Before the Independent Hearings Panel
at Waimakariri District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Proposed private plan change RCP31 to the Operative Waimakariri District Plan

and: **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**
Applicant

Summary of evidence of Evidence of Chris Sexton

Dated: 3 August 2023

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

chapmantripp.com
T +64 4 499 5999
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 993
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch

chapman tripp

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF CHRIS SEXTON

1 My full name is Christopher Philip Sexton. I am a Civil Engineer at Inovo Projects Limited.

2 My qualifications include a Bachelor of Natural Resources Engineering with Honours from the University of Canterbury (BE(Hons) Nat. Res), and I am a member of Engineering New Zealand.

3 I have over 7 years' experience as a Civil Engineer working on a range of Infrastructure and Land Development projects in both the public and private sector. In this capacity, I frequently use Geographic Information Systems to analyse property information as it relates to land development and constraints to development.

SUMMARY

4 Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and publicly available data, I prepared a series of development constraint spatial maps that provide a visual representation of what areas in the Waimakariri District are subject to development constraints and how many constraints affect each area. These maps are appended to the evidence of **Mr Walsh**.

5 I have reviewed the New Development Areas published by Waimakariri District Council as part of their Proposed District Plan Review. Based upon spatial analysis using exclusions provided by **Mr Walsh** in the memorandum attached at Attachment A of his evidence, I have provided analysis that the areas provided in the Proposed District Plan may be significantly reduced based upon the interpretations of the restrictions as set out in **Mr Walsh's** evidence.

6 The Waimakariri Capacity for Growth Model 2022 prepared by Formative Limited presents figures for the development capacity within existing urban areas of the District. The raw data from this growth model was made available (via email from Matthew Bacon – Waimakariri Development Planning Manager on 23 June 2023) to the applicant which was subsequently passed onto me. This was in the form of an Excel spreadsheet and I was asked to review this data and present it as a spatial representation using GIS. I understand that **Mr Walsh** queried with WDC whether there was any report to accompany the Excel model provided by Formative and was informed that the model consists only of the Excel file and no report has yet been completed providing further detail on the model.

7 The Excel spreadsheet provided includes fields for land parcel ID, Zone Name, Township, Land Area, Building Count, Medium Term

feasible yield, and Long Term feasible Yield.

8 The ID field from the Formative dataset matches with the property parcel ID's assigned by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). The Formative dataset was then referenced into Q-GIS matching the ID fields of the Formative dataset and the LINZ Primary Parcel dataset to provide a spatial representation of the parcels identified by Formative (see parcels identified by the colour yellow).

9 I then undertook analysis of the Formative dataset and its relation to the LINZ cadastral information to highlight areas meeting any of the following criteria which indicate that residential development and/or intensification is unlikely to occur:

9.1 Parcels whose purpose is for Utility or Local Purpose Reserve;

9.2 Parcels with a designation by a requiring authority; and

9.3 Parcels that have areas subject to Esplanade Provisions (creeks, streams and rivers).

10 Parcels matching this criteria are shown by red hatching over the yellow parcels in the figure shown at **Appendix 1**.

11 A cursory visual assessment was also undertaken to identify other examples of parcels that Formative had identified as providing development capacity, where in practice development is unlikely accounting for the parcel shape, land use, natural features such as waterbodies, etc.

12 I will now show some examples on-screen highlighting where residential development and/or intensification is unlikely to occur.

13 Insufficient time was available to undertake a comprehensive and conclusive spatial assessment of the Formative assessment. However, my observation is that the omissions I identified in the initial assessment (as summarised by **Mr Akehurst**) highlights that there is insufficient robustness in Formative's assessment to conclude how many parcels are available for further development within the Waimakariri District in the medium and long term.

14 It is my professional opinion that the Formative assessment of available developable area within the Waimakariri District is too broad to be relied upon to provide a realistic and reliable indication of development capacity with a bias to overestimate the available capacity.

CONCLUSION

15 In summary, the spatial analysis I have carried out using GIS has assisted **Mr Walsh** and **Mr Akehurst** in providing further comment on areas of the Waimakariri District that face development constraints, and the current development capacity available within the Waimakariri District. Specifically, the Growth Model created by Formative was interrogated and multiple errors were found within the model in terms of failure to exclude areas of existing urban land that is unsuitable for development and intensification. Therefore, I consider the Formative growth model has over-estimated the available growth potential within the district's main centres.

16 I agree with the conclusions and comments made within **Mr Walsh's** and **Mr Akehurst's** evidence in regard to current development capacity and areas where development constraints occur.

Dated: 3 August 2023

Chris Sexton

APPENDIX 1