

<b>UNDER THE</b>	Resource Management Act 1991
<b>IN THE MATTER OF</b>	the submissions of B & A Stokes on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (#214) and Variation 1 (#29)
<b>AND</b>	Hearing Stream 12E: Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend; Variation 1

---

## **SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICOLE LAUENSTEIN**

---

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Nicole Lauenstein. I am a director at a+urban.
- 1.2 I filed a primary statement 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. It addressed the urban design aspects of the Stokes' proposal to rezone their land to the north of Ravenswood (**Site**) to General Residential / Medium Density Residential zone, subject to an Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) (the **Proposal**).
- 1.3 I have the qualifications and experience set out in that evidence.

### **2 SECTION 42A REPORT**

- 2.1 There are no urban design matters raised in the s42A report which cause me to change my opinion with regard to the appropriateness of the Proposal.
- 2.2 I am satisfied that that ODP and the supporting narrative (see **Tabs 9 & 11** of Graphic Set) satisfactorily address the key urban design matters such as connectivity, residential amenity, accessibility, access to green spaces and cohesive urban form. Based on his favourable comments relating to those matters, Mr. Jolly and I appear to be largely in agreement regarding the urban design qualities of the ODP.

### **3 CLARIFICATION OF THE ODP AND MATTERS RAISED BY MR JOLLY**

- 3.1 Other matters raised by Mr Jolly in relation to the Proposal are minor in that context and have not materially informed the recommendations of the s42a Reporting Officer. Nevertheless, I would like to address some of the matters Mr Jolly raises.

- 3.2 Mr Jolly queries some detailed aspects of the urban design sketches (part of my urban design evidence). These sketches are indicative in nature and have been provided to show the design concept that underpins the ODP. Such a level of detail would normally not be shown at ODP level as it requires further detailed design development to resolve aspects such as exact local/minor road layout, lot orientation, exact form and sizes of green spaces, waterway setbacks etc.
- 3.3 Clarification regarding classification of waterways and related setbacks is also a matter of detail and is best resolved at the detailed design and subdivision consent stage.
- 3.4 Mr Jolly notes that the smaller of the two green spaces provided for in the ODP, an elongated area that straddles the green corridor, could be improved. That space is a response to existing trees along this green corridor and aims to provide a more generous setback for residential activity, and to protect the trees.
- 3.5 The design and intended function of green spaces and the community hub are also matters of detail that are best addressed at the consenting stage. I am satisfied however that the current ODP provides sufficient direction for those facilities at this stage to achieve good urban outcomes.
- 3.6 With regard to density distribution, I note that the ODP narrative already includes a directive to provide higher densities in proximity to the Ravenswood Key Activity Centre (**KAC**) and the larger green spaces, with reduced densities towards the predominantly rural lifestyle and large lot residential zoning to the west and north of the Site.
- 3.7 This leaves the matter of overall density. The ODP has initially been designed for a minimum of 12 households / hectare (**hh/ha**) with the ability to accommodate 15hh/ha and more. In response to the s42A report, the Stokes have now adjusted the minimum density required to 15 hh/ha to meet policy requirements for greenfield areas. I can confirm that no changes to the ODP layout are required to meet this minimum density of 15hh/ha. It may however simply require some refining of the local roading layout and additional smaller pocket parks – none of which are normally shown on the ODP. Those will be identified at the detailed design stage together with the more intensely developed areas of the Site.

#### **4 WIDER COMPACT URBAN FORM**

- 4.1 I have read the evidence of Ms. Hampson and agree with her assessment of the urban form matters as set out in her paragraphs 6.18 and 6.19 (including Figures

1 and 2 of her supplementary evidence). I consider this to be a very important aspect of the Proposal – it has been designed to complement the overall urban form of the KAC and provide a residential foil to the northern side, filling to some extent the gap between the KAC and developed area of Waikuku.

## **5 CONCLUSION**

5.1 In summary I remain of the opinion that the Proposal will contribute positively to the wider urban environment, supporting a more integrated, balanced urban form which ensures that new residential areas are accessible to community and commercial services and open space. I support the various ecological initiatives enabled as part of the Proposal as they contribute to enhancing the health of the natural environment, and the wellbeing of the people and communities that will reside alongside and interact with that environment. In my opinion, this Proposal contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.

**Nicole Lauenstein**

21 August 2024