

Before an Independent Hearings Panel
Appointed by Waimakariri District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Submissions and further submissions on the Proposed
Waimakariri District Plan

and: Hearing Stream 12D: Ōhoka rezoning request

and: **Carter Group Property Limited**
(Submitter 237)

and: **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**
(Submitter 160)

Summary of evidence of Chris Sexton

Dated: 1 July 2024

Reference: J M Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 3 353 4130
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF CHRIS SEXTON

- 1 My full name is Christopher Philip Sexton.
- 2 I prepared the following statements in support of the Submitters' rezoning request:
 - 2.1 Statement of evidence dated 5 March 2024; and
 - 2.2 Supplementary statement of evidence dated 18 June 2024.
- 3 As part of this hearing process, I have assisted Mr Akehurst and Ms Hampson in the analysis of Council's Land Uptake Monitoring Survey (LUMS) data and supporting memo as provided by Mr Wilson. I also reviewed the *Waimakariri Residential Capacity and Demand Model – IPI 2023* prepared by Formative (*Formative Report*) and completed further analysis on the Waimakariri Capacity for Growth Model 2022 (WCGM22) produced by Formative.

LUMS

- 4 Mr Wilson's memo outlines the methodology used for the LUMS along with the assumptions that are used. A spreadsheet with the base data used for LUMS was provided and shows quarterly updates from 2016 through to September 2022, with a gap in the data between the September 2022 monitoring survey and the April 2024 data which Mr Wilson's memo relies on.
- 5 Mr Willis' s42A report and Mr Yeoman's evidence both refer to Mr Wilson's memo to support their view that sufficient development capacity within the Waimakariri District is provided in accordance with the NPS-UD requirements. For the reasons outlined in my supplementary evidence, I consider that the LUMS should not be relied upon for the sufficiency assessment, particularly because it does not consider if development is feasible. The NPS-UD states that capacity must be feasible and realistically expected to be realised.
- 6 I reviewed each greenfield development/zone identified by Mr Wilson on a line-by-line basis and have compared his results to those achieved by developers. I found several examples where the LUMS dataset was incorrect in terms of both gross and net site area. I found that almost all the developments identified by Mr Wilson did not have an accurate representation of the net site area. Using GIS tools, I was able to calculate actual net site areas and import developer proposed subdivision scheme plans to calculate the projected net site area requirements and actual lot yields.
- 7 Mr Wilson states in his memo that the LUMS allows for 20% of the gross site area for non-residential use with the remaining 80% of the area allocated solely to residential allotments in cases where there is insufficient data available at subdivision consent time to determine the net site area. From my review of the developed areas identified in the LUMS, I found that there were no developments

with a net site area of 80% of the gross site area, and all developments required significantly more than 20% of the gross site area to allow for roads, stormwater reserves and other non-residential use.

- 8 My review of LUMS found that developers were often achieving a higher net-density than the LUMS estimate due to the incorrect net site area calculation. However, due to the overestimation in net land area available for residential use, LUMS tends to overestimate the remaining capacity within the development. My review shows that the LUMS dataset is not referenced back to actual yields as achieved by developers. Instead, it often shows capacity that is unable to be realised. Examples of this are provided in my supplementary evidence.

WCGM22

- 9 I reviewed the data outputs from WCGM22 that were made available to submitters in the form of an Excel spreadsheet. I reviewed this data and provided analysis on how capacity was distributed throughout the district. My review initially focused on classifying the data in terms of the Statistics New Zealand Statistical Area 2 (SA2) 2023 boundaries. This information was then used by Mr Akehurst and Ms Hampson in their assessment of residential sufficiency as broken down by SA2 area.
- 10 I then proceeded to analyse the WCGM22 information in relation to Mr Yeoman's view that developers are achieving higher densities than anticipated by WCGM22. I reviewed the subdivision scheme plans and deposited survey plans for subdivisions that had occurred since WCGM22 had been developed to determine if developers had achieved higher yields. I conducted further ground-truthing to update capacity projections to actual yield along with capacity uptake due to completed dwelling construction.
- 11 While my review of the LUMS did show that recent developments were achieving a higher net density, the land requirements for non-residential purposes resulted in a lower gross yield. This was also shown when reviewing the results of WCGM22 which only provides a total yield output.
- 12 From my review of the greenfield developments completed or consented since WCGM22 was developed, I was only able to find two examples where WCGM22 underestimated the development yield. Both examples are retirement/lifestyle village developments, which is a type of development that WCGM22 does not allow for in its calculations. While I agree with Mr Yeoman that the WCGM22 underestimated the yield for these two examples, the significant overestimation for other greenfield developments far outweighs the underestimation that these village developments represent. Mr Yeoman provided examples (that he references extensively in his PC31 evidence) of four small infill developments that were able to achieve higher yields than WCGM22 predicted. I consider the

additional yields able to be achieved with infill development is immaterial when compared to the significant overestimation made for greenfield developments.

- 13 WCGM22 calculates capacity by using an allowance of 25% of land for non-residential purposes and then applying a target net density. From my review of the LUMS and recently completed developments, I consider that the allowance of 25% for non-residential land is not enough, and as developments move into more constrained land, the requirements for stormwater management and flood hazard mitigation will further impact on the portion of land available for accommodating residential allotments. From my review of the information provided, I consider that both WCGM22 and the LUMS overestimate the amount of yield expected from residential subdivisions. As per the PC31 Panel's findings, there is a very real likelihood that WCGM22 has overstated residential capacity.

Dated: 1 July 2024

Chris Sexton