

**Before the Independent Commissioners appointed by the Waimakariri District Council**

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

and

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

**Brief of evidence of Kim Thomas Goodfellow on behalf of Oxford- Ōhoka Community Board - Landscape.**

---

Dated: 13 June 2023

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

**CavellLeitch** >  
LIMITED

AJS-434615-182-33-V1

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

## **Evidence of Kim Thomas Goodfellow:**

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. My full name is name is Kim Thomas Goodfellow.
2. I am a landscape architect and master planner and work in my own company; The Goodfellow Group Limited which was established in 2013. I hold a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Lincoln University. I am a Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects.
3. I have more than 23 years' experience working in the areas of landscape architecture and urban development.
4. My work has included designing and leading a wide range of projects, including masterplans/development frameworks, large infrastructural projects, providing landscape peer review services through to comprehensive design packages for various project types. These projects include:
  - 4.1. Landscape Peer Review for Ohiwa Residential subdivision - Ōpōtiki District Council
  - 4.2. Masterplanner for Naval Point Redevelopment, Lyttelton – Christchurch City Council (with Richard Knott Limited)
  - 4.3. Urban design leader for the Christchurch Northern Corridor Alliance (CNC) – Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency
  - 4.4. Landscape architect for Papakura Town Centre - Papakura Local Board (with Richard Knott Limited)
  - 4.5. Landscape design leader for Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (CSM2) – Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency
  - 4.6. Designing and authoring a masterplan for Ōpōtiki Harbour and Wharf – Ōpōtiki District Council (with Richard Knott Limited)
  - 4.7. Designing and authoring Waihou Bay Masterplan – Ōpōtiki District Council (with Richard Knott Limited).
5. I was previously asked by Waimakariri District Council (WDC) to provide landscape advice and evidence in support of their submission opposing Plan Change 31 to the Operative District Plan (PC31). I initially provided

written comments in July 2022 which informed the Council's submission and later prepared and presented evidence on their behalf at the hearing held in August 2023.

## **SCOPE**

6. I have been engaged by the Oxford Ōhoka Community Board to prepare this statement of evidence on landscape matters relating to submissions 160 and 237 Ōhoka for Hearing Stream 12: Rezoning Requests (larger scale) in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (Proposed WDP), in response to the Ōhoka rezoning submissions of Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited and Carter Group Property Limited. In carrying out this assessment I have visited the site on a number of occasions in July 2023.
7. In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following material:
  - 7.1. Evidence of David Compton-Moen, 5 March 2024
  - 7.2. Evidence of Tony Milne, 5 March 2023
  - 7.3. Evidence of Hugh Anthony Nicholson, 14 May 2024
  - 7.4. Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

8. I confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and agree to comply with it while giving evidence. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

9. My evidence will provide comment on the landscape evidence prepared on behalf of the plan change Applicant from Mr Compton-Moen and Mr

Milne, and also the landscape evidence from Mr Nicolson prepared on behalf of Waimakariri District Council. Specifically, this will relate to;

- Landscape effects on the existing rural character of Ōhoka
- The rezoning proposal, and mitigation measures (MMs)
- Anticipated District Plan Development

## **SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE**

10. In summary, I consider the proposed rezoning which seeks to provide for 850 dwellings into this rural environment is of a density that is suited to residential subdivision in an urban setting, and is not consistent with the rural village character of Ōhoka. This request for rezoning, if granted, will not maintain but instead significantly reduce the rural character of the Ōhoka settlement.

