

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My name is **Chris Morahan**. I am a Principal Advisor within the Christchurch City Council's strategic transport team. I have a Bachelor of Engineering (civil with honours) from the University of Canterbury and have worked for the last 15 years in transport engineering and planning.
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the **Christchurch City Council** (Council) to assist in the understanding of the transportation-related impacts of Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan, including the impacts of qualifying matters relating to the city spine and the airport noise influence area.
3. My evidence notes that the two corridors from the city centre to Hornby and Belfast are the two busiest public transport corridors in the city and several documents have previously identified them as needing significant infrastructure upgrades to support future growth; the 2018 Regional Public Transport Plan and the 2024 Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan both state that mass rapid transit is the long-term intention for this corridor.
4. However the corridor is relatively narrow, particular the portions along Riccarton and Papanui Roads which are approximately 20m for much of their lengths.
5. The Indicative Business Case for Mass Rapid Transit was endorsed in 2023. This included conceptual design work which concluded that mass rapid transit could be accommodated within this narrow corridor, but there would be no space for any landscaping or trees along most of Riccarton and Papanui Roads.
6. A qualifying matter requiring a 4m setback along this corridor would result in greenery to at least be provided adjacent to the corridor, with resultant amenity benefits.
7. The efficient operation of the public transport network, and especially mass rapid transit, is maximised when development opportunity along the corridor is maximised. If this qualifying matter were to significantly reduce the amount of development along the corridor then that would be a concern. However, in paragraph 12.115 of her evidence, Ms Oliver states this is not the case: *“Regarding the impact on development capacity, in my view the proposed setback has a very minor impact.”*

8. Therefore I support the city spine qualifying matter.
9. Mass rapid transit and intensification have a symbiotic relationship. High quality public transport is necessary to service intensification, but it is also dependent on intensification to generate usage and justify its high costs.
10. If the airport noise influence area qualifying matter were to result in less development in the Riccarton corridor than would otherwise have occurred, then this would result in negative impacts on the transport network, through reduced benefits and therefore viability of the planned mass rapid transit scheme, and public transport more generally.
11. If, however, the same level of total development occurs, just in different locations along the corridor, then there would be minimal impacts on the transport network.
12. In paragraph 128 of my evidence I stated that, in locations that fall within 800m of a proposed mass rapid transit station and are also located under the newly proposed airport noise influence area, there are currently approximately 1,300 households. The mass rapid transit business case is predicated on this number increasing to approximately 3,300 by 2051.
13. In paragraph 12.59, Ms Oliver compares this number to the estimated gross yields in these locations and concludes that *“the approximate summation of the QM impacted scenario gross yield is 7,785hh and if this is reduced by the existing 1,304hh, creates a net yield of 6481hh. This well exceeds the desired 3,300hh to support the MRT indicative yields”*
14. The proposed zoning will therefore enable roughly twice as much housing in these locations as what the business case was predicated on.

Date: 15 April 2024

Chris Morahan