

**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 **Mike
Greer Homes NZ Limited**

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF VIKRAMJIT SINGH
IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE REPORT
ON BEHALF OF MIKE GREER HOMES NZ LIMITED
REGARDING HEARING STREAM 12E**

DATED: 2 AUGUST 2024

Presented for filing by:
Gabi Newman
Saunders & Co
PO Box 18, Christchurch
T 021 311 784
gabi.newman@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 Mike Greer Homes NZ Limited (**Mike Greer Homes** or **MGH**). Mike Greer Homes seek to rezone approximately 14 ha of land at the southern entrance to Kaiapoi (the **Site**) from Rural Lifestyle Zone (**RLZ**) 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 Mike Greer Homes 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 and Response Document that address matters within scope of my expertise (Urban Design), 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 by Mr Peter Wilson and the Appendices to that report relevant to Urban Design matters, in particular, Appendix F - which includes a Memorandum regarding Green Space recording

responses by Mr Jon Read - Councils Green Space and Communities Facilities Planner;

- b. Reviews the matters related to connections relevant to Urban Design in Appendix F- which include a Memorandum regarding Transport recording responses by Mr Shane Binder - Council's Transport Planner;
- c. Reviewed the Urban Design matters raised in the Officer Report Appendix G – which includes an Urban Design Memorandum by Mr Edward Jolly including responses to the matters raised;
- d. Reviewed the parts of the Response Document relevant to my area of expertise;
- e. Reviewed my Evidence in Chief (**EIC**) filed earlier on behalf of the MGH; and

CONTEXT AND APPROACH

- 8. As mentioned, the Officer Report recommends rejection of the Mike Greer Homes rezoning submission. A range of reasons are given for this recommendation, with most unrelated to urban design matters. There are limited matters 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 OFFICE REPORT'S COMMENTS - GREEN SPACE

- 10. Under the heading 12.4.2 New South Kaiapoi Development Area Assessment – "Green Space" at [1025], the report refers to the assessment of Mr Read that the Officer report adopts. Overall, Mr Read, in terms of green linkages and associated connectivity, is relatively supportive of the evidence for the proposed MDRS rezoning of the Site. However, he has raised the following three matters:
 - a. Provision of well design amenity streetscape to break up the bulk form of the interior of the development;

- b. Provision of appropriately sized recreation reserve (neighbourhood park) for the proposed number of lots; and
- c. On the Indicative Lot Layout, an issue with the interface of the lots along the proposed northern Recreation Reserve in terms of creating a semi-private context.

11. I set out my response in relation to each of these three matters following.

Well Designed Amenity Streetscape to break up the MDRS built form dominance.

12. Mr Read recommends a well designed streetscape will be required to break up the bulk form of the proposed MDRS development. This is certainly expected, and I agree, noting that it would be appropriate from an Urban Design perspective.
13. I am supportive of a well-designed streetscape which would respond to the scale, density and proximities presented in design by a MDRS development. Furthermore, the ODP provides for this, and that the design of the same typically occurs during the subdivision consent phase.

Provision of appropriately sized recreational reserve (neighbourhood park)

14. Mr Read acknowledges that the green open space network is in accordance with Councils expectations and the recreation reserve (neighbourhood park) is appropriately located to the north of the Site. However, Mr Read recommends a size of 0.4 to 0.45 Ha to align with the number of lots as achieved in the Indicative Lot Layout.
15. I agree with that the provision of a larger sized recreational reserve (neighbourhood park) is desirable. However, determination of the size of the reserve is a matter which can be detailed at the subdivision consent stage to align with the final lot numbers.
16. It is my understanding that through the consenting process, following the rezoning, Council reserves control over the design of the neighbourhood park, and this also typically aligns with Council's own guidelines. At this stage the ODP accompanying the rezoning submission clearly identifies and indicates this area as a Recreation Reserve.

Interface of the lots along the proposed recreation reserve

17. In regard to the location and future overlook of the northern recreation reserve, Mr Read suggests repositioning the lots along the northern boundary of this reserve to avoid the unnecessary semi-private context resulting from future overlook and the physical articulation of these lots.
18. From an urban design perspective this is a fair point. However, it seems these comments are in response to the Indicative Lot Layout plan that was included in the expert evidence, although it was not included in my EIC.
19. It is my understanding that the Indicative Lot Layout plan was submitted only to indicate one possible Site outcome enable by the re-zoning, and not the final outcome.
20. The ODP is not suggestive of any such semi-private condition, and it is my understanding the same can be resolved at the subdivision design/consenting stage.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE REPORT'S COMMENTS - TRANSPORT ADVICE.

