

**BEFORE A HEARING COMMISSIONER APPOINTED BY ASHBURTON
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

IN THE MATTER OF PC0001/23 - Plan Change 6 to the Operative
Ashburton District Plan – Pajanti Limited 259 Alford
Forest Road, Ashburton

**EVIDENCE OF DAVID HARFORD
ON BEHALF OF PAJANTI LIMITED**

Date: 29 JANUARY 2025

1. INTRODUCTION, QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERTISE

- 1.1 My name is David Harford. I am an independent Planning Consultant and Director of David Harford Consulting Ltd (DHCL). I have a Bachelor of Resource Studies (Lincoln University), and I am an associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (“NZPI”). I have been involved in resource management for both local government and in a private capacity for over 27 years.
- 1.2 In preparing this evidence, although this is not the Environment Court, I acknowledge that I have read the code of conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note (2014). I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state 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 that I express.
- 1.3 This evidence is given in support of the matters raised in the Planning Officers Section 42A report under the RMA prepared by Lauren Wright (Planning Officer) on 21st January 2025.
- 1.4 I am authorised to give this evidence on behalf of Pajanti Ltd.

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 In preparing this evidence I have read the planning officer report, and it accurately describes the details of the application, subsequent amendments and the submissions lodged on the proposal.
- 2.2 The amendments I refer are described under Section 3.1 of the Officer Report *Background to the Plan Change*.
- 2.3 I wish to record that I support and agree with the findings in the officer report approving Plan Change 6 with no additional amendments except where I make comments below.

3. OVERVIEW & CONCLUSIONS FROM THE OFFICER REPORT AND SUBSEQUENT MATTERS

- 3.1 I note the officer report mentions the possibility of no hearing being required under paragraph 2.1.4 of her report. I am happy with that outcome as we now

have no submitters who request to be heard and unless the hearing commissioner wishes to discuss any matters or concerns in person regarding the Plan Change, I consider the commissioner could make a decision off “the papers”.

- 3.2 Under 3.2.1 Figure 1. This shows the draft scheme plan as it is intended to be applied for as part of the Subdivision Consent application to be lodged with the Council following the Plan Change approval (should it be approved).
- 3.3 However, the Outline Development Plan (ODP) contained in Figure 2 is accurate in relation to road, right of way position and the no build line however I would suggest we can provide a version that removes the cadastral outlines that show the underlying current title or legal description boundaries. The reason I raise this minor point is that it may create some confusion when people read the District Plan and see the outline of the existing cadastral boundaries shown thinking that is the layout. I don't consider they are necessary for the ODP.
- 3.4 Under 3.1.5 of the officer report, the matter of the possible extension of the Residential C zone to encompass adjoining land to the south was raised in the Plan Change application. I have spoken with that landowner (PGB Holdings Ltd) since lodgement of the application, and it may well be that landowner may wish to pursue their own Private Plan Change in the future to achieve a Residential C zoning. This needs no further discussion at this point, and it is merely raised in that the proper process would be followed should that landowner wish to achieve the same zoning as sought by Pajanti Limited.
- 3.5 I agree with the comment made by the Planning Officer at 3.1.6 with regards to use of the draft scheme plan at Figure 1 as part of the ODP or rules for PC 6. This is not required as the Residential C zone and subdivision standards in the District Plan would address that and further, the subsequent subdivision application for the site would address all matters of subdivision linked to a subdivision scheme plan submitted as part of an application for approval by the Council including approval from NZTA.
- 3.6 As far as the NZTA are concerned it is considered that as they have been satisfied with the agreements in principle reached in terms of this Plan Change application and have not requested to be heard, written approval as part of the subdivision application and land use consent application (access to a State Highway District Plan Transport Standard) should not be an issue.

3.7 In terms of Environment Canterbury, the proposal is in accordance with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which will be addressed as part of the future subdivision application to the Ashburton District Council.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 For the reasons set out in this evidence, the recommendation to approve the Plan Change with no further amendments, and acceptance of the two submissions, is supported.

David Harford

29 January 2025