

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-Ōhoka Community Board
[submitter 62] to the Rolleston Industrial Developments
Limited [submitter 160] and Carter Group Property Ltd
[submitter 237] submission to Rezone land at Ōhoka.

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

Dated: 2 July 2024

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

CavellLeitch >
LIMITED

AJS-434615-182-77-V1

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

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF KIM THOMAS GOODFELLOW

1. My full name is Kim Thomas Goodfellow.
2. My qualifications and background summary are including in my brief of evidence dated 13 June 2024.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

3. In summary, I consider the Request for rezoning of 850+ dwellings is a residential subdivision density which is suited to an urban context, and is not consistent with the existing rural character of Ōhoka. This rezoning (if granted) will not maintain but instead significantly reduce the existing rural character of Ōhoka. In this regard I support my original assessment of the Plan Change.

RESPONSE TO SUBMITTERS EVIDENCE

4. In response to the summary of evidence prepared by Dave Compton-Moen on Landscape, I have the following comments:
 - 4.1. In overall terms Mr Compton-Moen comments *'I consider that it is possible to maintain and enhance the rural village character of Ōhoka even with an increased size and population¹'*.
 - 4.2. Mr Compton-Moens comments do not address the central issue that the rural character of Ōhoka is derived from its pattern of low density housing. Introducing a high density of dwellings (845+) onto the existing rural character of Ōhoka will create adverse landscape effects and irrevocably change the settlement character of Ōhoka.
 - 4.3. The Request for rezoning proposal includes features that will enhance amenity. However, these features do not address or mitigate the loss of character which will occur in seeking to introduce 845 dwellings into the rural environment of Ōhoka and which are contrary to the following sections of the Proposed Waimakiriri District Plan (PWDP):
 - 4.4. 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.

¹ Statement of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, page 5

- 4.5. 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'.
- 4.6. 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.
- 4.7. I do not agree with Mr Compton-Moens statement: '*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*²' and it is my opinion that the proposal will have an adverse effect on the character of Ōhoka in the moderate - high range.
5. In response to the summary of evidence prepared by Mr Tony Milne, I have the following comments:
- 5.1. I agree with Mr Milne that the proposed mitigation measure have '*...many positive effects on landscape and amenity...*³'. However while these mitigation measures may enhance landscape amenity for a suburban residential development, such measures fail to address the problem (previously mentioned above) of the proposed high density development, that is not in keeping with the existing character of the Ōhoka.
- 5.2. Mr Milnes' evidence includes a theoretical subdivision layout ('Rural Lifestyle Concept') and states: '*...This concept simply demonstrates a continuation of the existing development pattern in the surrounding 'Lower Plains'*'. Mr Milne further explains: '*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*⁴'.
- 5.3. Mr Milnes theoretical subdivision layout comprises of (minimum) 4 hectare sized lots, which is vastly different to the 500m² lots which are shown in the request for rezoning (i.e. 20 times the density) which is of a density that would fail to

² Statement of evidence of Dave Compton-Moen, page 17

³ Statement of evidence of Tony Milne – page 5

⁴ Statement of evidence of Tony Milne- page 5

protect the existing small rural settlement character of Ōhoka. In addition, a 4 hectare lot may be able to practically incorporate rural activities (as possible under PWDP Rural Lifestyle Zone), whereas 500m² lots as proposed by the rezoning Outline Development Plan would not accommodate such rural activities.

- 5.4. 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.
 - 5.5. However, 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.
7. My opinion in in general agreement with the findings of Mr Nicholson (urban design) and I concur with his description: *'...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'*⁵.

Conclusion

8. I support my original assessment of the Plan Change and consider that the Request for rezoning will have an adverse effect on the character of Ōhoka in the *moderate - high* range. If granted in its current form, the outcome will be that the present rural character of the Ōhoka settlement will no longer exist and 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: 2 July 2024

Kim Thomas Goodfellow

⁵ Statement of evidence of Hugh Nicholson – page 25