibility has a direct relation to easy walkable and cyclable distances. This has in parts already been addressed as part of the urban form and connectivity discussion but not with this specific focus of providing access. Key to accessibility is also identifying the relevant destinations. The proposal includes a commercial centre and allows for a second primary school (if required), it provides open space and parks for recreational purposes, and is in proximity of the existing domain. Applying 400 and 800m walking buffers across all these key destinations would show that all residential areas of an urban density are within such a walkable distance, and only the southernmost areas are slightly more distant but remain within an easy cycle distance to the main centre of Ōhoka.
- 41 In paragraph 8.2, Mr Nicholson expresses concern that “[t]rips to larger supermarkets and most other shopping, employment or recreational destinations would require a car”. Most people drive to the supermarket for the weekly shop to avoid having to carry multiple heavy bags. People are also time poor these days, and if living further out tend to organise themselves to limit the number of vehicle trips by incorporating trip linking (for example, doing the supermarket shop on the way home from work or after the kids football game etc.).
- 42 Mr Nicholson mentions that none of the new dwellings are within a 1km distance to the existing school. This is because location of the primary school is outside of Ōhoka. Most of the current residents are not within a 1km distance of Ōhoka School. The provision of a new primary school within the development would also help to alleviate this for all residents of Ōhoka.
- 43 Higher education facilities, supermarkets and workplaces are often not within a walkable/cyclable distance, not even within the denser metropolitan area of Christchurch. The closest supermarkets and secondary schools are in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and are within a cyclable distance of 8-10km (e-bikes extend the cyclable distance to 8-10km, from a typical 4-5km on a standard bike). Kaiapoi High School has a school bus route that services Ōhoka.
- 44 In paragraph 8.7, Mr Nicholson expresses the concern that although Christchurch, Rangiora and Kaiapoi are within easy driving distance, a well-functioning urban environment requires provisions for active and public transport. Previous discussions clearly show that there is no shortage of active transport options (walking and cycling) to the main destinations that we expect to be able to walk and cycle to. Further, a public transport service is proposed connecting Ōhoka with Kaiapoi and beyond.
- 45 In paragraph 8.8, Mr Nicholson describes the wider road network surrounding Ōhoka and concludes that even with safe connections, the distance to the nearest centres exceeds the walkable and

cyclable distances of 1km and 4km. He disregards the fact that the closest centre for all residents is part of the proposal and well within acceptable walking and cycling distances.

- 46 The closest main centres outside of Ōhoka are Kaiapoi and Rangiora, and there is no expectation that all facilities can always be accessed by foot or bike. Both places can be reached by e-bike and by car and public transport (directly in the case of Kaiapoi).

***Mandeville and Ōhoka – ‘conurbation’***

- 47 In my view, the proposal cannot be a ‘peninsula’ form of development (as portrayed by Mr Nicholson) and at the same time merge with Mandeville. Notwithstanding this, I consider the issue raised by Mr Nicholson is one of perception. When viewed on aerial plans there could be the perception of a conurbation. Aerials are two dimensional representations and boundary definitions/treatments are not perceptible.
- 48 The reality is experienced at ground level when travelling from one area to the other. On the ground, there is a clear sense of leaving Mandeville and entering Ōhoka. The distance between Mandeville and Ōhoka is centre to centre (approx. 4km). Each place has different characteristics with Ōhoka providing very clear thresholds defining entry and exit. Mandeville has a completely different character to Ōhoka with less urban character (particularly on the outer edges).
- 49 The proposal provides strong design measures in terms of setbacks and landscaping to create a street scene that presents a rural type interface (refer to visualisation and landscape evidence). This is largely a landscape matter, which I leave to the landscape architect experts to discuss.
- 50 In summary, conurbanisation is defined as two urban areas merging into one. I do not consider that this would occur given:
- 50.1 The distance between centres;
  - 50.2 The difference in development character; and
  - 50.3 The edge treatment along and road boundaries of the site.
- 51 In paragraph 9.7, Mr Nicholson expresses concern that the proposal would function as a dormitory or lifestyle settlement. However, he provides no evidence or any assessment undertaken to justify this concern. There will be residents that travel to the larger centres to work, but there will also be people working in the surrounding rural areas, working from home, and/or working locally in the Ōhoka and Mandeville area.

