

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of submissions and further submissions on
Hearing Stream 12 – Upper Clutha
Mapping Annotations and Rezoning
Requests

**BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND
(ECONOMICS)
ON BEHALF OF MIKE BERESFORD (SUBMITTER 149)
Dated: 4 April 2017**

Prudence Steven QC
Canterbury Chambers
PO Box 9344
Christchurch 8149

Telephone: (03) 343 9834
Email: pru@prusteven.co.nz

BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND

1. INTRODUCTION

Qualifications

- 1.1. My full name is Michael Campbell Copeland.
- 1.2. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and a Master of Commerce degree in economics.

Experience

- 1.3. I am a consulting economist and 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. I have over 40 years' experience in the application of economics to various areas of business, including resource management matters. During the period 1990 to 1994, I was also a member of the Commerce Commission and during the period 2002 to 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. A summary of my curriculum vitae is **attached as Appendix 1.**
- 1.4. With respect to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), I have prepared evidence for clients covering a number of projects and policies. A selection of these is listed at the end of my curriculum vitae in **Appendix 1.**

Background¹

- 1.5. The South Island Landless Natives Act 1906 awarded blocks of land to approximately 4,000 South Island Maori but the allocation of several of the blocks of land was not implemented. One of these pieces of land was the original Hawea-Wanaka Block located some 40 kilometres north of Wanaka at a place called the "neck" between Lake Wanaka and Lake Hawea. This original Hawea-Wanaka Block was not available for settlement redress for

¹ Material in this section from The Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block; A South Island Landless Natives Act 1906 (SILNA) Block; The Maori Land Court; 2016.

Ngai Tahu in 1998 (because the Crown had granted a 100 lease of the land to another party) and so a substitute piece of land was negotiated. This substitute land is known as the Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block. It has an area of approximately 50.7 hectares and is located just north of the Wanaka township near Lake Wanaka and adjacent to the Peninsula Bay residential area. The land is to be vested in the descendants of the original owners of the original Hawea-Wanaka Block. There are an estimated 1,019 such descendents.

- 1.6. The Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block had its reserve status removed under the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 and is currently held on trust by the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations and the Minister of Maori Affairs. While the land is held in trust by Ministers, all holding costs are being met by the Crown. These costs include rates (approximately \$7,000 per annum for both the Queenstown Lakes District Council and the Otago Regional Council), insurance (currently around \$825 per annum) and forest maintenance costs (varying each year but possibly averaging around \$40,000 per annum²).
- 1.7. Approximately 40.1 hectares of the block is forest, known locally as Sticky Forest or Plantation Forest. The trees are exotic species – Douglas-Fir and Pinus Radiata. The majority of the trees will not be ready for harvest until 2032-2042. Although not a reserve the block is a popular location for mountain biking and is used for organised cycle racing and general recreational cycling (see the evidence of Mr Rob Greenaway).
- 1.8. The shareholder owners of the block have yet to decide on the future use of the block. However an option advanced by the submission of Mr Beresford is for residential development of approximately 20 hectares of the block with the remaining area retained for recreational use. This option would give a higher and more immediate return than continuing with forestry over much of the block, given the time to forest maturity³, the steep terrain of much of the block, access difficulties, consenting issues for forestry within the area of Outstanding Natural Landscape, the ongoing forestry management costs,

² An estimate based on actual forest maintenance costs for 2009/10 and a forecast for 2010/11 provided by PF Olsen.

³ Different parts of the forest have been planted at different times. Also the Douglas-Fir trees have a longer time to full maturity than the Radiata Pine trees. Some of the trees are ready for harvest now and some not for up to 20 years. This means harvesting costs will be higher than if all of the forest could be harvested at the same time. (Source: personal communication from Mr George Platts, P F Olsen Limited)

the relatively small size of the forested area, trucking costs for felled timber⁴ and the fact that past forestry management has not included regular⁵ tree pruning and thinning.⁶

- 1.9. Therefore Mr Beresford has sought a change of zoning from Rural General to Residential which has now been narrowed down to an area of approximately 20 hectares of the Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block. This area is suitable for residential development, whilst the remainder of the block, much of which is on steep terrain, is proposed to be retained in exotic forestry and be available for continued recreational use.

