

BEFORE COMMISSIONER MARK ST. CLAIR APPOINTED BY NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER

the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

IN THE MATTER of an application under section 88 of the Act by **ROBE AND ROCHE INVESTMENTS LIMITED** to the **NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL** for a subdivision to create 113 residential lots and additional road and recreational reserves at 56 Pohutukawa Place, Bell Block. (SUB21/47803)

STATEMENT IN REPLY OF LAWRENCE RYAN MCILRATH ON BEHALF OF ROBE AND ROCHE INVESTMENTS LIMITED

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Lawrence Ryan McIlrath.
- 1.2 I prepared a primary statement of evidence on this matter dated 28 March 2025. In that statement, I describe my qualifications and experience. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the 2023 Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it.

2. SCOPE

- 2.1 During the hearing (14 April 2025), the Commissioner inquired about the structure of household growth that I presented in my evidence (para 7.3). I reference "couples" and "family" households as dominating Bell Block's growth.
- 2.2 In this reply, I provide additional information about household growth patterns – specifically, the modelling approach and results.

3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Economic Assessment Report (provided as Appendix 1 in my primary evidence) draws on Stats NZ data to estimate the growth patterns. I used historic data from various Censuses and forward-looking projections to evaluate past growth patterns and project future trends.

- 3.2 The assessment combines several datasets to provide detailed insights into the composition of households and the anticipated change. The following attributes are used to describe household types:
- (a) Household income;
 - (b) Household age (based on the reference person's age);
 - (c) Household size and composition (e.g., parents and children); and
 - (d) Dwelling tenure and ownership patterns.
- 3.3 Combining the attributes provides insight into the household and dwelling structures across 294 household-types. The analysis uses different combinations to assess specific perspectives, i.e., the type of dwellings that would be required. The reporting is at an aggregate level to avoid 'analysis paralysis'.
- 3.4 The relationship between household types and dwelling types is informed by a comparison of how household-types¹ and dwelling types² changed between periods.
- 3.5 The historic household change, development patterns as per the consent data are described in the Economic Assessment Report³ in the following sections:
- (a) Historic household growth - section 2.1.1 (page 6). The section describes the change in households by type in Bell Block (Table 2.1)
 - (b) Historic dwelling growth – section 2.1.3 (page 9). The section also describes dwelling consents broken down by typology (Table 2.4).
- 3.6 I note that the discussion in the Report covers the absolute change in households (by type) and the percentage change in households across household types. However, the discussion does not cover the relative contribution of each household type towards total growth, i.e., the Commissioner's question.
- 3.7 Using the information in Table 2.1 (in my primary evidence), I estimated the share of total growth caused by the different household types. I also present

¹ From Census data.

² Estimated from consent information.

³ Appendix 1 in my primary statement of evidence.

the proportion of total households in each household type (see **Table 1** below).

Table 1: Bell Block: Households by Type – Share of Growth & Portion of Total

	% of Growth			% of Total		
	2006-13	2013-18	2006-18	2006	2013	2018
Single Person	15%	18%	16%	21%	19%	19%
Couple	40%	32%	37%	28%	31%	31%
Two parent w. children	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%	29%
Single parent w. children	1%	7%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Multi-family Household	3%	6%	4%	12%	10%	9%
Non-family Household	4%	0%	3%	2%	3%	2%
SUM	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Grouped</i>						
<i>Couple</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>37%</i>	<i>28%</i>	<i>31%</i>	<i>31%</i>
<i>Family*</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>36%</i>	<i>30%</i>	<i>30%</i>	<i>31%</i>
<i>SUM</i>	<i>72%</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>73%</i>	<i>58%</i>	<i>61%</i>	<i>62%</i>

** Includes: two parent with children, single parent with children and multi-family households.*

- 3.8 Couple and family households accounted for between 72% and 75% of growth between 2006 and 2013, and 2013-2018, respectively. Over the entire period (2006-2018), family households accounted for 73% of growth in Bell Block.
- 3.9 The comparable figures for New Plymouth district are between 55% and 72% for 2006-2013 and 2013-2018, respectively. The intercensal period between 2006 and 2018 saw 62% of New Plymouth's growth occurring through an increase in couple and family households.
- 3.10 Over the long term (2006-2018), couples and family households captured a larger share of Bell Block's growth than in New Plymouth.
- 3.11 The additional information confirms the observations and findings outlined in the Economic Assessment Report as well as my primary statement of evidence.

Lawrence Ryan McIlrath
Market Economics

23 May 2025