

Before an Independent Hearings Panel
appointed by Christchurch City Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14 (Housing
and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan

and: **Christchurch International Airport Limited**
Submitter 852

Summary of Evidence of Natalie Hampson (Economics)

Dated: 23 April 2024

REFERENCE: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
AM Lee (annabelle.lee@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 3 353 4130
F +64 3 365 4587

PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF NATALIE HAMPSON

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Natalie Diane Hampson and I am the Director of Savvy Consulting. I have worked in the field of economics for over 20 years for commercial and public sector clients, with a particular focus on economic assessment within the framework of the Resource Management Act.
- 2 Relevant to this process, I am familiar with the urban economy of Ōtautahi Christchurch and have recently completed a detailed assessment of the operations and economic role of the Christchurch International Airport (*Christchurch Airport*).
- 3 I prepared a brief of evidence addressing the relief sought by Christchurch International Airport Limited (*CIAL*) on the proposed Plan Change 14 (Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan (*PC14*).¹ I participated in expert conferencing on economic matters for PC14 and am a signatory of the joint witness statement (*Economic JWS*).² I also prepared rebuttal evidence that responded to the briefs of evidence of other submitters.³
- 4 Throughout my evidence I have considered the effect of the net additional land within the Remodelled Outer Envelope Contour (*Remodelled Contour*) and the total land within the Remodelled Contour. My conclusions on the economic costs and benefits of the proposed Airport Noise Influence Area Qualifying Matter (*Airport QM*) are based on the total land within the Remodelled Contour.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 5 The ability of Christchurch Airport to continue to operate 24 hours a day and 365 days a year, as well as to develop and adapt to changing demand and projected growth in demand for air transport services has a significant positive effect on the social and economic wellbeing of the Christchurch, Canterbury and national community. Even minor impacts on the efficient operation and investment certainty of CIAL could have significant economic consequences over the long-term.
- 6 The feasible capacity enabled by PC14 at a district level is substantial. As raised by Kāinga Ora's legal submissions,⁴ providing for significantly more housing capacity contributes to the social and

¹ Dated 20 September 2023.

² Dated 5 October 2023.

³ Dated 9 October 2023.

⁴ Dated 16 April 2024, paragraph 3.3.

economic wellbeing of the current and future Christchurch community. Applying the Airport QM as proposed by CIAL in parts of Christchurch does not come close to constraining demand for additional housing over the long-term at the district level. It therefore does not undermine the social and economic benefits achieved by PC14.

- 7 At an aggregate level, the economic benefits of applying an Airport QM that restricts further intensification of noise sensitive activities outweighs the economic costs of reduced (but by no means eliminated) development capacity in parts of the Christchurch urban area.
- 8 At a localised level, and specifically around Riccarton Town Centre, the potential economic costs of CIAL's proposed Airport QM are less clear. More information is needed on demand and feasible and reasonably expected to be realised capacity under operative, notified and recommended zoning in this Mass Rapid Transit (*MRT*) walkable catchment (as well as the options for mitigation/compensatory intensification outside the Airport QM).
- 9 The need for this data was a key focus of the Economic JWS. As far as I am aware, the data has not been prepared or supplied.
- 10 While Ms Oliver has adopted the extent of CIAL's proposed Airport QM in her S42A report, there are exceptions to the Council's approach which provide for some areas of intensification in the form of High Density Residential Zone (*HRZ*) within the Airport QM. There is insufficient economic evidence supporting the need for this exception.
- 11 Providing HRZ within the Remodelled Contour (as recommended by Council) increases the number of future households exposed to noise associated with Christchurch Airport operations that is equal to or greater than 50dB Ldn, and does not ensure that the efficient operation of the Christchurch Airport is safeguarded over the long-term.
- 12 Council also recommends increasing the height of the Large Town Centre Zone from 22m (notified) to 32m to improve the commercial feasibility of development/redevelopment. While the CIAL proposed Airport QM overlaps parts of the Riccarton Town Centre Zone, I support an increase in building height across the Zone. This support (primarily for the notified building height) is on the basis that noise sensitive activities (i.e. residential units) are limited to buildings outside the Airport QM (unless approved by a non-complying consent), as proposed by CIAL.
- 13 I conclude that the proposed Airport QM based on the Remodelled Contour can be applied in PC14 without significantly compromising

the intensification and economic performance of the Riccarton Town Centre Zone over the long-term. Further information on the demand for high density housing (apartments) in the Riccarton walkable catchment (inclusive of the Town Centre Zone) would provide more certainty to my conclusion – but as above, such data has not been provided to the best of my knowledge.

- 14 Finally, Ms Buddle for Environment Canterbury considers that PC14 should retain the operative 50dB Ldn noise contour for the Airport QM so as not to prejudice the upcoming CRPS review of the airport noise contours. I disagree that this is the most appropriate approach for land use planning. It could be more than a year (or maybe 2 years) until the outcome of the CRPS is decided. During that time, intensification beyond the operative 50dB Ldn contour and within the Remodelled Contour could be approved. Adopting the Remodelled Contour in PC14 is a conservative approach that, at worst, could result in a minor temporary constraint of intensification opportunity for those affected property owners (if for example, the CRPS did not adopt the Outer Envelope).
- 15 However, should the CRPS process confirm the Remodelled Contour as the basis for land use planning, then the benefit of restricting the number of new dwellings within the Airport QM to operative densities in the interim (to safeguard the operation of Christchurch Airport and manage adverse effects on the amenity and health of residents) is more than minor, as these benefits accrue over the long term.

Dated: 23 April 2024

Natalie Hampson