

**BEFORE HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE CENTRAL OTAGO  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or  
**the Act**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Hearing of Submissions and Further  
Submissions on Proposed Plan Change 19  
(**PC19**) to the Central Otago District Plan  
(**CODP** or **the District Plan**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Submissions and Further Submissions on  
Proposed Plan Change 19 by the Doug Jones  
Family Trust and Searell Family Trust No. 2  
(submitter #82)

---

**STAGE 2 – ZONING HEARING  
SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD FORD ON BEHALF OF THE  
DOUG JONES FAMILY TRUST AND SEARELL FAMILY TRUST NO. 2**

Dated: 16 May 2023

---

Presented for filing by:  
Chris Fowler  
PO Box 18, Christchurch  
T 021 311 784 / 027 227 2026  
chris.fowler@saunders.co.nz

## INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Richard Andrew Ford. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief.
2. This Summary of Evidence sets out the key points within my Evidence in Chief.

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

3. The subject land presents a significant number of constraints to the development potential of land including but not limited to: Topography, BLR, existing services, Heritage & Archaeological features, Geotechnical factors, established informal trails and community use patterns.
4. The methodology applied in the Rationale Cromwell Yield Assessment is considered sound on a district or zone level basis, but the approach does not assess realistic yield when considering development potential on an individual site basis.
5. When the same methodology is applied to the subject land specifically, a resultant yield of 80 lots is contemplated under the PC 19 zoning framework. This represents an overestimate of the development potential or realistic yield of the site.
6. An assessment of the development potential of the site has been undertaken:
  - (a) Stage 1 proposed 20 lots pending re-application for consent as per ongoing correspondence with CODC regarding RC 190154,
  - (b) Stage 2 returned a hypothetical 46 lots using a maximum yield approach unlikely to be adopted upon subdivision,
  - (c) Future Development area contains 2.89 ha of LLRZ unburdened by BLR and is therefore unable to yield 14 lots at LLRZ.
7. Under an ODP framework realistic yield of Stage 2 drops to 20 Lots. PC 19 framework would cause further reduction due to increase in minimum lot size.
8. Ms Muir highlighted in the infrastructure report that the proposed rezoning would *exceed current infrastructure planning provisions for level of service and growth*. However, forecasted network capacity is adequate to service the realistic development potential of the proposed rezoning.

9. Upon subdivision, specific engineering design matters can be suitably addressed in line with the operative or proposed engineering standards at that time.
10. For the reasons considered above, I am of the opinion that infrastructure is not an impediment to the proposed rezoning of the subject land.
11. Thank you again for the opportunity to present my evidence and I am happy to address any questions.

Richard Ford  
16 May 2023



---