Scope of My Evidence

- 1.10. I have been asked to provide evidence on behalf of Mr Beresford (who I will refer to as the applicant), on the economic effects of the proposed rezoning. My evidence addresses the following matters:
- 1.10.1. The relevance of economic considerations under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**);
 - 1.10.2. The economic benefits of the proposed rezoning;
 - 1.10.3. Some potential economic costs of the proposed rezoning; and
 - 1.10.4. My conclusions.
- 1.11. Although not necessary in respect of council hearings, I confirm I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and I agree to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the hearing committee. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of

⁴ It is likely the trees from Sticky Forest would if harvested be exported as logs via Port Chalmers (Source: personal communication from Mr George Platts, P F Olsen Limited)

⁵Some pruning of the trees on the land was undertaken "several years ago" – see Protection Sought for Sticky Forest Bike Trails; www.stuff.co.nz 20 September, 2016. Mr Beresford in his evidence says he is aware of pruning being undertaken in 2009.

⁶ A report prepared for the Ministry for Primary Industries (Predicting Harvesting and Deforestation of Radiata Pine Forest Blocks Using National Spatial Data Sets; MPI Technical Paper No 2016/50; Barbara Hock, Duncan Harrison and Richard Yao (Scion Research); August 2016) lists factors increasing likelihood of harvesting to include proximity to roads, existing required infrastructure and the ability to share costs with nearby larger forests. Factors increasing likelihood of reforestation include absence of nearby built environment and close proximity to market for logs.

expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

2 ECONOMICS AND THE RMA

Community Economic Wellbeing

- 2.1 Economic considerations are intertwined with the concept of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is embodied in the RMA. In particular, Part 2 section 5(2) refers to enabling “*people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety*” as part of the meaning of “*sustainable management*”, the promotion of which is the purpose of the RMA.
- 2.2 As well as indicating the relevance of economic effects in considerations under the RMA, section 5 also refers to “*people and communities*” (emphasis added), which highlights that, in assessing the impacts of a plan change, it is the impacts on the community and not just the Council or 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. The proposed rezoning enables the owner shareholders and residents and businesses of Wanaka and the wider District to provide for their economic and social well-being. I discuss this later in my evidence.

Economic Efficiency

- 2.3 Part 2 section 7(b) of the RMA directs 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 includes the concept of economic efficiency.⁷ 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”.*⁸

⁷See, for example, in *Marlborough Ridge Ltd v Marlborough District Council* [1998] NZRMA 73 at [86], the Court noted that all aspects of efficiency are “*economic*” by definition because economics is about the use of resources generally.

⁸Pass, Christopher and Lowes, Bryan, 1993, *Collins Dictionary of Economics* (2nd edition), Harper Collins, page 148.

- 2.4 More generally, economic efficiency can be considered in terms of:
- 2.4.1 Maximising the value of outputs divided by the cost of inputs;
 - 2.4.2 Maximising the value of outputs for a given cost of inputs;
 - 2.4.3 Minimising the cost of inputs for a given value of outputs; and
 - 2.4.4 Minimising waste.
- 2.5 The proposed rezoning enables a more efficient use of the applicant's land holding and therefore is consistent with this part of the RMA. I address this later in my evidence.

Viewpoint for Economic Assessment

- 2.6 An essential first step in carrying out an evaluation of the positive and negative economic effects of the proposed rezoning is to define the appropriate viewpoint that is to be adopted. This helps to define which economic effects are relevant to the analysis. Typically a district (city) or wider regional viewpoint is adopted and sometimes a nationwide viewpoint might be considered appropriate.
- 2.7 In the case of the rezoning proposed for Sticky Forest, the actual and potential economic effects will mostly be on owner shareholders and the local community, consisting of residents and businesses of Wanaka and the Queenstown Lakes District. Therefore all three of these viewpoints are relevant.

The Justification for Land Use Controls

- 2.8 Over the past thirty years or so, there has been a growing acceptance in New Zealand and other countries that economic efficiency is maximised when investment decisions are left to individual entrepreneurs or firms, without intervention from Government – i.e. “market based” outcomes. The reason for this is that in theory, a perfectly competitive market, where investment decisions are left to individual entrepreneurs or firms without intervention from Government, achieves an efficient allocation of resources.
- 2.9 The essence of this policy 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".