***Village character***

- 52 The concept of the village and its characteristics does not manifest in population size or density. The calculations Mr Nicholson provides are not helpful. The historic growth rate is not realistic as there have been only limited urban development opportunities available in the past. The only plan change that has materialised in the past 15-20 years is Hallfields, which is still under construction. This has resulted in a very skewed development pattern with little growth capacity in the last 15-20 years. Growth only existed in the 4ha lifestyle market.
- 53 In paragraph 10.1, Mr Nicholson describes the position of the Proposed Plan, with regard to existing character and amenity values, as providing for some further organic expansion that retains the small settlement character. The following paragraph, however, focuses on a definition of village character by quoting the dictionary of urbanism and other definitions by Mark Twain and submitters, but he has not undertaken his own assessment of the Ōhoka village or settlement character.
- 54 In paragraph 10.7, Mr Nicholson agrees that the proposal is sympathetic and reflects the character of Ōhoka, but then reverts back to his numeric assessment based on population numbers and lot sizes, neither of which is a determinant of character.
- 55 Paragraph 10.9 appears to support an exclusive viewpoint that would mostly preclude new people coming into the community and therefore changing its character. On this matter, I refer to Objective 4 of the NPSUD which clearly contemplates a range of housing types in different locations, and expressly acknowledges amenity values will change over time, as they should.
- 56 I reiterate my opinion that the proposal aligns with the directives of the NPSUD and the policy of the Proposed Plan regarding existing character and amenity values. The proposal is sympathetic to and reflects the character of Ōhoka, as confirmed by Mr Nicholson.
- 57 The proposed expansion of Ōhoka will grow organically over several stages into the existing landscape and structure of Ōhoka and is to a large extent filling in the missing quarter. The increase in population will be gradual over a long period of time and will most likely see other parts of Ōhoka also undergo change through infill and continued development of Hallfield and possibly other zoned areas north of Mill Road. The proposal would develop incrementally through staging with construction of the first stage possibly starting in 2028 and estimated to end in 2040. This shows that the proposal is designed to be part of a natural growth process tailored to the specific requirements of Ōhoka.
- 58 I disagree with Mr Nicholson's position in paragraph 10.10. Aging in place is really important for a community – any concerns about scale or size and even building typology and character can be

controlled via guidelines and size restrictions. The proposal results in maximum building height within the site of 8 metres – not 12 metres as suggested by Mr Nicholson (in relation to retirement village development).

- 59 But more importantly the inclusion of the opportunity for active retirement living provides choice for people to age in place. It is highly unlikely for these retirement options to be of a scale that would intrude into the character of Ōhoka.
- 60 In paragraph 10.11, Mr Nicholson reverts back to the fact that the proposal will bring change, although he does not consider the changes to be bad, the mere fact that they are evident seems to be prohibitive. This is contrary to the overall directive of the NPSUD which does provide for and expects change. The Proposed Plan also allows for some growth whilst recognising and retaining existing character.
- 61 The particular emphasis on the increase in population number is misplaced. A town of 2,200 people is still a small one with a small town feel and a close-knit social fabric and a sense of community.

***Masterplan***

- 62 I consider that the concern expressed by Mr Nicholson in paragraph 11.2 regarding certainty that the proposed illustrative masterplan will materialise is unfounded. The ODP is robust and detailed. Alternative layouts would be substantially similar to the masterplan as they need to fit within the underlying blue /green network, provide the key road layout and connections etc. The ODP does not leave too much flexibility which is a deliberate move to ensure the high amenity of the design is achieved and the final layout is responsive to the existing urban structure.

**Design guide**

- 63 Mr Nicholson raises concerns regarding the workability of the proposed design guidelines and process. This is standard practice and does not need to be difficult. It has been used in development of various sizes through New Zealand including Kirimoko in Wanaka, Jacks Point in Queenstown, Te Whariki in Lincoln, and Kennedy's Bush in Halswell. Council is only involved at the start to approve the design guide and after that the only part for Council to check is that design approval for the house design and landscaping has been issued. All the work sits with the design board/committee and this entire process is financed through the individual residents via a fee and bond. I have been part of such procedures as an independent professional architect/urban designer advising the residents association or design board. The process has always been very simple for Council to participate in.

Dated: 13 June 2024

---

Nicole Lauenstein