

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

Rebuttal evidence of Gary Sellars (housing capacity)

Dated: 9 October 2023

Counsel: A M Lee (annabelle.lee@chapmantripp.com)
J M Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 3 353 4130
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF GARY SELLARS

- 1 My full name is Gary Russell Sellars. I am the Director of Valuation and Consultancy at Colliers Valuation (*Colliers*).
- 2 I provided a statement of evidence in relation to the relief sought by Christchurch International Airport Limited (*CIAL*) on proposed Plan Change 14 (Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan (*PC14*) dated 20 September 2023 (*primary evidence*). My qualifications, experience and involvement with *CIAL* are set out in my primary evidence and I do not repeat those here.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 5 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I note that in preparing my evidence I have reviewed the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with it in preparing my evidence on technical matters. I confirm that the technical matters on which I give evidence are within my area of expertise, except where relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 My rebuttal evidence responds to briefs of evidence from:
 - 6.1 **Mr Jonathan Clease** on behalf of Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities; and
 - 6.2 **Ms Pauline Fiona Aston** on behalf of Miles Premises Limited and Equus Trust.

RESPONSE TO MR CLEASE

- 7 Mr Clease at paragraph 3.210 of his evidence, referred to the area of Riccarton immediately west of Hagley Park and south of Westfield Riccarton Mall, and stated that this area has experienced a high rate of transition whereby the vast majority of sites have already been redeveloped with multi-unit housing, typically as 1-2 storey townhouse complexes. He went on in paragraph 3.211 to state that the ability to deliver the strategic outcome of accommodating significant amounts of future demand along this corridor is likely to be muted.
- 8 In my primary evidence at paragraph 110, I referred to a simple survey of residential sites in Riccarton central that I had completed focussed on the south Riccarton central area which corresponds with the area referred to by Mr Clease. In the south Riccarton central

area, there are 1,243 sites, of which 261 (21%) have been developed with medium density residential buildings of 2-3 storeys. The categorisation I used is different to what Mr Clease has used in that I have limited my identified medium density residential buildings to 2-3 storeys whereas Mr Clease has referred to multi-unit housing as being typically 1-2 storey townhouse complexes.

- 9 I acknowledge that this sector of Riccarton has already experienced medium density multi-unit development, although I am of the opinion that there is the potential for the redevelopment of many of the single storey townhouse complexes currently existing due to their age in a number of cases and demand for higher density.

RESPONSE TO MS ASTON

- 10 At paragraph 97 of her evidence, Ms Aston refers to the Christchurch City Council Housing Capacity Assessment and states that this fails to provide for housing needs in the north-west/west sector where there is very limited supply and strong demand. I assume her view is based on the evidence of Michael Blackburn submitted on behalf of Miles Premises Limited. Mr Blackburn's evidence focussed on the north and north-west suburbs of Christchurch (Yaldhurst, Avonhead, Burnside, Bishopdale, Harewood, Casebrook, Northwood, Redwood, Belfast and Marshland).
- 11 Mr Blackburn's evidence focussed on the number of residential sections available in various developments within this part of Christchurch. He estimated there is only a little over 1,000 residential sections still available across all of the developments in this part of Christchurch. Adopting building consent data, he estimated that there was market demand for 325 dwellings per annum which indicated there is currently only three years worth of land available.
- 12 The analysis completed by Mr Blackburn does not take into account the potential to develop existing zoned residential land in this location.
- 13 In my primary evidence, I outlined my housing capacity assessment based on Greenfield¹ land excluding sections already developed. In the corresponding geographic areas which I described as Harewood, Yaldhurst, Belfast and Marshland, I identified a housing capacity of 5,342 HHUs. If Mr Blackburn's estimate of 1,000 existing residential sections is added, then the total increases to a potential 6,342

¹ "Greenfield land" is a term used in this evidence to describe undeveloped land that is potentially suitable for residential development and includes existing residential zoned land, plan change areas and land zoned Rural but considered to be suitable for rezoning to residential.

HHUs. Applying Mr Blackburn's estimated demand of 325 per annum in this location indicates there is a supply of 19.5 years available. Therefore, I do not agree with Ms Aston's statement that there is a very limited supply to satisfy housing needs in the north-west/west sector.

Gary Sellars

9 October 2023