

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed District Plan
Proposed Plan Review (Chapters
21 and 22)

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL COPELAND

21 April 2016

Darby Planning LP (#608),
Soho Ski Area Limited (#610),
Treble Cone Investments (#613)
Lake Hayes Ltd (#763)
Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd (#767)
Mount Christina Limited (#764)

ANDERSON LLOYD
LAWYERS
QUEENSTOWN

Solicitor: M Baker-Galloway R E Hill
(maree.baker-
galloway@andersonlloyd.co.nz/rosie.hill@and
ersonlloyd.co.nz)

Level 2,
13 Camp Street,
PO Box 201,
QUEENSTOWN 9348
DX ZP95010
Tel 03 450 0700
Fax 03 450 0799

1. **Qualifications and Experience**
- 1.1 My full name is Michael Campbell Copeland.
- 1.2 I am a consulting economist and am currently joint managing director of Brown, Copeland and Company Limited, a firm of consulting economists which has undertaken a wide range of studies for public and private sector clients in New Zealand and overseas. During the period July 1990 to July 1994, I was a member of the Commerce Commission and between 2002 and 2008 I was a lay member of the High Court under the Commerce Act. Prior to establishing Brown, Copeland and Company Limited in 1982, I spent six years at the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research and three years at the Confederation of British Industry.
- 1.3 I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and a Master of Commerce degree in economics. A summary of my curriculum vitae is attached as **Appendix 1**.
- 1.4 With respect to the Resource Management Act 1991 (*RMA or the Act*), I have prepared evidence for clients covering a number of development projects and policies. A selection of these is listed in my curriculum vitae in **Appendix 1**.
- 1.5 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed:
 - (a) The reports and statements of evidence of other experts giving evidence relevant to my area of expertise, including:
 - (i) The evidence of Mr Hamish McCrostie;
 - (ii) The evidence of Mr Christopher Ferguson;
 - (iii) The Council s.42A Reports prepared in relation to Chapters 21 and 22 and including the evidence prepared by Mr Philip Osborne.
- 1.6 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with it and I agree to comply with it. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

2 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 I have been asked to prepare evidence on Chapter 21 Rural and Chapter 22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle of the Proposed District Plan ("**PDP**") on behalf of the submitters named on the front cover page of this evidence.
- 2.2 The next part of my evidence sets out some general economic concepts that I believe are relevant to considerations under the RMA. This is followed by an assessment of the economic benefits and costs of:
- (a) Allowing increased residential density within the Rural Lifestyle Zone;
 - (b) Allowing for consolidation, and an increase in the range, of commercial activities within the Ski Area Subzones (SASZs); and
 - (c) Providing for land owned by Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd to be rezoned Rural Residential and a Commercial Overlay to cover the land currently occupied by the Amisfield Wine Cellar and Bistro.

3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 The social and economic well being of people and communities, the efficient development and use of resources and providing opportunities for economic growth and employment are relevant considerations under the RMA.
- 3.2 Reducing the residential density cap in the Rural Lifestyle Zone to 1 residential dwelling per hectare will enable land owners to better meet market demand and lower building, infrastructure and transport costs.
- 3.3 Providing greater certainty about, and an increase in, the range, of activities that can be undertaken within the SASZs will enable better utilisation of the natural and physical resources in the SASZs. It will provide economic benefits not only for commercial operators with activities within the SASZs, but also for businesses and residents throughout the District.

- 3.4 The proposed Commercial Overlay over the land currently occupied by the Amisfield Wine Cellar will enable more efficient use of the investment in existing facilities on the site.
- 3.5 The relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd, Soho, Treble Cone and Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd in relation to Chapters 21 and 22 of the PDP:
- (a) Enables people and communities to provide for their social and economic well being;
 - (b) Is consistent with the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; and
 - (c) Will provide opportunities for economic growth and employment within the Queenstown Lakes District.
- 3.6 I am unaware of any economic costs associated with the relief sought in relation to Chapters 21 and 22 of the PDP. Any environmental or other non-economic costs associated with the relief sought will need to be considered together with the economic benefits I discuss in my evidence as part of the overall judgement under section 5 of the RMA.

