

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY WAIPA
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission and further submission by Tabby Tiger Limited on an application by Titanium Park Limited and Rukuhia Properties Limited for a Private Plan Change 20 – Airport Northern Precinct Extension

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MARK BULPITT CHRISP
ON BEHALF OF TABBY TIGER LIMITED**

(Planning)

Dated: 7 March 2023

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Mark Bulpitt Chrisp. I am a Principal Environmental Planner in the Hamilton Office of Mitchell Daysh Ltd, a company which commenced operations on 1 October 2016 following a merger of Mitchell Partnerships Ltd and Environmental Management Services Ltd (of which I was a founding Director when the company was established in 1994 and remained so until the merger in 2016).
2. In addition to my professional practice, I am an Honorary Lecturer in the Department of Geography, Tourism and Environmental Planning at the University of Waikato. I am also the Chairman of the Environmental Planning Advisory Board at the University of Waikato, which assists the Environmental Planning Programme in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in understanding the educational, professional and research needs of planners.
3. I have a Master of Social Sciences degree in Resources and Environmental Planning from the University of Waikato (conferred in 1990) and have more than 30 years' experience as a Resource Management Planning Consultant.
4. I am a member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, the New Zealand Geothermal Association, and the Resource Management Law Association.
5. I am a Certified Commissioner under the Ministry for the Environment's 'Making Good Decisions' course.
6. I have appeared as an Expert Planning Witness in numerous Council and Environment Court hearings, as well as several Boards of Inquiry (most recently as the Expert Planning Witness for the Hawke's Bay Regional Investment Company Ltd's proposed Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme).

7. I have been involved in a range of planning processes relating to developments in the vicinity of the Hamilton Airport over the last three decades including:
- (a) Resource consents for Narrows Landing, Caroline Eve, CTC Accommodation Facility, and a boat building shed on land north of Raynes Road;
 - (b) A Private Plan Change advanced by Waikato Regional Airport Ltd (“**WRAL**”) which originally created Titanium Park;
 - (c) Resource consent application for Alpha Aviation (aircraft manufacturing);
 - (d) A Private Plan Change rezoning land owned by Meridian 37 Ltd for industrial purposes;
 - (e) A Private Plan Change advanced by WRAL for aircraft navigation lights and facilities at the northern end of the runway;
 - (f) Resource consents for BBC / Tomra’s recently constructed facility on the corner of Airport Road (SH21) and Lochiel Road;
 - (g) Resource consent for Zempire Ltd (a tent manufacturer) on Lochiel Road; and
 - (h) Submission to Future Proof in relation to the proposed Western Development – a proposed 960 ha (approx.) intergenerational development of land between State Highway 3 and the North Island Main Trunk Railway Line.
8. Leading up to the hearing of PC20, I participated in the Expert Caucusing sessions relating to Transport and Planning on 10 and 15 February 2023.

Scope of Evidence

9. I have been engaged by Tabby Tiger Ltd to present planning evidence in relation to its submission and further submission on Plan Change 20 (“**PC20**”). Specifically, my evidence will address the following matters:

- (a) The narrowed scope of Tabby Tiger's submission and further submission;
- (b) The planning background to PC20;
- (c) The need for a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to land use and infrastructure planning in the vicinity of the Hamilton Airport; and
- (d) The way in which PC20 should, in my opinion, be advanced in the absence of the planning referred to above.

Code of Conduct

10. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses 2023 contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

NARROWED SCOPE OF SUBMISSIONS

11. Tabby Tiger lodged a submission and a further submission on PC20. Tabby Tiger's submission supports the purpose of PC20 to rezone additional land surrounding the Airport, from Rural Zone to Airport Business Zone. The proposal to increase the supply of business/industrial zoned land within the Waipa District (and particularly around Hamilton Airport) is supported and is necessary in order to meet the increased demand for industrial zoned land (against a background of constrained industrial land supply).
12. In addition to supporting the rezoning of land as set out in PC20, Tabby Tiger's submission sought the rezoning of additional land on the eastern side of Airport Road from Rural Zone to Airport Business Zone. A number

of other submitters also sought that additional land be rezoned to Airport Business Zone.

