

Before Palmerston North City Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a proposed plan change to rezone
land at 611 Rangitikei Line to establish
the Whiskey Creek Residential Area

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DANIEL GEORGE MALES
IN SUPPORT OF FLYGERS INVESTMENT GROUP LIMITED
(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE)**

3 JUNE 2022

Counsel Acting
M J Slyfield
Stout Street Chambers

(04) 915 9277
morgan.slyfield@stoutstreet.co.nz
PO Box 117, Wellington

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Daniel George Males. My qualifications, experience and involvement with the plan change are set out in my evidence dated 18 May 2022.
2. The plan change incorporates the following landscape elements :
 - (a) a new reserve within the flood plain providing recreational access and amenity
 - (b) a new neighbourhood park directly connected the reserve
 - (c) a rehabilitated Whisky Creek and environs providing ecological improvements
 - (d) a new urban edge to the city acting as an important gateway on approach along Rangitikei Line.
 - (e) a further vegetated corridor along Rangitikei Line
 - (f) an internal local roading network connecting new streets to the reserve.
 - (g) a shared path connection through the site from Benmore Avenue through the proposed Reserve and around to the Mangaone Stream shared path; and
 - (h) pedestrian footpaths and street planting throughout the site.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

Submissions 7, 11 and 20 : existing wildlife, ecological outcomes, and the Whiskey Creek environs.

3. I support the intention of these submissions and the statement in the S42a "that the proposed Conservation and Amenity Zone is likely to provide for a better and enhanced environment for wildlife following the intended rehabilitation and development of the reserve."
4. I recommend no change to the structure plan for the following reasons:
 - (a) Currently the site is principally utilized as arable farmland. While this provides some pockets of habitat, it provides very little biodiversity.
 - (b) The plan change includes provision of over 8 Ha of reserve within the flood plain (approximately 10 Ha in total). The re-vegetation of this reserve and stream corridor has potential to provide significant ecological benefits in terms of water quality, habitat (both aquatic and terrestrial) and food

source for fauna, as well as the ability to recreate a measure of forest cover.

- (c) As outlined in the UDLR I believe this reserve is well placed to enable significant ecological improvements to the site and wider city.

Submission 18: The realignment of the Whiskey Creek stream and construction of the wetland require resource consent and impacts on freshwater will need to be addressed and consents approved by Horizons. (Submission S18)

- 5. I support this submission but recommend that no change to the structure plan for the following reasons:

Currently the upper reaches of the creek have been altered from the original stream alignment. The intention within the masterplan is for a revitalised stream



corridor that includes riparian planting, the introduction of new wetland features and enhanced biodiversity and habitats.

Figure 1: Aerial image of the existing site

- (a) Figure 1 clearly illustrates the existing stream alignment and overland flows to the northern section of the site. With the exception of the constructed field drains, the alignment of these are unaffected by the proposed roading and development areas shown in the plan change. I agree that additional consents will be required.

Submissions 1, 2, 3, 11 and 15 request a buffer strip (houses to be set back or removed) along the boundary with houses on Meadowbank Drive

- 6. I recommend that these submissions be rejected for the following reasons
 - (a) The open space along the stream corridor provides for significant positive ecological outcomes. This open space location also provides amenity for both neighbourhood residents and the wider city, allowing strong

connections to be forged with adjacent natural and rural environments. This is therefore a preferable location for public reserve.

While a number of the existing dwellings, notably 23b and 2 Meadowbrook Drive (as illustrated in Submissions S1,S2 and S11) do have low fences and look out over the site many do not.



Figure 1: view of Meadowbrook Drive properties from the site.

Due to this prevalence of rear fences and properties backing on to the space I agree with the s42A report that the inclusion of a green strip of open space along the rear boundary of Meadowbrook Drive properties *"would not be consistent with good practice from an urban design perspective (i.e. having properties backing onto a strip reserve)"*.

I do however agree with the evidence of Andrew Burns in the recommendation to increasing the rear yard setback from 1.5m to a min 3m setback for any future dwellings that share a common boundary with Meadowbrook Drive. This, together with a 5m max height of any new dwelling units adjoining properties along Meadowbrook Drive would in my view provide additional buffer on 'private land' between new dwellings and the existing Meadowbrook Drive properties. Additional measures such as aligning property boundaries where possible (as shown on the masterplan) would also enable effective ongoing control over fencing and boundary treatment.

SECTION 42A REPORT

7. I agree with and support the following suggested amendments from the Parks and Recreation Assessment by Aaron Phillips, which do not have a significant impact on the masterplan or structure plan:

- (a) The neighbourhood reserve adjacent to the multi-unit housing be identified as a separate land parcel.

- (b) That the stormwater treatment reserve, discussed in sections 3.12 to 3.14 of Appendix I, have any reference to open space or recreation functions removed.
 - (c) That buffer reserves, if any, consider the form and function matters raised in Section 11 of Appendix I.
8. These do not have a significant impact on the masterplan or structure plan, and I agree with and support these amendments.

CONCLUSIONS

9. My evidence concludes it is my opinion that the landscape design approach as outlined in the masterplan (which underlies the plan change and structure plan) is design led and principle-based. This was informed by a robust process, and I remain of the view that the Whiskey Creek Plan Change and Structure Plan restores ecological aspects of the site while developing the land for residential and recreational uses. This is consistent with best-practice landscape architecture and design.

Daniel George Males

3/06/22