

Introduction

1. My full name is Elizabeth (Liz) Jane White.
2. I am a Senior Resource Management Consultant at Incite, which is a specialist resource and environmental management consultancy. I hold a Bachelor of Arts with Honours from Canterbury University, and a Master of Resource and Environmental Planning with First Class Honours from Massey University. I am an associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association.
3. I have over 10 years resource management and planning experience spanning both the public and private sectors. My experience includes both regional and district plan development, including the preparation of section 32 and section 42A reports, as well as undertaking policy analysis and preparing submissions for clients on various Resource Management Act 1991 (*RMA*) documents. I also have experience in preparing and processing resource consent applications.
4. I have been asked to provide planning evidence on behalf of Environment Canterbury (*ECan*) in support of its submission on Plan Change 21 (*PC21*) to the Timaru District Plan.

Code of Conduct

5. Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the practice note when preparing my written statement of evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

Scope of Evidence

6. My evidence is limited to those matters raised by ECan on PC21, and the response to those in the section 42A report. In particular, my evidence focusses on those aspects of the submission and PC21 that relate to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (*RPS*).

Evidence

7. In my review of Ecan's submission on PC21, I consider that there are three topics covered by the submission:
 - a. Support for the introduction of an ODP for Broughs Gully;
 - b. Support for provisions within PC21 that relate to, and are aligned with, matters addressed in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (CLWRP), (particularly in relation to stormwater management); and
 - c. Changes sought to provisions to better align the provisions of PC21 with the CLWRP (particularly in relation to stormwater management).
8. I have reviewed the Officer's Report on Submissions and note that the changes sought by ECan have largely been accepted, for the reasons set out in the submission. My understanding is that there are no outstanding matters raised in the submission that ECan intend to pursue. As a result of this, my evidence is focussed on:

- a. stormwater management provisions; and
- b. the introduction of an ODP through PC21.

Stormwater Management Provisions

9. The land covered by PC21 is part of the Waitarakao / Washdyke Lagoon catchment. As set out in ECan's submission, the Lagoon has important values. It is culturally significant, covered by a Maitaitai reserve, is a habitat for birds and is an important link in the network of coastal wetlands in Canterbury. Under the CLWRP it is identified as being "at risk" in terms of nutrient allocation.
10. As a result of these values and to ensure appropriate alignment between the regional planning framework and PC21, ECan requested some changes to the policy framework to recognise the importance of the Lagoon, which have been recommended for inclusion within the Officer's Report, on the basis that the changes are appropriate when considering the context of the waterbody and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. I support those recommendations.
11. It is therefore also important to ensure that the provisions within PC21 implement the changes that are recommended, and align with the relevant regional provisions. In particular, this means ensuring that stormwater infrastructure is adequate to protect the Lagoon. The advice that I have received from ECan officers is that robust stormwater infrastructure for the plan change area is critical to achieving better outcomes for the Lagoon. It is my view that the use of an ODP is an appropriate tool for ensuring such infrastructure is developed, while leaving the evaluation of the detail of any specific infrastructure for consideration through the regional resource consent process.

The introduction of an ODP

12. From a review of the PC21 section 32 Assessment, my understanding is that while the area where the ODP is proposed is zoned for residential development, the area in question has not been developed to its full development potential, and that this relates to, in part, the servicing of individual sites (because these are in the multiple ownership in the plan change area) being problematic. The Assessment also notes that as well as difficulties with developing individual blocks from an infrastructure point of view, development of individual titles may not lead to a coherent and connected area of development.
13. In my experience, it is common for ODPs to be used within district plans as a tool to guide and better ensure co-ordinated and coherent development. While it is more commonly used for greenfield land, it is my view that that the circumstances outlined in the section 32 Assessment support the introduction of an ODP in this instance. This is because:
 - a. The ODP and associated provisions in PC21 address the current infrastructure issues that have limited the land being developed to the residential density anticipated by its zoning. It therefore better enables the efficient development of this physical resource, in line with s7(b) of the RMA. This also means that the ODP provides a level of certainty to landowners about development potential;
 - b. Redevelopment of the land on a site-by-site basis is less likely to achieve co-ordinated and integrated development, which is overcome by the use of an ODP.

14. I consider that the introduction of the ODP, as proposed by PC21, and associated provisions to enable the development within the ODP area in a co-ordinated fashion, is an improvement to the status quo, as it provides a comprehensive guide to development, and overcomes the problems associated with developing and servicing land which is held in multiple ownership. In my view, it is therefore a more efficient and effective way of achieving the objectives of the Timaru District Plan.
15. I have also reviewed the relevant RPS provisions, and as expanded on further below, I consider that PC21 is in line with the RPS' direction relating to integration between land use and infrastructure. My assessment below focusses on summarising those parts of the RPS provisions that are particularly relevant. However, for completeness I have included the relevant RPS provisions in full in Appendix 1.
16. Objective 5.2.1(1) of the RPS seeks that development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth, primarily in and around existing urban areas. In my view, the existing District Plan provisions have not resulted in this aim being given effect to in Broughs Gully. The introduction of the ODP and associated provisions, in my view, provides a framework that is more likely to result in the aims of Objective 5.2.1(1) being met in this area.
17. Objective 5.2.2 pertains to the integration of land-use with regionally significant infrastructure. Of particular relevance, the '*Principle reasons and explanation*' to the objective states that patterns of land-use as well as the costs of infrastructure development need to be factored into decision-making. In my view, PC21 responds to the current issues regarding the provision of infrastructure to the plan change area, and seeks to ensure future development is appropriately serviced and integrated, in a way that provides guidance and certainty for land owners, developers, and the Council.
18. Policy 5.3.1 directs that urban growth occurs in a form that concentrates or is attached to existing urban areas and promotes a co-ordinated pattern of development. In my view, the ODP better ensures that this is achieved in any future development of the land, which is attached to the existing urban area.
19. Amongst a range of other things, Policy 5.3.2 directs that development is enabled which integrates with the efficient and effective provision or upgrade of infrastructure. At Method (3), the RPS directs that territorial authorities set objectives, policies and may include methods:
 - (a) *that establish a comprehensive approach to the management of the location of urban and rural-residential development within the territorial authority area, including provisions requiring consideration as to how the new land use will be appropriately serviced by transport and other infrastructure.*
20. In my view, the ODP and related provisions are specifically aimed at implementing this direction, because they take a comprehensive approach to the area, and seek to ensure that future development of the land is appropriately serviced.
21. Policies 5.3.5 directs that development is appropriately and efficiently served for the collection, treatment, disposal or re-use of sewage and stormwater and the provision of potable water. The ODP and related provisions are based on overcoming the existing issues

