

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 Natalie Hampson

---

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 NATALIE HAMPSON**

- 1 My full name is Natalie Dianne Hampson.
- 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 My evidence addresses two key topics: the economic effects of the proposed Local Centre Zone (*LCZ*) and the potential role of the proposed zoning to provide capacity in a location of demand within the Greater Christchurch urban environment and where there is a shortfall of medium-term capacity provided in the Proposed District Plan (*PDP*).
- 4 The Submitter's proposed LCZ will provide a new focal point for the Ōhoka (and surrounding) community and improve the functional and social amenity of this urban area. It will provide a range of local jobs and access to a range of convenience retail and service activities, reducing spending leakage and travel to meet household convenience needs.
- 5 I support the land area provided for the LCZ in the Outline Development Plan as it provides flexibility for the developer to provide for necessary stormwater management, provide additional landscaping, provide additional parking for the Ōhoka Market (and a space to operate in the winter months if the adjoining park is unsuitable), and to generally develop a local centre befitting of the site.
- 6 I have assessed the potential for the proposed centre to have adverse distributional effects on the existing centre network. My modelling showed that no centre, including the nearby Mandeville LCZ, would suffer more than minor adverse effects on centre amenity, vitality and vibrancy based on the food, grocery and liquor store supply assumptions modelled.
- 7 As food, grocery and liquor sector effects are a good indicator of how other convenience retail and service activities may impact the centre network, I conclude that the distributional effects of the proposed centre would not lead to any significant adverse effects on other centres in Waimakariri District. The proposed floorspace cap ensures that significant adverse effects on other centres will be avoided.
- 8 The proposed areas of Settlement Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone (*LLRZ*) provide capacity for 850 (or more) new dwellings. I support the scale and location of this capacity as it:

- 8.1 expands an existing urban area which minimises the externality effects of urban growth (relative to creating new urban areas);
  - 8.2 is an efficient use of the land resource compared to the notified zoning and the alternative of meeting demand outside of the main urban townships with only LLRZ as has been the case in Mandeville;
  - 8.3 provides for demand of standalone dwellings, including on lot sizes not likely to be provided in the main urban townships, consistent with Policy 1(a)(i) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (*NPS-UD*);
  - 8.4 supports a competitive land and development market for housing as required under NPS-UD Objective 2;
  - 8.5 enables land development to be planned and delivered with economies of scale (due to the significant amount of capacity proposed) which helps reduce the unit cost of residential sections, consistent with the intent of NPS-UD Policy 8;
  - 8.6 allows more people to live in close proximity to a centre as required under NPS-UD Objective 3a;
  - 8.7 is in a location of high relative demand as required by NPS-UD Objective 3(c) and as demonstrated by analysis of recent population growth, recent dwelling consents issued, StatisticsNZ population and household projections and the research by Mr Davidson; and
  - 8.8 helps address a shortfall of capacity required to meet expected medium-term housing demand (inclusive of the competitiveness margin) outside of the main urban townships and in the Greater Christchurch urban environment generally, thus helping the Council meet the requirements of Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.
- 9 Policy 8 does not require there to be insufficient capacity in order for local authorities to be responsive to proposals that would add significant capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.
- 10 Nonetheless, in my evidence, I have demonstrated (with the help of Mr Sexton's evidence) that based on a more current estimate of housing capacity and medium-term demand (adopting the approach and assumptions relied on in the Council's Waimakariri Capacity for Growth Model 2022 (*WCGM22*)), there is now insufficient capacity in the three main urban townships to cater for the next 10 years of growth. Further, and directly relevant to the proposal, there is demand for housing in the Greater Christchurch urban environment outside of the main urban townships, and especially for Ōhoka, that

is not being met by the PDP. Those modelled shortfalls (when assessed against a moving 10-year demand period as required by the NPS-UD) are growing by the day.

- 11 It is Mr Yeoman's primary position that there is sufficient capacity provided for medium-term demand in the PDP/Variation 1 in the three main townships, although his model already shows that there is insufficient capacity zoned in the rest of the district. Mr Yeoman relies on a model that is already out of date. In lieu of providing any updates, he asserts that the Council's preferred demand projection overstates demand that he expects over the medium-term and that his capacity estimates understate capacity being achieved in the three main townships.
- 12 The NPS-UD directs decisions making to be based on demand projections adopted by a local authority. Despite Mr Yeoman's speculation of changes in housing demand over the medium-term, he has not provided an alternative demand projection for Council to adopt. As set out in my supplementary evidence, I have also not seen data, including that provided by Mr Wilson, that shows that the WCGM22 is so conservative that there would be little risk of there being a shortfall of capacity across the combined main urban townships in the medium-term if assessed today.
- 13 Irrespective of what 'unders and overs' Mr Yeoman believes are inherent in the WCGM22, I do not consider it appropriate for PDP decision making to be based on a snapshot of sufficiency that is 2 years old. The uptake of capacity that has occurred since that WCGM22 was developed can be quantified with certainty.
- 14 Based on the matters that I have assessed in my evidence statements, including the relevant objectives and policies of the NPS-UD, I support the Submitter's rezoning request from an economic perspective.

Dated: 1 July 2024

---

Natalie Hampson