

BEFORE THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL

**IN THE MATTER** of The Resource Management Act 1991

AND a requested change to the Central Otago District Council's Operative District Plan – Plan Change 13 (PC13)

**JOINT STATEMENT ARISING FROM EXPERT CONFERENCING – DWELLING CAPACITY - PLAN CHANGE 13**

**5 June 2019**

This Joint Witness Statement (JWS) is the outcome of expert witness conferencing for Plan Change 13 (PC13). It addresses the outcome of expert conferencing for the matters set out in paragraph 8(a) of Minute 8 of the Commissioners dated 23 May 2019 as follows:

*Capacity for Growth (supply of residential land)*

*There is varied expert evidence on the availability of land zoned or otherwise for housing in Cromwell. From a factual perspective the Commissioners require an agreed statement on the following matter*

*Capacity in terms of the land currently zoned for residential development, including infill potential;*

*Potential for rezoning for additional residential development within the current urban boundaries (in terms of the various urban boundaries referred to in expert witness statements)*

Expert conferencing was held via teleconference on 5 June 2019. Alistair Ray, Natalie Hampson and David Mead participated.

This JWS has been prepared in accordance with Section 4.7 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. In addition, all attendees have read, and agree to abide with, Appendix 3 to the Environment Court Practice Note 2014, which comprises the Protocol for Expert Witness Conferencing

We agreed that the memo provided by Marilyn Brown dated 31 May 2019 provided an appropriate framework to address the matters identified in the Minute. We did not have the opportunity to address her updated memo of 7 June 2019.

Our respective positions on the matters identified in section 1.1 are set out as follows:

### **Natalie Hampson**

In terms of the assessment of “possible yield” provided by Marilyn Brown for CODC, I agree with the following:

- I agree with the possible yield of the Top 10 and Wooring Tree sites. Our figures are the same for Wooring Tree and are materially the same for Top 10.
- I agree with the possible yield of Gair Ave Final Stage and The Chalets. The Gair Ave figures relate to a smaller area than my initial assessment, and I accept that some of that capacity has been developed in the interim.
- Ms Brown does not identify the ‘Golden View Lifestyle Village’ as a greenfield growth area, as I did in my analysis. Given the time that has elapsed, this no longer represents vacant capacity and I accept that it should no longer be counted if taking a 2018 (say) baseline as opposed to a 2016 baseline.
- I agree with the potential yield of vacant plan enabled land area in the three settlements of Bannockburn, Pisa Moorings and Lowburn. The densities identified are in keeping with the operative zoning which seems appropriate given the proposed spatial framework.
- I agree with the potential yield of the Town Centre Sites. I believe the densities are not unrealistic. However, it is not clear which pieces of land are included in these sites or how loss of current business floorspace (if applicable) will be addressed. It is understood that a portion of this potential yield would require changes to the district plan (along with the areas identified below).
- The remaining potential yields in Ms Brown’s amended table relate to capacity that is not currently plan enabled or would be unlikely to be delivered under the operative district plan. On the presumption that all locations could and would be rezoned to the densities suggested by Ms Brown:
  - I accept that the potential yields of the Sew Hoy Estate (labelled Waenga Drive in my assessment), North Cromwell Greenfield Growth Area, the Golf Course and Freeway Orchard are appropriate if rezoned.
  - I accept that the potential yields of Cromwell East, West and North are appropriate. For clarity, it is my understanding that the assumption is that 20% of the net zone area would develop at the densities specified, leaving the balance of the areas at current densities. Unless specific precincts are identified for higher density, it is also relevant to assume that the same potential yield could be spread over the total net zone area (excluding any greenfield sites evaluated separately) at lower average densities (i.e. same outcome, different distribution).
- My views on whether these potential yields are commercially feasible by 2048, or whether they should be relied upon at this point in time, are addressed in my rebuttal evidence.
- Ms Brown has updated total dwelling demand for Cromwell and Surrounds based on my figures from 2016-2043 to 2018-2048. I accept the total growth figure of 2,580 for the period 2018-2048.

### **David Mead**

I agree with the analysis presented by Marilyn Brown, with the following comments:

- The potential dwellings for the town centre are high for the Cromwell context. A more reasonable estimate may be 30 dwellings per ha, for the 2.1ha, or a total of 80 dwellings.
- The Golf Course and Freeway Orchard are feasible longer term development options. The golf course would likely require an alternative location to be found, and this would need to be facilitated by the Council. However this is not unreasonable in the longer term.

- It is reasonable to expect plan changes / plan reviews to adjust density settings, over a 30 year time frame. Rezoning of low density residential areas to facilitate infill development is a reasonable prospect, for example.

In addition to the analysis provided by Ms Brown, I note:

- The demand figures are for either Cromwell Ward (M Brown memo) or Cromwell and Surrounds (N Hampson evidence). Both these areas covers rural, rural-residential and urban areas. As such an allowance should be made for rural and rural-residential development. For example 5% of demand
- Cromwell has a large pool of holiday/second homes. One estimate is 21% of the total number of dwellings<sup>1</sup>. As the township develops, it would be my expectation that the proportion would decline. Overtime, some population growth could be accommodated by permanent occupation of second/holiday homes.



David Mead



Natalie Hampson

---

<sup>1</sup> As of the 2013 census, a total of 2,151 dwellings were counted in the Cromwell Census Area Unit with 462 listed as unoccupied (or 21%). 408 of the 462 are listed as "Unoccupied dwelling - empty dwelling".