13. On 16 February 2023, the Hearing Panel released its decision on the scope of the submissions by Tabby Tiger and others. The Panel determined that:

“... the portions of the relevant submissions relating to rezoning further land beyond that depicted in the notified version of PPC20 are out of “scope” and are struck out on that basis; they will accordingly not be considered at the upcoming hearing of PPC20. This includes submissions by Hamilton City Council (23.7), Tabby Tiger Limited (15.1) and S & M Morales (24.1) as well as those parts of the following further submissions which support or oppose those submissions: Costenuff Trust (FS1), Grass Ventures Limited (FS3), Hamilton City Council (FS10) and Tabby Tiger Limited (FS12).”

14. On the basis of the above, Tabby Tiger will not be pursuing the rezoning of its land as part of PC20. The remaining scope of the submission and further submission by Tabby Tiger (and therefore the scope of my evidence) is as follows:
 - (a) Support for the rezoning of land from Rural Zone to Airport Business Zone as proposed in PC20;
 - (b) A concern about the manner in which planning for land uses in the vicinity of the Hamilton Airport has occurred to date (including PC20); and
 - (c) The need to ensure that the provision of infrastructure, particularly roading, is designed and constructed to provide for the development of land uses in the vicinity of the airport beyond that which will occur as a result of PC20 being approved.

PLANNING BACKGROUND

15. Light industrial land uses surround most medium to large scale airports worldwide. That is largely because they are typically synergistic (e.g., freight and logistics operations) and/or compatible land uses with the

operation of an airport. The same transition of land uses surrounding the Hamilton Airport has been occurring over the last two or three decades.

16. The history of development around the Hamilton Airport has been piecemeal and *ad hoc*. It has occurred as a result of a series of private plan changes and resource consent applications pursued by motivated individual landowners in the airport area. This has included WRAL, Titanium Park and Meridian 37 advancing Private Plan Changes to rezone land for industrial / commercial purposes. Others have advanced resource consent applications for a range of industrial / commercial land uses (e.g., PowerBeat, Narrows Landing, Caroline Eve, BBC / Tomra and Zempire). The relevant planning authorities and infrastructure providers have been reactive to such proposals rather than proactive in terms of planning for activities surrounding the airport. PC20 is the most recent example of this piecemeal planning history being perpetuated.

17. An unfortunate consequence of planning processes like PC20 is that the proponent is forced to address and resolve infrastructure issues, such as the provision of roading upgrades, in the absence of any knowledge, common understanding or agreement as to what will happen in the surrounding environment in the short, medium or long-term including the provision of roading infrastructure by the road controlling authorities. By way of example, no reliance can be placed on the Southern Links roading proposal despite it being designated in the Waipa, Waikato and Hamilton City district plans. Waka Kotahi has, for some time, been undertaking a 'form and function' review of Southern Links. Even when that has been completed, there will be no certainty as to if and when any parts of Southern Links will be constructed in the vicinity in the airport. I also understand there is no certainty associated with the funding and timing of proposed upgrades in the short-term such as the proposed three-arm roundabout at the intersection of Airport Road and Raynes Road.

18. I was involved in a submission to Future Proof (last year) seeking a more comprehensive and visionary approach to the planning for land uses around the airport, however that submission was rejected. This included proposals that would facilitate a rail link to the airport precinct.

19. A coordinated approach is necessary, in my opinion, to identify and plan for land uses and the development of transportation (and other) infrastructure surrounding the airport. This requires Waipa District Council (as the obvious lead agency) to coordinate with Waka Kotahi and consult with all surrounding landowners with development proposals and to prepare an Airport Precinct Development Strategy (or similar) which:
 - (a) Ensures that the airport is able to operate into the future (including any expansions or modifications to its operations) and that surrounding land uses are compatible with the operation of the airport;
 - (b) Recognises and seeks to provide for the development of land for industrial / commercial purposes around Hamilton Airport in the short, medium and long-term. This is not just a zero-sum game of supply and demand for industrial land based on land area (hectares) alone;
 - (c) Sets out the nature of changes to the Waipa District Plan to provide for development around the airport in a wholistic and comprehensive manner (this can/should include staging); and
 - (d) Develops a coordinated plan for the timely provision of infrastructure (roading and three waters) to be delivered by the relevant infrastructure providers to enable the development of the area. This should include responsibilities in terms of funding and delivery of infrastructure.