21. Under the heading 12.4.2 New South Kaiapoi Development Area Assessment – [1024] covering Transport issues, the report refers to the assessment from Mr Shane Binder (council's Senior Transportation Engineer). In relation to to Urban Design matters, Mr Binder raises the following:
 - a. Issue of urbanisation of the street frontage along Main North Road (**MNR**) shown as an area of "recreation reserve."
 - b. The southern access should be moved from where it is to avoid crossroad intersection situation with a road on the lot on the other side of MNR.

22. I set out my response in relation to each of these matters following.:

Urbanisation of the Street Frontage along MNR

23. Mr Binder highlights the green area proposed along the MNR as a "Recreation Reserve" and considers some degree of urbanisation will be necessary with walking /cycling paths, streetlights, trees, crossing points and kerb and channel.
24. I do not disagree with Mr Binder. However, I would like to point out that the ODP accompanying the submission identifies an area of 10m along the MNR frontage as a "Greenway".

25. From an Urban Design perspective, the 10m Greenway along the MNR is supportive of the wider “greener” outlook to the road corridor. It is anticipated that it will include grass verges, planting and trees, street lighting and furniture, along with a shared pedestrian walkway and cycling path. All elements that are integral to the urban environment and not uncommon in a “Greenway”. This would also integrate well with the existing Kaiapoi road frontage treatment north of the Site.
26. The final form of the Greenway design will be detailed at the subdivision design stage and as it forms part of the open space network, Council reserves control over the final design of this.

The southern access should be moved.

27. Mr Binder considers there is need to move the southern access from its current proposed location to avoid it from forming a crossing intersection along the paper road in the lot opposite of the proposed Site.
28. I disagree with this part of the assessment. While I advocate for avoiding conflict in movement corridors, I am in favour of current location of the southern access due to the points as following;
 - a. In terms of Urban Design, the ODP layout of the road network is logical and legible for both internal and external movement corridors for the future development. The southern access supports good permeability and accessibility for the south portion of the Site;
 - b. The road network will also provide access for pedestrian and cycleway and will integrate well with the existing Kaiapoi movement structures. Notably, the south access is also close to the bus stop along MNR which encourages use of public transport.
 - c. The current location of the southern access is also supportive of providing appropriately sized lot depth along the south edge of the Site resulting in efficient land use.
 - d. The current location of the southern access is also supportive of providing appropriately sized lot depth along the south edge of the Site resulting in efficient land use.

29. Additionally, I have been advised by Mr Matt Collins (Transport Engineer for the submitters), that it is his understanding the paper road within the opposite lot is a private accessway and not a proper road. I am supportive of his supplementary evidence stating the same understanding and the future resolution of the junction without moving it from its current proposed location in the ODP.¹
30. Overall, I am supportive of the current proposed location of the southern access to the proposed road and differ from Mr Binder in this respect.

RESPONSE TO S42A OFFICE REPORT'S APPENDIX G – URBAN DESIGN EXPERT EVIDENCE

31. Under the heading Appendix G - Urban Design, the Officers Report includes comments by Mr Edward Jolly on the proposed MDRS subdivision proposal as part of the rezoning submission.
32. Notably, the comments have been provided for the Indicative Lot Layout and it is unclear whether he was aware of the ODP accompanying the submission. (also included in the combined statement GA of the Urban Design and Landscape evidence submitted by myself and Mr Rory Langbridge respectively)
33. Mr Jolly's observations are relatively supportive of the Site being appropriate for residential development as an extension of the Kaiapoi township. He considers that the variety of reserve spaces provided would support future walking and cycling opportunities while also acknowledging the ecological enhancement that would be provided within these spaces.
34. Further, Mr Jolly is also supportive of the setback of the built environment being consistent with existing neighbourhoods along MNR, maximising opportunity for walking and cycling connections along the road edge along with connection to existing bus routes.
35. Mr Jolly provides further comments in detail on the Indicative Lot Layout of the proposed MDRS development, including the following:

¹ Para 19, Supplementary evidence of Mr Matt Collins – Transport Expert from the submitters.

- a. Lack of Hierarchy of roads with suggestion for reorienting local streets with an effort to avoid undesirable traffic on local streets as cut through. Refer to Diagram 4 included in the Urban Design Review Memo.
- b. Lack of cycleways and key pedestrian routes with a suggestion of possible solution in Diagram 4 as provided in the Memo.
- c. Lack of integration of two streams with possibility to engage these features as key elements with interconnected walking and cycling routes.
- d. Poor location of recreational reserve to the north. Mr Jolly provides suggestions to make the location more central to the development, which in his opinion provides better accessibility and better connections to walking and cycle routes.
- e. Avoid the use of rear lots in general and especially along the northern reserve.