4 ECONOMICS AND THE RMA

Community Economic Wellbeing

- 4.1 My evidence addresses economic considerations that are relevant to the concept of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is embodied in the RMA. In particular, section 5(2) refers to enabling “*people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well being*” as a part of the meaning of “*sustainable management*”.
- 4.2 As well as indicating the relevance of economic effects in considerations under the RMA, this section also refers to “*people and communities*”, which highlights that in assessing the impacts of a proposal it is the impacts on the community and not just particular individuals or organisations that must be taken into account. This is underpinned by the definition of “*environment*” which also extends to include people and communities.
- 4.3 However enabling the establishment, sustainability and growth of commercial activities within the Queenstown Lakes District provides

social and economic benefits for its residents and businesses generally and not just financial returns for the individuals and organisations undertaking those activities. I expand on this later in my evidence.

Economic Efficiency

4.4 Section 7(b) of the RMA notes that in achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons “*shall have particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources*” which include the economic concept of efficiency¹. Economic efficiency can be defined as:

“the effectiveness of resource allocation in the economy as a whole such that outputs of goods and services fully reflect consumer preferences for these goods and services as well as individual goods and services being produced at minimum cost through appropriate mixes of factor inputs”².

4.5 More generally economic efficiency can be considered in terms of:

- (a) Maximising the value of outputs divided by the cost of inputs;
- (b) Maximising the value of outputs for a given cost of inputs;
- (c) Minimising the cost of inputs for a given value of outputs;
- (d) Improving the utilisation of existing assets; and
- (e) Minimising waste.

4.6 Enabling the establishment, sustainability and growth of commercial activities within the Queenstown Lakes District will provide economic efficiency benefits for the businesses undertaking these activities and for the District generally through economies of scale and scope.³ I discuss these benefits later in my evidence.

Economic Growth and Employment

4.7 Section 32A 2(a) of the RMA requires reports prepared under the Act to:

¹See, for example, in *Marlborough Ridge Ltd v Marlborough District Council* [1998] NZRMA 73, the Court noted that all aspects of efficiency are “*economic*” by definition because economics is about the use of resources generally.

²Pass, Christopher and Lowes, Bryan, 1993, *Collins Dictionary of Economics* (2nd edition), Harper Collins, page 148.

³ Economies of scope are the economic benefits arising from having complementary activities located in close proximity to each other.

“Identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provision, including the opportunities for:

- (i) Economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
- (ii) Employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced.”*

4.8 This section of the RMA again highlights that economic costs and benefits and economic growth and employment effects are relevant to the preparation of the district plan.

Non-economic Effects

4.9 My evidence addresses the economic effects⁴ of the relief sought by submitters. Non-economic effects (i.e. the environmental, social and cultural effects) are covered in the evidence of other witnesses for the submitters.

4.10 In economics, ‘intangible’ costs and benefits are defined as those which cannot be quantified in monetary terms. Sometimes attempts can be made to estimate monetary values for ‘intangible’ non-economic costs and benefits using techniques such as willingness to pay surveys or inferring values on the basis of differences in property values. Once quantified in monetary terms these effects can supposedly be considered as part of the assessment of economic effects.

4.11 However, such techniques are frequently subject to uncertainty and criticism. In my opinion it is generally better to not attempt to estimate monetary values for these effects but to leave them to be assessed by appropriately qualified experts and for their assessments to form part of the application of the relevant legal test. This also avoids the danger of ‘double-counting’ – i.e. including them within a quantified measure of economic wellbeing or efficiency and treating them as a separate consideration.

⁴Sometimes economic effects can have a social dimension – e.g. employment and income effects.

5 INCREASED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY WITHIN THE RURAL LIFESTYLE ZONE

- 5.1 The specific relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd is set out in the evidence of Mr Christopher Ferguson, but in broad terms it seeks to allow down to 1 dwelling per 1 hectare.⁵ Although with this change the density of residential development within the zone will still remain low, there are a number of economic benefits from the relief sought.
- 5.2 Firstly, the submitter is seeking the changes so that landowners are better able to respond to market demand. There is now a general acceptance in New Zealand and other countries that economic wellbeing and economic efficiency are maximised when investment decisions are left to individual entrepreneurs or firms, without intervention from Government. The essence of this approach is that the efficient use of resources, and therefore "sustainable management" results from the creation of a climate where the market enables people to make investment decisions "to provide for their economic well being". Sometimes "market imperfections" or "externalities"⁶ arise because the actions of individuals or firms create positive or negative impacts on others.
- 5.3 Consideration of the efficient allocation of resources must encompass the extent to which externalities exist, but the existence of externalities does not necessarily imply the need for intervention. This is because intervention in the market, for example to restrict residential density within the Rural Lifestyle zone, is not costless in that it prevents optimum resource allocation from the perspective of the market. Also there may be external benefits associated with enabling higher residential density. Therefore, from the point of view of community economic well being and economic efficiency, market interventions such as residential density controls should only be imposed where clear external costs have been identified and the significance of these external costs is such that it outweighs the costs of the particular form of intervention proposed.

