

UNDER THE

Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER OF

the submissions of B & A Stokes on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (#214) and Variation 1 (#29)

AND

Hearing Stream 12E: Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend; Variation 1

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JONATHAN CLEASE

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Jonathan Guy Clease. I hold the position of Director at Planz Consultants Limited.
- 1.2 I have prepared two statements of evidence on behalf of B & A Stokes in relation to their submissions on the Waimakariri Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) and Variation 1 to the PDP.
- 1.3 The first was a primary statement of evidence that provided a planning overview of the Stokes' proposal to rezone their land to the north of Ravenswood (**Site**) to General Residential / Medium Density Residential zone (**Proposal**), subject to an Outline Development Plan (**ODP**). I then prepared supplementary evidence that responded to matters raised in the Section 42A report with respect to the Proposal along with amendments to the ODP and associated narrative in response to the Section 42A report (refer **Tabs 9 - 11** of the Graphic Set). For completeness, my supplementary evidence also included an assessment of the newly approved Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan and the provision of a Section 32AA assessment.

2 MY EVIDENCE

- 2.1 Based on my assessment, I concluded that:
- (a) The Proposal enables the Council to meet its obligations as set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (**NPS-UD**) through ensuring the requisite capacity is delivered in Woodend to match anticipated demand over the medium term.

- (b) Even if additional capacity is not found to be required, NPS-UD Policy 8 directs decision makers to be responsive to proposals that deliver significant development capacity. Mr Wilson agrees that the Proposal does deliver significant capacity.
- (c) The NPS-UD therefore places no policy barrier to providing additional capacity, provided that such capacity is located in a manner that contributes to a 'well-functioning urban environment' (**WFUE**).
- (d) The delivery of WFUE outcomes sit as a separate (but linked) direction to the need to deliver the requisite capacity. The delivery of a WFUE is informed by both NPS-UD Policy 1, and, of particular relevance to the Proposal, Policy 3(d) which requires a commensurate level of building height and density of urban form for areas adjacent to town centres. Regardless of whether or not the PDP meets the capacity requirements, there is a separate requirement that it also delivers the urban form outcomes directed by Policy 3(d). The Proposal is located immediately north of the Ravenswood Key Activity Centre (**KAC**) (see **Tab 8** of the Graphic Set), which is one of only three town centres in the Waimakariri District. As such, the Proposal better gives effect to the NPS-UD direction on urban form than the notified PDP position of a Rural Lifestyle Zone.
- (e) The suite of expert evidence submitted in support of the Stokes' submission confirms that the Proposal can be serviced, can deliver enhanced outcomes for ecology and waterway health, that it protects a known wāhi tapu site, enables modal choice and does not compromise the safe and efficient functioning of the road network. That evidence also confirms that the ODP enables good urban design outcomes to be delivered.

2.2 In the Section 42A report, Mr Wilson does not identify any fundamental barriers to the Proposal being accepted. He does however raise concerns regarding three discrete matters, namely:

- (a) downstream stormwater capacity;
- (b) deliverable density (an increase from 12 households/hectare (**hh/ha**) to 15 hh/ha); and
- (c) the availability of sufficient rules/mechanisms to ensure the funding and provision of infrastructure is able to be delivered.

- 2.3 The ODP narrative (see **Tab 11** of Graphic Set) has been revised to confirm that a minimum density of 15hh/ha will be delivered.
- 2.4 Mr Hall's supplementary evidence assessed in detail how stormwater will be managed. The key tool is the proposed use of extensive stormwater basins that have been sized to attenuate flood flows to pre-development levels such that there is no material change in the volume of stormwater discharged from the Site and therefore minimal effect on downstream waterway function.
- 2.5 Mr Hall's supplementary evidence likewise discusses the funding and regulatory 'teeth' associated with the subdivision consent process, and concludes that the PDP's standard subdivision provisions are sufficient for the types of network improvements needed to service the Proposal. I likewise assessed the standard processes for funding and regulating the delivery of new services to support urban growth areas, including subdivision consent conditions / s224 processes and associated developer agreements, Development Contributions, and Financial Contributions.
- 2.6 I maintain my position with respect to those matters and, as such, conclude that the outstanding matters of concern identified by Mr Wilson are able to be readily addressed. I also conclude that the Proposal provides a unique opportunity to deliver significant housing capacity in a location immediately adjacent to the Waimakariri District's third largest commercial centre and in a township where there is high demand both in absolute terms and relative to the other townships. This capacity can be delivered in a manner that provides an integrated extension to the township, ensures the PDP gives effect to the NPS-UD Policy 3(d) directions regarding urban form outcomes, is able to be plausibly serviced with reticulated infrastructure, enables modal choice and access to public transport, and facilitates significant ecological restoration.
- 2.7 The Medium Density Residential zone, in tandem with the proposed ODP, will therefore more efficiently and effectively deliver the outcomes sought by the higher order planning framework than the notified Rural Lifestyle and Large Lot Residential zones.

Jonathan Clease

21 August 2024