

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14 (Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF REBECCA ANNE FOY ON BEHALF OF
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

SOCIAL IMPACTS –HOUSING INTENSIFICATION POLICIES

Dated: 10 October 2023

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My full name is **Rebecca Anne Foy**. I am a Director of Formative, an independent consultancy that has operated for two years, specialising in social, economic, and urban form issues. Prior to this, I was an Associate Director of Market Economics Limited for three years and was employed there for 20 years.
2. I hold the qualification of Master of Arts (in Geography) from the University of Auckland.
3. I am a member of the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment, the International Association for Impact Assessment, and the Resource Management Law Association.
4. In response to submissions questioning whether intensification might lead to negative social effects that had not been researched by Council in preparing PC14, Council prepared an internal assessment of the likely social impacts of housing intensification policies. They used information from Council's "Life in Christchurch" and "Life in Christchurch Housing and Neighbourhood" survey results to understand the key community values and trends regarding housing and perceptions of living in Christchurch. I peer reviewed the draft report at various stages of the research and a draft version was attached to Ms Oliver's S42A report (Appendix F).
5. Since the S42A report was lodged, the social impact report has been finalised and the following key changes have been made to the report:
 - (a) Definitions are provided for density thresholds (low density, medium density, high density, and higher density) in a new Figure 1.
 - (b) Section 5.1.3 has been renamed "Development-related infrastructure" from "Congestion", however generally the text remains the same.
 - (c) Figure 10 has been introduced, showing the number of bedrooms for each dwelling compared to number of occupants in Christchurch. It shows that 53% of 3+ bedrooms are occupied by one or two person households. This table has been introduced to show that smaller households are living in larger dwellings than they potentially need to occupy, and if the status quo development trends

continue, that the mismatch between household types and dwellings may continue, especially with an aging population.

- (d) A section on physical health impacts has been added into Section 5.3. This discusses the health benefits of higher density living in terms of encouraging use of active modes to access jobs, study, and other daily activities, in comparison to more dispersed residential forms which are typically more car dependant. A 2017 study found that 37% of households in high density mixed use and 23% of households in medium-density neighbourhoods walked or cycled to access these activities compared to 12% in medium density and low density, non-mixed use neighbourhoods.
 - (e) This section also describes the potential for negative effects on physical health that may arise from higher density living through exposure to air emissions from increased congestion and poor indoor air quality, including respiratory conditions, cardiovascular mortality, and cancers.
 - (f) A large section of duplicative text has been removed from section 5.4.3 Tree Canopy.
6. Upon review of the final report, I considered it important to compare the numbers presented in Figure 8: Christchurch City access to social infrastructure by ward on a per capita basis, rather than in terms of totals, given that the populations for each ward vary. That assessment showed that on a per capita basis the wards with the highest access to social infrastructure were Banks Peninsula, Heathcote, Central, and Hornby. The wards with the lowest access to social infrastructure were Innes and Papanui. This pattern is slightly different from that shown in Figure 8 using only totals, though the differences are only minor.
7. Overall, the conclusions of Council's report remain unchanged, and having considered Council's updated report, nothing changes the conclusions I reached in my evidence. Those conclusions were that while a range of positive and negative social impacts may arise from intensification, if density is done well, and in the right places, the overall social outcomes are likely to be more positive than negative. Council has a role in engaging with communities to understand what is important for individual communities and

to help make decisions on where to target investment to ensure well-functioning environments are achieved.

Date: 10 October 2023

Rebecca Anne Foy