20. It is hoped that Ahu Ake (the Spatial Plan that Waipa District Council is currently preparing) might be the 'break through' that is required (or to

at least be the start of the process) to achieve the sort of comprehensive planning needed for the airport precinct.

PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE AS PART OF PC20

21. As noted above, an unfortunate consequence of planning processes like PC20 is that the proponent is forced to address and resolve infrastructure issues, such as the provision of roading upgrades to accommodate the traffic generation associated with their proposed development whereas that is a function of Waka Kotahi in relation to the State Highway Network and local authorities in relation to the local roading network.
22. In the absence of the comprehensive planning that I consider is urgently required in relation to the airport precinct, I would urge the Panel of Commissioners to ensure that any required infrastructure upgrades are undertaken in a manner that provides for the ability for that infrastructure to be cost effectively upgraded or expanded in the future to provide for the future development of activities in the wider area. Any infrastructure upgrades that only provide the capacity for the development of the land the subject of PC20 and which do not enable the expansion of that capacity in the future (without having to dig everything up and starting again) would not represent an efficient use of natural and physical resources.
23. In line with the points I have made above, the evidence of Ms Makinson sets out what that could look like in relation to the proposed upgrading of the intersection of Airport Road and Raynes Road. When the time comes to upgrade the proposed roundabout to two lanes (and potentially to a four-arm roundabout), Tabby Tiger is willing to play its part (including making land available and a contribution to a share of the costs if necessary).

24. In terms of PC20, in my opinion, it is appropriate that PC20 be approved subject to an amendment to Rule 10.4.2.13A in the Waipa District Plan as follows (additions underlined based on the version of the rule presented in the s.42A report):

10.4.2.13A The following transport upgrades are required to enable the full development of the Northern Precinct. These upgrades, along with when they will be required, are set out below:

Transport upgrade	Implementation requirement
Upgrading of SH21 / Raynes Road intersection to a 3-arm roundabout	To be completed prior to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any section 224c certificate for subdivision under the RMA being issued for the completion of any subdivision within Northern Precinct; or • Any industrial / commercial activity being able to generate traffic.
Capacity Increase at SH21 / Raynes Road roundabout to double circulating lanes and dual approach lanes	To be completed prior to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any industrial / commercial activity being able to generate traffic that gains access off Raynes Road; or • When the cumulative total consented land area in Northern Precinct with sole access to SH3 roundabout exceeds 80 ha (gross) <p><u>Advice Note:</u> <u>The design of the upgraded roundabout should be undertaken in consultation with Waipa District Council and enable the ability to further upgrade it in the future to accommodate traffic generation associated with additional growth in land uses in the vicinity including the possibility of a fourth arm into the land to the east.</u></p>

25. I would like to emphasise that none of what I am suggesting is seeking to delay Titanium Park in the achievement of its objectives. Rather, I am proposing that the relevant planning agencies and infrastructure providers take a more comprehensive and cost-effective approach to the provision of infrastructure in the vicinity of the airport.

CONCLUSION

26. From a planning perspective, I support the rezoning of land from Rural Zone to Airport Business Zone as proposed in PC20 (i.e. the Northern Precinct).
27. To avoid a continuation of the piecemeal and *ad hoc* approach to date, a coordinated approach is necessary, in my opinion, to identify and plan for land uses and the development of transportation (and other) infrastructure surrounding the airport. This requires Waipa District Council (as the obvious lead agency) to coordinate with Waka Kotahi and consult with all surrounding landowners with development proposals and to prepare an Airport Precinct Development Strategy.
28. In the interim and in terms of PC20, so as to enable an efficient use of natural and physical resources, I have recommended a proposed amendment to Rule 10.4.2.13A in the Waipa District Plan (i.e., the addition of an advice note).



Mark Chrisp

Dated: 7 March 2023