- 2.10 Despite this, in reality markets are not "perfect", and the presence of "externalities"⁹ affects the working of the market and the results that could be expected from a totally unregulated system of resource allocation. Externalities arise because the actions of individuals or firms sometimes create positive or negative impacts on others.
- 2.11 It is unrealistic to assume that development of particular forms of economic activity and/or the location of that economic activity will not sometimes impose costs on the community in general. Where the developer, and/or those engaged in various forms of economic activity at the site do not face the incidence of these costs, externalities arise and intervention of some form may be justified. In other words, development may create costs or benefits for parties other than those commercially involved in transactions related to the development.
- 2.12 Externalities may be in the form of environmental effects such as visual, cultural, noise, water or air pollution effects. Externalities in an economic context may relate to the provision of infrastructure where a strict user pays system is not in place, and road transport congestion and safety effects.
- 2.13 Consideration of the efficient allocation of resources must encompass the extent to which externalities will or are likely to exist, but the existence of externalities does not necessarily imply the need for intervention. This is because intervention in the market, for example to prevent residential development on around 20 hectares of the Sticky Forest Block, is not costless in that it prevents optimum resource allocation from the perspective of the market. Also there may be external benefits associated with types of development at particular locations, which need to be taken into account. For example as I discuss later in my evidence the proposed rezoning of approximately 20 hectares of the Sticky Forest will enable the retention of the mountain bike tracks through much of the land. Without the rezoning for the beneficiaries to at least get a satisfactory economic return from the land, large parts of the block will eventually need to be milled and replanted. In this scenario the land for various reasons could not continue to be available for recreational use.

⁹Defined 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.

- 2.14 Therefore, from the point of view of community economic well being and economic efficiency, market interventions such as land use constraints 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.
- 2.15 Further, restricting development having considered only potential negative externalities relies on partial or incomplete analysis and will lead to suboptimal outcomes. It ignores not only positive externalities, but also the economic and other benefits inherent in market determined solutions.
- 2.16 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.
- 2.17 This approach is consistent with the requirements under section 32 of the RMA to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and benefits and costs of proposed provisions in district plans.
- 2.18 Later in my evidence I assess the economic externality benefits and costs associated with enabling the Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block beneficiaries to utilise some of their land for residential development.

Intangible Effects

- 2.19 In economics, 'intangible' costs and benefits are defined as those which cannot be quantified in monetary terms. For any project, such effects may include amenity effects, landscape effects, ecological effects, Māori cultural and relationship effects and recreational effects. I would note that such effects may be positive or negative – i.e. a benefit or a cost for a particular community of interest.
- 2.20 Sometimes attempts can be made to estimate monetary values for so called 'intangibles' using techniques such as willingness to pay surveys or inferring values on the basis of differences in property values. However, these techniques are frequently subject to uncertainty and criticism.
- 2.21 In my opinion, it is generally better to not attempt to estimate monetary values for these effects but to leave them to be part of the consideration under s 5 of the RMA. This also avoids the danger of 'double-counting' – i.e. including them

within a quantified measure of efficiency and treating them as a separate matter in the overall judgement under s 5. Later in my evidence I discuss economic effects arising from the recreational benefits of the proposed rezoning of approximately 20 hectares of Sticky Forest. Mr Rob Greenaway discusses these recreational benefits in greater detail in his evidence. Other “intangible” effects relating to landscape are covered in the evidence of Mr William Field.

3 ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE

Economic Efficiency Benefits from Market Based Outcome

- 3.1 The evidence of Mr Michael Beresford describes how the beneficiaries of the Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block are determining the most productive use of their land from their perspective. One possible option involves residential development of part of their land holding and therefore the applicant’s amended request for the rezoning for this part of the block. This would be in effect the market-based outcome described in the previous section of my evidence and would maximise economic efficiency in the absence of economic externality costs.
- 3.2 Mr Beresford describes how consideration has been given to likely net returns from forestry, the difficulties faced with harvesting the existing trees and replanting and maintaining the forest over much of the land, and the delays in providing the beneficiaries a meaningful economic return after over 100 years since the requirement for redress was first acknowledged. As a consequence he has ascertained the possible best use of the land is for part of it to be used for residential development, leaving the rest to be available for continued recreational use by the community.
- 3.3 In my view the Hearing Panel does not need to “second-guess” the beneficiaries’ financial analysis of the alternative uses for their land¹⁰, but needs to consider the extent of benefits and costs for the rest of the community – i.e. residents and businesses of Wanaka and the Queenstown Lakes District – that would arise from the requested change in zoning. I address these later in my evidence.