⁵ See requested amendments to Rule 22.5.12.1, Rule 22.5.12.2 and Rule 22.5.12.3.

⁶ Defined as the side effects of the production or use of a good or service, which affects third parties, other than just the buyer and seller.

- 5.4 In other words to justify land use controls, which restrict free market outcomes, externality costs must be identified and they must be significant enough to outweigh the inherent cost of not allowing a free market solution and any positive externalities that may be associated with that free market solution. Specifically with respect to the requested lowering of the residential density cap in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, meeting market demand should be enabled unless significant negative externalities from doing so are apparent.
- 5.5 Secondly, higher density residential development is consistent with economic efficiency to the extent that building costs and infrastructure services' costs are lower. Similarly, higher density residential development is generally consistent with lower transport costs. However, with respect to both infrastructure services' costs and transport costs, savings will only occur if the "without scenario" (i.e. what will occur without the relief sought) will be greater low density development within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. If instead without the relief sought, there is greater residential development in other higher density zones infrastructure and transport costs will not be reduced by the relief sought. However market participants would be frustrated by having to settle for a less preferred residential location.
- 5.6 Thirdly, to the extent that the relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd attracts more residents to Queenstown (i.e. if without the relaxation in Rural Lifestyle Zone residential density, persons who would have chosen to live within the District choose to reside outside the District), population, employment and economic growth within the District will be higher.
- 5.7 Whilst there may be environmental or other non-economic costs associated with the relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd, I am unaware of any economic costs that would arise from the proposed relaxation of residential density sought within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

6 ACTIVITIES IN THE SASZs

- 6.1 The specific relief sought by Soho Ski Area Limited (Soho) and Treble Cone Investments (Treble Cone) is set out in the evidence of Mr Christopher Ferguson. In broad terms by amending the definition of SASZ activities allowed, they seek greater certainty about and an increase in, the range of activities that can be undertaken within the SASZs. These relate to:

- (a) Access facilities and infrastructure;
- (b) Visitor accommodation associated with skiing and other recreational activities,
- (c) Commercial activities (including ticketing, offices, restaurants, cafes, equipment hire and retailing) associated with skiing and other recreational activities;
- (d) Ski area operations, including avalanche control, ski patrol and the use of equipment and vehicles to support skiing and other recreational activities;
- (e) Snow making infrastructure installation and operation; and
- (f) Service infrastructure including water, wastewater disposal, telecommunications and electricity.

6.2 The evidence of Mr Hamish McCrostie sets out the rationale for the relief sought by Soho and Treble Cone. In essence the relief will enable:

- (a) Better utilization of the SASZs' natural resources and the investment in facilities and equipment and their utilization for a longer period of time each year;
- (b) The offering of an enhanced, safer and more competitive experience for visitors to the SASZs;
- (c) Synergies between the range of commercial activities undertaken within the SASZs;
- (d) Increased sustainability of commercial activities undertaken within the SASZs; and
- (e) Economies of scale and scope with respect to the commercial activities undertaken within the SASZs.

6.3 Enabling better utilisation of the natural and physical resources located within the SASZs is consistent with having regard to *“the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources”* as required under section 7(b) of the RMA. In addition increasing the range of activities available, lengthening the seasons and improving the attractiveness and competitiveness of commercial activities within the SASZs will have wider economic benefits for the District. It will lead to increased demand for goods and services from businesses throughout the District,

increasing and/or sustaining economic growth, employment opportunities and incomes. In turn this will bring about efficiency improvements and improvements in economic wellbeing through economies of scale in the provision of goods and services, increased competition and improved utilisation of infrastructure and other public and private sector assets.

- 6.4 Finally the relief sought by Soho and Treble Cone is consistent with attracting higher spending visitors to the District more frequently and for longer periods. This will provide District-wide economic benefits
- 6.5 Whilst there may be environmental or other non-economic costs associated with the relief sought by Soho and Treble Cone, I am unaware of economic costs that would arise from the proposed measures to enhance commercial activities within the SASZs. Obviously should there be environmental or other non-economic costs associated with more intensive commercial activity within the SASZs, then this will eventually diminish the quality of the “product” on offer with consequent economic costs for operators and the District generally. Commercial entities operating within the SASZs have a vested interest in ensuring this does not occur.

