

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY  
THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

**IN THE MATTER** of a submission under clause 6 of the First Schedule of the RMA by Alistair John Dugald Cameron in relation to the proposed zoning of an eight hectare lot located on the eastern side of the Ashley township and being Lot 1 DP 394101 RT 376526

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

**OF** Waimakariri District Council Hearing on Proposed District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF PETER LLOYD GLASSON**

**22 JULY 2024**

---

- 1 My name is Peter Lloyd Glasson. My qualifications and experience are as set out in my Evidence in Chief. This summary evidence should be read in conjunction with my Evidence in Chief (04 March 2024), and Supplementary evidence (04 July 2024), relating to a request for rezoning of an eight hectare property at 2 Auckland St, Ashley ("the Property").
- 2 The Property is presently zoned Rural in the Operative Plan, and Rural Lifestyle Zone ("RLZ") in the Proposed Plan. A rezoning to Settlement Zone ("SETZ") is sought. This would permit approximately 90 lots. However, the Submitter, if the Property is rezoned to SETZ, would subdivide it into approximately 70 lots with an 800m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size.
- 3 A Draft scheme plan of subdivision for the Property was attached to my Evidence in Chief. I submitted an Outline Development Plan with my Supplementary Evidence.
- 4 My Evidence in Chief also attached reports on servicing (potable water, stormwater, wastewater), flooding, geotechnical, and soil analyses. Some additional material was submitted by way of Supplementary Evidence. I consider that these reports, as well as the additional supplementary material, satisfies the matters relating to these subjects. More detailed engineering analysis of these issues will be undertaken and resolved at the subdivision consent stage.
- 5 The proposed SETZ of the Property will enable the only logical expansion of the Ashley township allowing an urban form on the Property that directly abuts the existing township and is of a similar form and intensity, and further consolidates the existing township. I also consider that the proposed rezoning will not cause any reverse sensitivity issues with respect to the existing Daiken MDF operation (1400m distant) and over 800m from the nearest Daiken owned but undeveloped zoned land. I have specific and in-depth experience in MDF plant operation, and it is my view that the rezoning of the Property will not result in reverse sensitivity issues arising from the proposed rezoning of the Property to SETZ.
- 6 Ashley is approximately 3.5 kilometres from the Rangiora northern "Park & Ride" facility on River Road. This is the closest point of public transport to Ashley. A dedicated cycleway links the two locations. I consider that a 'denser' location of new dwellings, such as that proposed, is much more likely to increase the likelihood of the extension of public transport than the further proliferation of rural lifestyle sections in the general locality.



- 7 An additional major advantage of the rezoning to SETZ is the development of a reticulated wastewater system and sewer main to the existing Cones Road sewage pumping station that may otherwise not be undertaken at Ashley. Over time, existing and infill development will be able to connect to this system. It will also support the existing services in the township of the pub, school, preschool, and tennis club, and make the addition of further services over time a more realistic possibility
- 8 In my view the NPS-HPL is not applicable to the site and especially that the loss of eight hectares of Class 3 land is insignificant compared with the advantages of allowing the expansion of the township.
- 9 With respect to the NPS-UD the rezoning will allow residential expansion and growth in a consolidated urban form and density, and provide a residential product at an affordable price point compared to other housing formats elsewhere within the District.
- 10 The Property is located outside of the Greater Christchurch boundaries and is therefore not subject to the provisions of Chapter 6 (Map A) (Policy 6.3.9) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The proposed rezoning is neither within an existing urban area nor within a greenfield priority area. However, it is my view that its proximity directly abutting the existing Ashley township and its provision of services provides reason for its rezoning.
- 11 The proposed rezoning and residential development is in accordance with Chapter 5 (Policy 5.3.1) of the CRPS. The proposed rezoning of the Property will concentrate a development directly alongside an existing urban area and will be in accordance with an existing urban form and character.
- 12 If there is to be consideration of the question of "need" for the rezoning, then it is my view that the proposed rezoning is a significantly better use and more efficient use of land than either (1) rezoning the Property to large lot residential zone (LLRZ) or (2) allowing further LLRZ (5,000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size) or RLZ (4 ha minimum lot size) land elsewhere north of Rangiora township. This approach is in accordance with the objectives of the NPS-HPL and the NPS-UD.
- 13 It is my view that once land is rezoned to either LLRZ or RLZ, it is much less likely that the land will be used for productive rural purposes. It appears from the proposed rezoning and the other provisions that further

future development of land for residential development or at least LLRZ is proposed. Considered in this context, it is my view that a much more efficient approach is the rezoning of the subject Property to SETZ.

- 14 Unfortunately, over the years I have seen many instances where the rezoning of *sufficient* land to match demand has not occurred in a timely fashion and market pricing has been affected as a result. In addition, the threshold to the successful rezoning of land in the planning process has increased significantly with increased cost and significantly greater timeframes.
- 15 I do not consider that the process requiring the assessment of demand every three years (as required by the Waimakariri Residential Capacity and Demand Model), combined with the rezoning process, is nimble enough to avoid negative market effects. I remain sceptical of the ability of planners and other allied professionals, in particular, and humans in general, to predict the future with much degree of certainty.
- 16 Overall, I consider that the proposed rezoning is in accordance with the NPS-UD. The Property abuts an existing urban environment and is the most logical, and possibly the only direction of growth for the Ashley township. It will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.
- 17 Based on the existing Ashley township, I have recommended that the Property be developed on the basis of 800m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size – although the existing township itself can be developed on the basis of 600m<sup>2</sup> lot size. I consider that the 800m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size can be provided by way of a rule in the Plan.
- 18 In my opinion, there is no resource management reason why the Property should not be rezoned to SETZ.



.....  
**Peter Glasson**

**22 July 2024**