## **EVIDENCE OF DAVID COMPTON-MOEN**

11. I have reviewed the evidence prepared by David Compton-Moen (5 March 2024). I generally agree with Mt Compton-Moen's perception of the receiving environment in paragraphs 22 to 28. I also agree with Mr Compton-Moen's comment that under the Proposed District Plan 'Rural Lifestyle Zone' the site could be potentially developed into 4 hectare residential or lifestyle lots and that this change result in some degree of landscape effects. However, the potential (uncertain) landscape effects which may be anticipated with 36 nos. of 4 hectare lots would likely be considerably lower, when compared with potential landscape effects of introducing 850 suburban lots as shown in the request for rezoning.
12. Mr Compton-Moen's assessment of landscape effects can be summarised by the following statements:

*'Any effects on landscape character and amenity effects on existing and future residents can be successfully addressed through the proposed and carefully considered mitigation measures'<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Statement of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen - Page 4

*'I consider that it is possible to maintain and enhance the rural village character of Ōhoka even with an increased size and population<sup>2</sup>.*

*Overall, I consider that the proposed extension to the Ōhoka settlement will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment with any adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity successfully mitigated<sup>3</sup>.*

13. This request for rezoning includes proposed Mitigation Measures. Overall, I agree that these measures would enhance the landscape amenity of the overall proposal and also provide some visual screening. However, it is important to recognise that an important attribute of the rural character of Ōhoka is derived from its pattern of low density housing. This critical issue of the loss of character that will occur as a result of the proposed high density of dwellings and development has been raised as a significant concern by numerous submitters (FS9, FS36, FS56, FS60, FS74, FS119, FS120, FS128, FS132, FS137) and also highlighted in Mr Nicolson's evidence when he correctly explains: *the proposed rezoning would create a 'peninsula' of urban development extending south from the existing township surrounded on three sides by rural or residential land.*
14. I concur with these findings of Mr Nicholson and submitters. My opinion is that the proposed 500m<sup>2</sup> sections are not consistent with the surrounding rural environment of Ōhoka. While the proposed Outline Development Plan for rezoning - including the Mitigation Measures - would provide an appropriate level of landscape amenity for a suburban residential development, such development will fail to mitigate the adverse effect on the Ōhoka settlement character.

#### **EVIDENCE OF TONY MILNE**

15. On the subject of landscape character and visual amenity, Mr Milnes' evidence includes a theoretical subdivision layout ('Rural Lifestyle Concept') and states<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>2</sup> Statement of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen - Page 5

<sup>3</sup> Statement of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, Page 17.

<sup>4</sup> Statement of evidence of Tony Milne, page 5

*'...This concept simply demonstrates a continuation of the existing development pattern in the surrounding 'Lower Plains' landscape character area.*

*'The result of this theoretical RLZ subdivision is the fragmentation of the Site into a potential yield of 36 lifestyle lots, which in turn will add to the proliferation of "finely textured lot boundaries and shelter planting, mailboxes, mown roadsides, entrance gates, houses and buildings resulting in an enclosed landscape" that has already occurred in the vicinity.*

16. It is difficult to determine if the type of 'proliferation' of development as predicted by Mr Milne will occur. While Mr Milne's theoretical development can highlight the positive features of the request for rezoning in terms of landscape amenity, my opinion is these design features are of marginal relevance given:
  - 16.1. the theoretical subdivision layout comprises of (minimum) 4 hectare sized lots, which is vastly different to the 500m<sup>2</sup> lots which are shown in the request for rezoning (i.e. 20 times the density) which is of a density that would fail to protect the existing small rural settlement character of Ōhoka.
  - 16.2. A 4 hectare lot may be able to practically incorporate rural activities (as possible under PWDP Rural Lifestyle Zone), whereas 500m<sup>2</sup> lots as proposed by the rezoning Outline Development Plan would not accommodate such rural activities.
17. On Paragraphs 23 to 29 Mr Milne provides a summary of features (enhancements) of the Outline Development Plan such as perimeter landscape treatments, and pedestrian-cycle linkages etc. I agree that these features are positive aspects and appropriate to a suburban residential development of this scale. However, my opinion is that despite the enhancements, if the rezoning is granted, the overall impression in landscape terms will be a densely populated island with no rural character located in the mid Canterbury rural landscape.
18. The rezoning proposal strives to visually screen the intensive suburban development contained within its boundaries with the different Perimeter Landscape Treatments (LT-A, LT-B and Lt-C) as outlined in Mr Milne's evidence (page 6), and as explained in Mr Compton-Moens statement (page 4): *'Any effects on landscape and amenity effects on*

*existing and future residents can be successfully addressed through the proposed and carefully considered mitigation measures*'. Paragraphs 32 to 37 of Mr Milnes evidence provides a focus on visual effects and visual amenity. He also explains that a *'change in view does not necessarily result in an adverse effect'* which I agree with.