7 AMISFIELD COMMERCIAL OVERLAY

- 7.1 The specific relief sought by Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd is set out in the evidence of Mr Christopher Ferguson. The proposal is to rezone the land subject to its submission as Rural Residential and to identify a Commercial Overlay over that portion of the land that currently is occupied by the Amisfield Wine Cellar and Bistro. This will enable an expansion in the range of activities that can take place on the site. In addition to the existing sales of its own wines and restaurant, it is wishing to enable conferences and events, weddings and functions, exhibitions and retail sales of regionally produced food and wine. This would enable a more efficient utilisation of the investment in existing facilities on the site.
- 7.2 To the extent that the relief sought by Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd leads to more economic activity within the District, there will be economic benefits from increased economic growth and employment. However, more realistically the site will compete with other locations within the District for hosting the extended range of activities. There are economic

benefits from increased competition as well as from enabling market determined outcomes, as I have discussed earlier in my evidence. It is also beneficial for the District to have a range of alternative competing venues for hosting events and functions to attract visitors to the District. Maintaining and/or enhancing the “offering” will have positive impacts on the District’s economic growth and employment.

- 7.3 Whilst there may be environmental or other non-economic costs associated with the relief sought by Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd, I am unaware of economic costs that would arise from its proposal.

8 SECTION 42A REPORTS AND EVIDENCE

Council’s Section 42A Report: Chapter 21 Rural

- 8.1 At paragraph 14.36 (page 60), this report states:

“I do not support residential activity or subdivision for residential activity. I consider that enabling residential activity and subdivision in the Ski Area Sub Zones could have the potential to impinge on the viability of these areas”.

- 8.2 I am unsure what the author means by “viability”. The “financial viability” of activities within the SASZs is for commercial enterprises to address not the PDP. However where the provision of accommodation is for visitors or employees it will potentially improve financial viability in that an improved offering can be made to visitors and employee transport and time costs can be reduced.

Council’s Section 42A Report: Chapter 21 Rural Residential and Lifestyle

- 8.3 At paragraph 6.1 (page7), this report states:

“The purpose of both the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones is generally to provide residential living opportunities within specific locations amidst the wider Rural Zone.”

- 8.4 Whilst acknowledging this may be the main purpose of these zones, there are also commercial activities located within these zones and development of further such activities (or redevelopment of existing activities) should be permitted if their effects can be appropriately managed. In this regard the Commercial Overlay proposed for the Lakes Hayes Cellars Ltd's land currently occupied by its wine cellar and bistro

may provide for more efficient use of the site without detracting from the surrounding rural residential environment.

8.5 At paragraph 9.14 (page 22), this report states:

"The primary purpose of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones is to provide rural living opportunities and maintain rural amenity. I consider that enabling commercial activities is going too far and the impacts on amenity generally from commercial activities, on the (at times) quietness and spaciousness of residences in the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones is not supported. Additionally, and compared to the surrounding Rural Zone, I do not consider commercial activities should be as readily contemplated because the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones are not as expansive as the Rural Zone."

8.6 Again I question why commercial activities should not be permitted within the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones if their effects can be appropriately managed. Also commercial activities can add to the amenity benefits of residential areas – e.g. the provision of services (restaurants, cafes, stores, etc.) and employment opportunities within close proximity to places of residence.

Mr Osborne's Evidence

8.7 Mr Philip Osborne, an economic consultant, has prepared some evidence on behalf of the Queenstown Lakes District Council and which has informed the officer's section 42A reports. Mr Osborne's evidence addresses:

- (a) The significant economic contribution that tourism makes to the local District economy and the Otago regional and New Zealand economies;
- (b) The reliance of this contribution on Queenstown Lakes District's outstanding natural landscape;
- (c) The potential risk to this contribution from inappropriate tourism activities within the District's rural zones; and
- (d) The contribution of "rural activities" (defined to include "primary farming to viticulture") to the local District economy and to the

protection or maintenance of the District's natural landscape and environment.