36. I set out my response in relation to each of these five matters following.

Lack of Hierarchy of Roads

37. Mr Jolly endorses the configuration of the streets, deeming it rational and providing effective legibility and navigational guidance for prospective inhabitants and visitors. Notwithstanding this, he is critical of the lack of hierarchy of roads as shown on the Indicative Lot Layout. Mr Jolly comments that there is a deficiency in the hierarchical structure of the streets due to the utilization of similar road widths.
38. While I agree that a street hierarchy is essential for efficient traffic management, safety, and the overall functionality of the urban environment, the ODP accompanying the submission is not suggestive of street width at this stage.
39. It is my view as an Urban Designer that streets with similar width can have streetscape treatments to give them a definition appropriate to the level of usage and context. The Indicative Lot Layout, which has been the subject of Mr Jolly's remarks, is currently lacking in detail. However, this concern can be addressed by introducing variations in the streetscape design during the subdivision consent phase.

Lack of cycleways and key pedestrian routes

40. Mr Jolly identifies a lack of key pedestrian and cycleway routes and highlights connectivity issues within the Site and to Kaiapoi township.
41. I disagree with Mr Jolly, since the same are included with good clarity on the ODP included within the rezoning submission. It seems that Mr Jolly is not aware of the ODP and seems to have not referred to the same.
42. Overall, pedestrian and cycleway connections are considered in good detail in the proposed ODP and are clearly defined along with connection to the MNR and adjacent neighbourhood via a proposed pedestrian bridge. Much in line with the diagram 4 suggestion of Mr Jolly's Memo.

Lack of integration of two streams

43. Mr Jolly suggest that the Kaikainui Stream to the north and Courtney Stream to the south, are not integrated in the design proposal for the Site. Mr Jolly highlights the opportunity to engage these as a unique feature via an interconnection of pedestrian and cycling route.
44. Once again Mr Jolly makes these comments in relation to the Indicative Lot Layout plan. In my opinion integration has been considered and is shown as Esplanade Reserves with good clarity on the ODP. The creation of the Esplanade reserve of 20 m to both sides of the streams is a key factor of integration of the blue – green network of the proposed ODP and Site layout. It seems that Mr Jolly is not aware of the ODP and seems to have not referred to the same.
45. In terms of connections along the reserves, the ODP considers a series of interconnected pedestrian walkways which would enable access and connection at the local level and also for wider communities to access and enjoy these areas.

Poor location of recreational reserve to the north

46. Mr Jolly considers the open space reserve to the north is poorly located, and highlights its location as being to the periphery of the Site and accessed through a cul-de sac. He suggests two open space reserve areas placed centrally in the residential development as community gathering spaces, with access from the road network for walking and cycling.

47. I disagree and am supportive of the current location of the Recreation Reserve and its integration with the Esplanade Reserve to the north and Stormwater Management reserve area to the east. It is my understanding, this amalgamation of open spaces would result in a larger green space which provides access to both active and passive movement corridors, with minimum crossing along main street network. These connection are clearly marked in the ODP as pedestrian Walkway/ Cycleway.
48. In terms of location and access, the proposed Esplanade Reserves along the streams to the north and south periphery of the Site, and the Stormwater Management area to the east will be well within the 500m walking distance for all lots and will provide open green recreational spaces within close proximity.
49. The northern Recreational Reserve is currently also strategically located to give easy access to the neighbouring residential development north of the Site via a proposed pedestrian bridge (marked in the ODP); enhancing integration with the existing urban fabric of Kaiapoi.
50. Overall, the requirement of a large community green space is well met with current location of the Recreation Reserve area and its amalgamation with the Northern Kaikainui Esplanade reserve, Stormwater Management areas, and I am supportive of the proposed location. Not also my comments above in response to Mr Read's review of the Open Space network.

Avoid use of rear lot approach

51. Mr Jolly cites the location of a number of rear lots accessible via a cul-de-sac (to the north) would result in conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Diagram 4 in his Memo illustrates how this could be avoided by providing lots with access directly from the street network.
52. I agree with this part of the Urban Design Memo and note that the comment from Mr Jolly is in response to the Indicative Lot Layout only.
53. Overall, I am supportive of Mr Jollys lot layout suggestion and would advocate for this during Site layout resolution at the subdivision stage. It would result in best practise Urban Design.

CONCLUSION

54. Overall, the Officer Report indicates that Council is currently not supportive of the evidence regarding Hearing Stream 12E of the MGH submission on the PWDP to rezone the Site from RLZ to MDRS.
55. The Officer's Report and the supportive Appendices raised several matters in relation to urban design matters. These have each been addressed above.
56. Aside from matters that I consider to be fine tuning, the Commissioners can take comfort in the fact Councils Urban Design Expert – Mr Jolly and I agree the Site is well suited and positioned for urban expansion. Mr Jolly and the Officer report is supportive of the submission in Urban Design terms, and that there are no Urban Design related reasons to decline the rezoning of the Site.
57. Thank you for the opportunity to present my evidence.

Vikramjit Singh
2 August 2024