Before an Independent Commissioner appointed by Selwyn District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Proposed Plan Change 62 to the Selwyn District Plan

Evidence in reply Michael Benjamin Carvalho Vincent

22 September 2020

Applicant's solicitor:

Sarah Eveleigh Anderson Lloyd Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013 PO Box 13831, Armagh, Christchurch 8141 DX Mail: WP20309 P + 64 3 379 0037 | f + 64 3 379 0039



12000434 | 3450656 page 1

Introduction

- My name is Michael Vincent. I prepared a statement of evidence dated 31 August 2020, and supplementary statement of evidence dated 15 September 2020. My qualifications and experience are set out in my primary statement.
- While this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2014 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.
- This evidence is provided in response to the document titled '*Ellesmere Area Plan Land Capacity Calculation*', presented by Ms Lewes on behalf Selwyn District Council at the hearing on 15 September 2020. I have undertaken an audit of the land identified as available for infill subdivision, which I set out below.

Potential Infill

- The attached sheet shows areas within the Living 1 zone which, by my assessment, are not suitable to be counted within a land capacity calculation due to their existing purpose. These include:
 - (a) Leeston Hospital 1.79 hectares;
 - (b) Leeston Primary School 2.46 hectares; and
 - (c) Ellesmere College 8.21 hectares.
 - (d) TOTAL = 12.5 hectares not suitable for potential infill
- Table 1 shows a recalculated Potential Infill equation using the method shown on the tabled document¹. The original estimate includes the development capacity of the Living 1 zoned Ellesmere College (see footnote 4), which is not expected to occur, similarly it includes Leeston Primary School and Leeston Hospital. These over-estimate development capacity by 115 sections.

12000434 | 3450656 page 2

_

¹ Gross x 6 / 10 = Net

Table 1 Revised Potential Infill

Zone	Min. Ave. Lot size	Total size	Gross infill	Net infill potential
Living 1	650 m ²	34 <u>21.5 ha</u>	523 330	313 <u>198</u>
Living XA	650 m ²	40.5 ha	623	373
Living 2	5,000 m ²	18.5 ha	37	22
Living 2A	5,000 m ²	1.1 ha	2	1
Maximum net potential subdivision infill				709 594

Infill modelling

For infill areas, the calculations identify Living zoned lots² which are at least twice the minimum lot size, and assume that these will be subdivided to achieve 60% of the theoretical capacity (based on the net infill potential calculation as described in footnote 3 of the calculations). This does not take into account whether subdivision of these lots is expected to occur, considering matters such as the desire of landowners to subdivide, and whether the existing placement of buildings on the lot would readily facilitate subdivision.

Infill subdivision 2016 - 2019

Further investigation shows that between 2016 and 2019 there were four separate applications for infill residential subdivision within Leeston Living 1 zones.³ This created five additional allotments.

Table 2 2016 - 2019 Actual Infill Subdivision Leeston Living 1 Zone

Year	Legal Description	Number of Lots	Zone
2016	DP 487332	3	L1
2017	DP 505778	2	L1

12000434 | 3450656 page 3

² With the exception of co-owned lots as identified in footnote 1.

³ Information derived from QuickMap 'new record of title' search 21 September 2020.

2018	DP 470734	2 (around existing houses)	L1	
2019	DP 544079	3	L1	

From the evidence gathered, it shows the rate of infill subdivision within Leeston is very low and suggests the theoretical infill capacity is limited by matters such as owner willingness, topographical and physical constraints. This is relevant to assessing the likelihood that the net infill potential identified in Table 1 above will be realised.

Greenfield development

9 For the greenfield areas included in Table 1 above, the calculations assume development at the minimum average lot size will be realised over 60% of the development area. The **attached** approved (but now lapsed) subdivision plan for the Living XA land north of Leeston Dunsandel Road (the Martin block). This relates to 20.9 hectares, which using Council's calculations would equate to a land capacity of 194 sections. The proposed subdivision achieved 163 residential lots. In this case, the Council's assessment has over-estimated capacity that would have been achieved by the subdivision.

Deferred zone

In respect of the deferred zones, the calculations are based on 23 hectares of Living 1 Deferred Zone, rather than the actual 5.3 hectares of Living 1 Deferred Zone that exists. This over-estimates development capacity by 163 lots;

Table 3 Revised Deferred Zones

Zone	Area	Min. Ave. Lot size	Possible Gross Yield	Possible Net Yield
Living 1 Deferred Zone	23 <u>5.3 ha</u>	650 m ²	353 <u>82</u>	212 49

12000434 | 3450656 page 4

_

 $^{^4}$ My reading of footnote 3 is that the 15% required for stormwater management is included in the 40% for reserves and services, on the basis that "Gross x 6 / 10 = Net"

Living 2 Deferred Zone	27 24.4 ha	5,000 m ²	54 49	32 29
Maximum net potential deferred zoned capacity				2 44 <u>78</u>

It is noted the deferred zone presents 78 sections within the PC62 site. These sections are dependent on the uplifting of the zoning and count towards the yield under application. In my opinion it is relevant to consider the existing greenfield development as illustrated within the Living XA zone, which isn't within PC62 site.

Conclusion

- The amendments identified in Tables 1 and 3 would result in an identified capacity of 672 lots (as at April 2015). This includes 198 lots of infill within the Living 1 zone and 78 lots are within deferred zones which are part of the PC62 site.
- Overall it is recognised the *Ellesmere Area Plan Land Capacity Calculation* document is a model and is based on assumptions, however in my opinion there are a number of assumptions that do not reflect, and accordingly over-estimate, development that is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised.

Michael Vincent

M. Vincent.

Dated this 22 day of September 2020

12000434 | 3450656 page 5