- 8.8 Mr Osborne's evidence does not address the specific relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd, Soho, Treble Cone and Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd.
- 8.9 Whilst not disputing the linkage between the economic contribution of tourism to the local (and regional and national) economy(s) and the District's outstanding natural landscape, I think it important to recognise that this economic contribution would not materialise without a wide range of tourism activities and facilities which are located throughout the District, including within rural zones.
- 8.10 It is beyond my areas of expertise to assess the extent to which rural activities such as farming and viticulture protect the District's landscape and environment. However I note that there are many areas of agriculture and viticulture activities elsewhere in New Zealand that do not generate the level of economic benefits from tourism as do the mix of activities within the Queenstown Lakes District. Clearly there are other components, including the development of recreational and other facilities and activities within the rural zones of the District, which have contributed to the significant contribution of tourism to the Queenstown, Otago and national economies.
- 8.11 Therefore I would caution against controls on alternative land uses within rural zones and which are directed only at the protection of farming and viticulture. Keeping rural land prices artificially low through restrictions on alternative land uses, in an attempt to maintain the financial viability of farming and viticulture, prevents land (and other) resources being directed towards their highest and best use. If particular environmental or other externality costs are associated with particular alternative land uses, these should be addressed directly. It is not consistent with the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources to impose blanket controls on alternative land uses to prop up the financial viability of selected rural activities such as farming and viticulture.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 For the reasons identified in my evidence, the relief sought by Lake Hayes Ltd, Soho, Treble Cone and Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd in relation to Chapters 21 and 22 of the PDP:

- (a) Enables people and communities to provide for their social and economic well being;
- (a) Is consistent with the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; and
- (b) Will provide opportunities for economic growth and employment within the Queenstown Lakes District.

Michael Copeland

Dated this 21st day of April 2016

APPENDIX 1:**CURRICULUM VITAE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND**

DATE OF BIRTH	3 October 1950
NATIONALITY	New Zealand
EDUCATIONAL	Bachelor of Science (Mathematics) 1971
QUALIFICATIONS	Master of Commerce (Economics) 1972

PRESENT POSITIONS

(Since 1982)	Economic Consultant, Brown, Copeland & Co Ltd
(Since 2010)	Director, Healthcare New Zealand Holdings Limited

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

1978-82	NZ Institute of Economic Research Contracts Manager/Senior Economist
1975-78	Confederation of British Industry Industrial Economist
1972-75	NZ Institute of Economic Research Research Economist
1990-94	Member, Commerce Commission
2001-06	West Coast Regional Council Trustee, West Coast Development Trust
2002-08	Lay Member of the High Court under the Commerce Act 1986
2003-11	Director, Wellington Rugby Union
2010-13	Director, Southern Pastures

GEOGRAPHICAL EXPERIENCE

- New Zealand
- Australia
- Asia (Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, People's Republic of China, Philippines, Tajikistan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam)
- South Pacific (Cook Islands, Fiji, Tokelau, Tonga, Vanuatu, Western Samoa)
- United Kingdom

AREAS OF PRIMARY EXPERTISE

- Agriculture and Resource Use Economics (including Resource Management Act)
- Commercial Law and Economics (including Commerce Act)
- Development Programme Management

- Energy Economics
- Industry Economics
- Transport Economics

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT SPECIFIC PROJECTS

- Port storage facilities at Westport;
- The proposed Clifford Bay ferry terminal;
- The proposed pipeline and related facilities to utilise water from the Waikato River for metropolitan Auckland;
- A container terminal expansion by the Ports of Auckland;
- The proposed Variation No. 8 to the Wellington City District Plan covering height and other controls on development of the airspace above the Wellington railway yards;
- Proposed expansion of Paraparaumu town centre within the Kapiti Coast District;
- Wellington City Council's heritage preservation policy;
- Solid Energy's proposed West Coast Coal Terminal at Granity;
- Solid Energy's Mt William North coal mine at Stockton in the Buller District;
- The proposed Waimakariri Employment Park;
- The designation of land for a proposed motorway extension in the Hawke's Bay;
- The Hastings District Council's Ocean Outfall – two consent renewal applications;
- A proposed new shopping and entertainment centre in Upper Hutt;
- Rezoning of land in Upper Hutt from Business Industrial to Residential;
- New regional correctional facilities in Northland, South Auckland, Waikato and Otago;
- Proposed controls on wake generation by vessels travelling within the waterways of the Marlborough Sounds;
- The expansion of marina facilities within the Marlborough Sounds;
- Southern Capital's proposed new township at Pegasus Bay, north of Christchurch;
- Renewal of water resource consents for the Tongariro Power Development Scheme;
- Economic analysis inputs to a Section 32 report for the Waitaki Water Allocation Board;
- The imposition of land use restrictions within noise contours surrounding Christchurch International Airport;
- The expansion of the Whangaripo Quarry in Rodney District;
- The economic significance of Winstone's proposed quarry at Wainui, in the north of Auckland City;
- A proposed five star hotel development for Wanaka;
- Holcim's proposed new cement plant near Weston in the Waitaki District;
- TrustPower's proposed new wind farm at Mahinerangi in Central Otago;
- TrustPower's proposed new Arnold hydroelectric power scheme on the West Coast;
- McCallum Bros and Sea Tow Limited's appeal before the Environment Court regarding extraction of sand from the Mangawhai-Pakiri embayment north of Auckland;
- The development of the Symonds Hill pit at Winstones' Hunua Quarry;
- The rezoning of land for residential development at Peninsula Bay, Wanaka;

