

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MARK DAVID ALLAN ON BEHALF OF MOMENTUM LAND LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Mark David Allan. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief dated 30 August 2024.
2. This Summary of Evidence sets out the key points within my Evidence in Chief. I repeat the confirmation that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

3. Momentum's submission on Variation 1 seeks that the Site be rezoned MRZ and subject to an amended Outline Development Plan (subject of Stream 12E Hearing); that the notified density standard of one dwelling per 200m² within the airport noise QM be retained (subject of Stream 10A Hearing); and that the natural hazards QM not apply to the Site on the basis that ground levels will be raised to mitigate flood risk.
4. I have addressed the application of the natural hazards and airport noise qualifying matters (QM) introduced by Variation 1, and the implementation of MDRS in the context of the QMs as they relate to Momentum's Site.
5. The natural hazards QM applies to the older established parts of Kaiapoi that have significant flood risk due to their low-lying nature, which is exacerbated by significant capacity constraints in the wastewater and drainage networks. Notably, the extent of the mapped natural hazards QM (refer Figure 3 of my Evidence in Chief) does not include areas of more recent residential development, on account of flood risk having been mitigated through comprehensive / coordinated raising and grading of ground levels.
6. The Site (indeed the entire Kaiapoi Development Area) is also excluded from the mapped natural hazards QM. If the Site is rezoned MRZ, it would assume the Urban Flood Assessment Overlay (in addition to the Coastal Flood Assessment Overlay), meaning subsequent subdivision and development would be subject to the natural hazards provisions of the PWDP to ensure the Site's identified flood hazard risk is appropriately mitigated and acceptable.

7. So, contrary to Momentum's submission on Variation 1, I do not consider the natural hazards QM applies to the Site and therefore agree with the Officer Report's recommendation that this submission point be rejected. Instead, I note that flood risk will be addressed by Momentum's proposed flood hazard mitigation measures and the Flood Assessment Certificate process in the PWDP, which I agree is an appropriate mechanism to avoid significant flood risk.
8. The spatial extent and density standard of the notified airport noise QM was the subject of the Stream 10A Hearing. I was not involved in those proceedings but have reviewed the technical evidence relevant to Momentum's submissions. The Stream 10A Officer Report recommended the spatial extent of the QM remain as defined by the operative 50dBA noise contour and the density standard remain one dwelling per 200m². This accepts the relief sought by Momentum insofar as retaining the notified density standard within the airport noise contour.
9. Kainga Ora's submission on Variation 1 seeks the deletion of the airport noise QM and associated provisions, providing the scope to adopt a more targeted response to the MDRS by only limiting the application of the MDRS to the extent necessary to accommodate the airport noise QM. I raise this as the evidence of Shane Fairmaid and Richard Withy (for Momentum) supports removing the minimum lot size for subdivision and limiting density to one residential unit per site within the airport noise contour. It would contribute to housing choice and development freedoms (as mandated by the Housing Supply Amendment Act) and a well-functioning urban environment where the type, price and location of housing meets the diverse needs of the community (as directed by the NPS-UD). Any unnecessary curtailment of that development potential would jeopardise Momentum's proven medium density product and its contribution to housing supply and affordability.
10. I am aware of the issue raised by the Panel (Minute 38) regarding the legal submissions and planning evidence filed by Momentum (and CIAL) for these proceedings, specifically where that evidence addresses matters relating to the airport noise contour already addressed in Stream 10A. In preparing my Evidence in Chief, I have reviewed Momentum's technical evidence for Streams 10A and 12E and the Officer Reports for the same, for completeness. In a full district plan review process, not least one subject to a concurrent housing

intensification variation, there is inevitably some overlap between the Hearing Stream topics and evidence pertaining to Momentum's submissions. I have used that evidence to inform my analysis of the appropriateness of QMs and their associated provisions to restrict the application of MDRS on the Site, in the context of the Housing Supply Amendment Act and the NPS-UD.

11. In the event the Panel disregard this as new or additional evidence, it does not change my conclusions that MRZ is the most appropriate outcome for the Site, and any restriction on development within the airport noise contour should be evidentially based and balanced against the need to contribute to well-functioning urban environments and increase development capacity (NPS-UD).
12. Thank you again for the opportunity to present my evidence and I am happy to address any questions.

Mark Allan

13 September 2024