¹⁰For example it is not a requirement under the RMA to consider a new supermarket’s financial viability on a particular piece of land for which a rezoning is being sought. That is a matter for the supermarket owner to assess, not a Council Hearing Panel or the Environment Court.

- 3.4 However the Hearing Panel should also have regard to the positive economic efficiency benefits from allowing the best use of the land from the perspective of the applicant to be enabled. Under the RMA this is relevant both with respect to:
- 3.4.1 Section 5(2): enabling people and communities (i.e. the beneficiaries) to provide for their economic and social well-being; and
- 3.4.2 Section 7(b): having regard to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.

Economic Benefits from Retention of Mountain Biking Facilities

- 3.5 Mr Rob Greenaway in his evidence describes the recreational values of the existing Sticky Forest mountain biking trails. I understand he considers that these are recognised nationally and even internationally among the mountain biking fraternity. The proposed rezoning will enable the continuation of the use of much of these facilities by residents and visitors thereby providing a non-economic externality benefit to the local community. However there is an economic dimension to this benefit if the Sticky Forest mountain biking facilities encourage visitors to the District or encourage visitors to extend their stay in the District. To this extent the proposed rezoning leads to the retention of, and possible increase in visitor spending, providing employment and incomes in the accommodation, hospitality and other tourism related industries within the local Wanaka and District economies.
- 3.6 If residential development on the block is not possible the beneficiaries will more than likely seek to gain some return from their land by harvesting the existing forest and possibly replanting it. Given returns from the forest will be maximised by harvesting the trees as they reach full maturity, harvesting is likely to occur at different times. Access to the forest will not be possible at these times and for 3 years after any replanting so that pest control can be managed. Also harvesting and replanting is likely to destroy the existing bike trails.¹¹ Therefore without the proposed rezoning recreational and economic

¹¹ Source: personal communication from Mr George Platts, P F Olsen Limited).

benefits from the existing mountain biking activities on the land will be lost at least for an extended period if not in the longer term.

Increased Supply and Competition in the Market for Residential Land Supply

- 3.7 Under the heading “Responsive Planning” the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016, contains a number of policies requiring local authorities such as the Queenstown Lakes District Council with part, or all, of either a medium-growth urban area or high-growth urban area within their district or region to make available sufficient land capable of housing and business development. For example, policy PC1 requires the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

“To factor in the proportion of feasible development capacity that may not be developed, in addition to the requirement to ensure sufficient, feasible development capacity as outlined in policy PA1¹², local authorities shall also provide an additional margin of feasible development capacity over and above projected demand of at least:

20% in the short and medium term, and

15% in the long term.”

- 3.8 The proposed residential rezoning of the Sticky Forest Block is expected to add around 150 sections¹³ to the Wanaka market, at a time of high demand and rapidly increasing prices. In its September 2016 Wanaka Residential Marketbeat Research Newsletter, Bayleys Real Estate highlights the significant growth in the prices for residential sections over the 12 months to the June quarter 2016 when the median section price in Wanaka grew by 32% or \$90,000 to \$370,000. During the same period the number of transactions recorded was four times greater than that recorded in 2011, the bottom of the last cycle. The Newsletter also noted that these official figures possibly understated price and sales growth as the data used excluded all “off the plan sales”.

¹²Policy PA1 relates to local authorities having to ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity with different requirements for the short, medium and long term.

¹³Source: See the evidence of Mr Dean Chrystal.

- 3.9 With respect to increasing competition in the market for the supply of land for residential development the National Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 states¹⁴:

“Competition is important for land and development markets because supply will meet demand at a lower price where there is competition. There are several key features of a competitive land market and development market. These include providing plenty of opportunities for development. Planning can impact on the competitiveness of the market by reducing overall opportunities for development and restricting development rights to only a few landowners.”

This national policy statement requires councils to provide in their plans enough development capacity to ensure that demand can be met. This includes both total aggregate demand for housing and business land, and also the demand for different types, sizes and locations. This development capacity must recognise that not all feasible development opportunities will be taken up. This will provide communities with more choice, at lower prices.”