19. However, it is recognised that visual effects are only one subset of overall landscape effects. The underlying landscape values that make Ōhoka special are dependent on such landscape attributes as open views and low density housing, and these intrinsic attributes will be significantly and adversely effected by this rezoning proposal regardless of the high level of mitigation or screen planting that is proposed on the boundaries of the site.
20. If granted, in my opinion the rezoning proposal will easily be perceived when compared with the surrounding low density and rural character of Ōhoka. On this point I concur with Mr Nicholsons' observation that *"passers-by are likely to be aware of the differences between a more intensive suburban development as proposed and four hectare lifestyle blocks through increased levels of activity and built form, and other visual cues*'. On this same point, I totally agree with the comment of submitter (502) during the previous PC31 process, which summarised the proposal in terms of effects on the existing character in the following statement: *'it is not possible to add 850+ small lot properties into the heart of an established and thriving semi-rural community while still remaining in keeping with the character of the village<sup>5</sup>*'. If granted, this rezoning proposal will completely transform the existing rural character of Ōhoka.
21. I categorise Ōhoka as a rural village settlement (not an urban area) since in landscape terms this environment exhibits very consistent rural attributes such as the productive use of the land for primary purposes, open views over farmland, low density housing. Conversely, Ōhoka does not exhibit urban attributes. For these reasons I am not comfortable with references to the *'existing Ōhoka urban area/footprint'* as contained in paragraphs 53 and 54 of Mr Milnes evidence because such references do not appropriately reflect the existing landscape character.

---

<sup>5</sup> RCP031 Section 42A Report, Page 29.

## PROPOSED WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PLAN

22. The key Objectives and Policies relevant to landscape matters found in the Proposed District Plan are (Settlement Zone) Objective SETZ-01, Policy SETZ-P1.1, and Policy SETZ-P1.5, as follows:
23. In response to the **Objective SETZ-01**, I consider the provision of 850 dwellings as shown on the rezoning proposal does not comply with retaining the existing rural character and low level of housing density of Ōhoka, and which is also significantly different from the housing density that might occur on 4 hectare lots under the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
24. Similar to above, I consider the high level of residential density as shown on the ODP does not comply with **Policy SETZ-P1.1** which seeks 'density at the lower end compared to other residential zones'.
25. I consider the 10m wide landscape perimeter treatments LT-A, LT-B and LT-C wrapping around the edges of the site does not comply with **SETZ-P1.5** which seeks to maintain outlooks from within the settlement to rural areas.

## LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS

26. Consistent with Mr Milne, I have used the seven point scale<sup>6</sup> to assess the landscape effects of the proposed rezoning:

Very low	low	mod-low	moderate	mod-high	high	Very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

27. Due to the intensive residential nature of the proposed subdivision and its inconsistency with the surrounding Ōhoka environment, in my opinion the requested zoning would have a *moderate-high* level of landscape effect. I note that Mr Milne and Mr Compton-Moen consider the landscape and visual effects of the proposed rezoning would be *low-moderate*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines, NZILA 2021, page 140.



## CONCLUSION

I have reviewed the statements of evidence from the applicant, and the further submissions with regard to the requested rezoning at Ōhoka. In my opinion:

28. This is a high density suburban rezoning proposal that will provide for 850 lots which is inconsistent with the Ōhoka village settlement, housing density, and rural character.
29. While the rezoning proposal has been constructed by an experienced team which includes a range of master planning and landscape design approaches that are positive, if granted in its current form, the outcome will be that the present character of the Ōhoka village will no longer exist. Rather, it will be replaced with a suburb of housing density that is normally found in urban centres such as Christchurch or Rangiora. I consider that the rezoning proposal will have an adverse effect on the character of Ohoka in the *moderate - high* range.

Date: 13 June 2024



**Kim Thomas Goodfellow**