with the provision of these services, and ensuring that they are provided and developed in a co-ordinated and integrated manner.

22. In summary, my view is that PC21 better aligns with the direction in the RPS, and the achievement of co-ordinated, integrated residential development.



Liz White
Senior Planning Consultant
24 July 2017

Appendix 1 – Relevant RPS provisions

Objective 5.2.1 – Location, design and function of development (Entire Region)

Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:

- (1) achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's growth; and*
- (2) enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which:*
 - (a) maintains, and where appropriate, enhances the overall quality of the natural environment of the Canterbury region, including its coastal environment, outstanding natural features and landscapes, and natural values;*
 - (b) provides sufficient housing choice to meet the region's housing needs;*
 - (c) encourages sustainable economic development by enabling business activities in appropriate locations;*
 - (d) minimises energy use and/or improves energy efficiency;*
 - (e) enables rural activities that support the rural environment including primary production;*
 - (f) is compatible with, and will result in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure;*
 - (g) avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;*
 - (h) facilitates the establishment of papakāinga and marae; and*
 - (i) avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.*

Objective 5.2.2 – Integration of land-use and regionally significant infrastructure (Wider Region)

In relation to the integration of land use and regionally significant infrastructure:

- (1) To recognise the benefits of enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety and to provide for infrastructure that is regionally significant to the extent that it promotes sustainable management in accordance with the RMA.*
- (2) To achieve patterns and sequencing of land-use with regionally significant infrastructure in the wider region so that:*
 - (a) development does not result in adverse effects on the operation, use and development of regionally significant infrastructure.*
 - (b) adverse effects resulting from the development or operation of regionally significant infrastructure are avoided, remedied or mitigated as fully as practicable.*
 - (c) there is increased sustainability, efficiency and liveability.*

Policy 5.3.1 – Regional growth (Wider Region)

To provide, as the primary focus for meeting the wider region's growth needs, sustainable development patterns that:

- (1) ensure that any*
 - (a) urban growth; and*
 - (b) limited rural residential development**occur in a form that concentrates, or is attached to, existing urban areas and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;*
- (2) encourage within urban areas, housing choice recreation and community facilities, and business opportunities of a character and form that supports urban consolidation;*
- (3) promote energy efficiency in urban forms, transport patterns, site location and subdivision layout;*

- (4) *maintain and enhance the sense of identity and character of the region's urban areas; and*
- (5) *encourage high quality urban design, including the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values.*

Policy 5.3.2 – Development conditions (Wider Region)

To enable development including regionally significant infrastructure which:

- (1) *ensure that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, including where these would compromise or foreclose:*
 - (a) *existing or consented regionally significant infrastructure;*
 - (b) *options for accommodating the consolidated growth and development of existing urban areas;*
 - (c) *the productivity of the region's soil resources, without regard to the need to make appropriate use of soil which is valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, or through further fragmentation of rural land;*
 - (d) *the protection of sources of water for community supplies;*
 - (e) *significant natural and physical resources;*
- (2) *avoid or mitigate:*
 - (a) *natural and other hazards, or land uses that would likely result in increases in the frequency and / or severity of hazards;*
 - (b) *reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts between incompatible activities, including identified mineral extraction areas; and*
- (3) *integrate with:*
 - (a) *the efficient and effective provision, maintenance or upgrade of infrastructure; and*
 - (b) *transport networks, connections and modes so as to provide for the sustainable and efficient movement of people, goods and services, and a logical, permeable and safe transport system.*

Policy 5.3.5 – Servicing development for potable water, and sewage and stormwater disposal (Wider Region)

Within the wider region, ensure development is appropriately and efficiently served for the collection, treatment, disposal or re-use of sewage and stormwater, and the provision of potable water, by:

- (1) *avoiding development which will not be served in a timely manner to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the environment and human health; and*
- (2) *requiring these services to be designed, built, managed or upgraded to maximise their ongoing effectiveness.*

Policy 5.3.6 – Sewerage, stormwater and potable water infrastructure (Wider Region)

Within the wider region:

- (1) *Avoid development which constrains the ongoing ability of the existing sewerage, stormwater and potable water supply infrastructure to be developed and used.*
- (2) *Enable sewerage, stormwater and potable water infrastructure to be developed and used, provided that, as a result of its location and design:*
 - (a) *the adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources are avoided, or where this is not practicable, mitigated; and*
 - (b) *other adverse effects on the environment are appropriately controlled.*
- (3) *Discourage sewerage, stormwater and potable water supply infrastructure which will promote development in locations which do not meet Policy 5.3.1.*