- 3.10 In addition, Policy PA3 of the National Statement requires that when making planning decisions particular regard be given to:

- “a) Providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses; and*
- c) Limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.”*

- 3.11 The proposed rezoning of Sticky Forest will provide increased choice in the market for the supply of land for residential development in Wanaka. There will also potentially be an increase in the level of competition in this market depending upon the eventual marketing arrangements for the additional sections.¹⁵

¹⁴At page 4.

¹⁵There would be no increase in competition if the sections were ultimately developed and sold by an existing residential land developer in the market.

4 POTENTIAL ECONOMIC EXTERNALITY COSTS

Lost Forestry Production

- 4.1 Lost forestry production is not an external cost of discontinuing forestry on the 20 hectares of land for which rezoning is sought and the residual 30 hectares, which would not be harvested if it was retained for recreational purposes. The productive value of the land in alternative uses has been internalised into the beneficiaries' cost structure for the rezoning. Such costs are not costs to be borne by the wider community and therefore are not economic externality costs.
- 4.2 In any case the increase in the land's rateable value after rezoning will be indicative of the land being used more efficiently than if it continued only as an isolated forestry block.

Utilities

- 4.3 Externality costs can arise when utilities provided by central or local government (e.g. roads, water supply, storm water and flood control systems and wastewater disposal) are not appropriately priced. In the case of the proposed rezoning no such externality costs arise.
- 4.4 Utility costs will be fully met by the developer including connections to bulk utility networks. In addition the developer will be required to pay development levies and section buyers will also make ongoing payments via rates, petrol taxes and road user charges for the future operation and maintenance costs of utilities. Therefore the rezoning will not require other ratepayers of the District to provide subsidised services for the proposed residential development on the block.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 It is proposed to rezone approximately 20 hectares of the 50 hectare Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block known as Sticky Forest so that the beneficiaries can finally gain a meaningful economic return from their land.
- 5.2 The economic externality benefits from the proposed rezoning are:

- 5.2.1 Economic efficiency benefits from a more productive use of the land;
 - 5.2.2 The retention of the existing mountain bike facilities on the land and the associated retention of and possible increase in expenditure by visitors to Wanaka utilising these facilities; and
 - 5.2.3 An increase in the supply of residential sections, and an increase in the level of competition in the market for the supply of land for residential development in Wanaka.
- 5.3 There are no economic externality costs associated with the proposed rezoning of the block.
- 5.4 The proposed rezoning is consistent with:
- 5.4.1 Enabling “*people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety*”; and
 - 5.4.2 Having “*particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources*”.

Michael Campbell Copeland

Date: 4 April 2017

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

DATE OF BIRTH 3 October 1950

NATIONALITY New Zealand

**EDUCATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS** Bachelor of Science (Mathematics) 1971
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, Kiribati, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, 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 Studholme milk processing plant expansion;
- Renewal of resource consents at Fonterra's Edgecumbe, Edendale, Te Rapa and Te Awamutu milk processing plants;
- 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;
- 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 and preparation of evidence for Environment Court hearing;
- 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;
- Assessment of the economic effects of renewal of consents for the Alliance Group's Lorneville meat processing plant;
- Preparation of evidence for Winstone Aggregates in relation to the proposed extension of the Otaki quarry;
- An assessment of the economic benefits of NZTA's Waitarere Beach Road Curves Project, north of Levin;
- 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;

- Preparation of evidence for Darby Planning LP, Soho Ski Area Limited, Treble Cone Investments, Lake Hayes Ltd, Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd and Mount Christina Limited in relation to economic issues concerning the Rural and Rural Recreation and Rural Lifestyle Chapters of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan;
- Preparation of evidence for Coastlands Shoppingtown Limited in relation to the proposed Kapiti Coast District Plan;
- Preparation of evidence for Tinline Properties Limited in relation to a proposed plan change to enable the establishment of an out of centre supermarket;
- The assessment of the economic effects of a proposed Plan Change for safeguarding the future efficient operations of the Rangiora Airfield;
- The assessment of the economic effects of proposed changes to Queenstown Lakes District Plan covering the Jack's Point resort area;
- The assessment of the economic benefits of the development of a marquee golf course in Christchurch;
- Economic assessment of Waitemata Harbour Crossing Project alternatives.