- The rezoning of land for more intensive residential development at PekaPeka on the Kapiti Coast;
- A gondola development for the Treble Cone skifield;
- A gondola development for the Snow Farm and Snow Park skiing and snowboarding facilities;
- The extraction of gravel from the bed of the Shotover River;
- The proposed Hilton hotel development on Wellington's Queen's Wharf;
- Land use restrictions in relation to the Runway Extension Protection Areas for Christchurch International Airport;
- A new residential and commercial development by Apple Fields at Belfast on the outskirts of Christchurch;
- A proposed business park development on land at Paraparaumu Airport;
- The proposed redevelopment of Wellington's Overseas Passenger Terminal;
- The proposed Central Plains irrigation scheme in Canterbury;
- The staging of residential and business development at Silverdale North in the Rodney District;
- The redevelopment of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre;
- A Plan Change enabling the relocation of existing development rights for a residential and commercial development on Mount Cardrona Station in the Queenstown Lakes District;
- A new Pak'n Save supermarket at Rangiora;
- New supermarkets at Kaiapoi, Whitby, Silverstream and Havelock North;
- The extension of the TeRereHau wind farm in the Tararua District;
- MainPower's proposed new wind farm at Mount Cass;
- Fonterra's proposed new milk processing plant at Darfield and its subsequent expansion;
- Fonterra Pahiatua milk powder plant expansion;
- Fonterra's proposed new coal mine in the Waikato District;
- Assessment of the economic significance of ANZCO's Canterbury operations to the Canterbury regional economy;
- Resource consent extensions for Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited's gold mining operations at Macraes Flat in north-east Otago, the Globe Mine at Reefton and a proposed underground gold mine at Blackwater on the West Coast;
- Designation of land for NZTA's Waterview motorway project in Auckland;
- Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA's Transmission Gully motorway project in Wellington;
- Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA's MacKays to PekaPeka Expressway;
- Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA's PekaPeka to Otaki Expressway;
- Resource consents for NZTA's Basin Reserve Bridge Project;
- Resource consents for NZTA's Puhoi to Warkworth motorway extension;
- Resource consents for the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme;
- Assessment of the economic effects of a Queenstown Airport Corporation's proposed Notice of Requirement for the designation of additional land for aerodrome purposes;
- Assessment of the retail effects of proposed Plan Change 19 to the Queenstown Lakes District's District Plan;
- Assessment of the regional and national economic significance of Lyttelton Port;

- The economic benefits of utilising a Recovery Plan under the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act for the rehabilitation and enhancement of facilities at Lyttelton Port;
- The economic effects of the Lyttelton Port Company's Capital Dredging Project;
- Meridian's proposed new Mokihinui hydro scheme;
- Assessment of the economic effects of alternative wreck recovery options for the MV Rena;
- Assessment of the economic benefits and costs of Transpower's corridor management approach to giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission in District and City Plans;
- Assessment of economic effects of a proposed extension to Arrowtown's urban boundary;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of overhead deployment of ultrafast broadband infrastructure;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of the proposed Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme;
- Preparation of evidence for Transpower in relation to the proposed Ruakura development on the outskirts of Hamilton City;
- Preparation of two reports reviewing the economic benefits of the Hobbiton movie set at Matamata;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of renewal of a water discharge consent for Silver Fern Farm's Belfast meat processing plant;
- Preparation of evidence for Transpower in relation to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan;
- Preparation of evidence for Transpower, Ngāi Tahu Property Limited, the Lyttelton Port Company, Canterbury International Airport Limited, Tailorspace Limited, Church Property Trustees, the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Christchurch, Pacific Park Limited, Fulton Hogan and the Christchurch Aggregates Producers Group in relation to the Proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan.