Before the Selwyn District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Proposed Private Plan Change 80 to the Operative

District Plan

and: Two Chain Road Limited

Applicant

Summary of evidence of Ben Turner (real estate)

Dated: 20 October 2022

Reference: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)

LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)





SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF BEN TURNER

- 1 My full name is Benjamin James Winstone Turner. I am a rural real estate agent and company director at Bayleys Canterbury and have held this position for around 18 years.
- 2 My evidence considered the potential market for that part of the PC80 land considered highly productive (by virtue of its LUC 3 classification) on the PC80 site (the *LUC Land*). I understand the LUC Land comprises around 18.1 ha of the eastern end of the site.
- There are many factors that go into a purchaser's decision to buy land for productive purposes including (but certainly not limited to):
 - 3.1 Size of landholdings, and nature of ownership;
 - 3.2 Resource constraints (including availability of water and nutrient allocation);
 - 3.3 Proximity to urban areas;
 - 3.4 The site specific nature of the soils; and
 - 3.5 The ability to borrow and obtain finances from a bank to fund the purchase.
- 4 On top of this, it will be highly relevant what productive use a particular purchaser is looking to use the land for.
- If I was to list for sale the LUC Land comprising PC80 (whether on its own, or in combination with any of the other land comprising PC80), I would not foresee any potential market for anyone looking to use the land in a productive way. This is due to a number of constraints present for the site, including some significant and long-term constraints (in particular relating to water supply and nutrient allocation).
- If I was to list these properties as they currently are, I can see the potential market being to people who are looking to purchase for lifestyle reasons due to the proximity to the heart of Rolleston.
- From my experience, I am confident that the LUC Land is not able to be economically viable for land based primary production for at least 30 years due to a number of long term (and some permanent) onsite constraints.
- I consider that the development of the site as an industrial area as proposed by PC80 is appropriate, despite the fact that the site contains some 18.1 ha of LUC 3 land.

Dated:	20 October 2022	
Ben Tui	rner	