

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 13  
– Queenstown Mapping  
Annotations and  
Rezoning Requests

---

**REPLY OF ULRICH GLASNER  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**6 October 2017**

---

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / H L Baillie  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. JARDINE FAMILY AND REMARKABLES STATION (715).....	1
3. SEAN MCLEOD (391).....	2
4. MIDDLETON FAMILY TRUST (336/338).....	2
5. BODY CORPORATE 22362 (389).....	2
6. HURTELL PROPRIETARY LIMITED & OTHERS (97).....	3
7. ALPINE ESTATE LIMITED (450).....	3

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** My name is Ulrich Wilhelm Glasner. I prepared a statement of evidence in chief and rebuttal on infrastructure issues, for the Queenstown Mapping Hearing Stream 13. My qualifications and experience are listed in my evidence in chief dated 24 May 2017.

**1.2** The purpose of this reply evidence is to specifically respond to matters raised by the Panel during the course of the hearing. In particular, my reply relates to the following submissions:

- (a) Gertrude's Saddlery (494) and Larchmont Developments (527);
- (b) Jardine Family and Remarkables Station (715);
- (c) Frankton Flats North;
- (d) Sean McLeod (391);
- (e) Middleton Family Trust (336/338);
- (f) Body Corporate 22362 (389);
- (g) Hurtell Proprietary Limited & others (97); and
- (h) Alpine Estate Limited (450).

## **2. JARDINE FAMILY AND REMARKABLES STATION (715)**

**2.1** Based on the information provided, Lowe Environmental Impact Ltd, wastewater report 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2017 and MWH/Stantec Groundwater Take report 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017, I remain of the opinion that there is insufficient evidence to assure the Council that the wastewater from the full extent of residential development enabled by the rezoning (i.e. in the order of around 541 residential units in addition to those enabled by the notified PDP) can be appropriately disposed of without adverse effects on the environment.

**2.2** Specifically, the assessment around the groundwater bore supply by MWH/Stantec has not addressed the risk from a wastewater treatment facility in close proximity. Alternative solutions around wastewater disposal were not assessed or considered by the submitter.

**3. SEAN MCLEOD (391)**

**3.1** It was raised at the hearing by Mr McLeod that the infrastructure calculations were based on 10.7ha when in fact the relevant Body Corporate is approximately 50ha.

**3.2** While this information is helpful I still require further information around density to rerun my infrastructure calculations.

**3.3** In addition, network modelling for water supply and wastewater is required to assess the impact of the proposed increase of the development site up to approximately 50ha.

**3.4** Due to this lack of information I continue to oppose the rezoning.

**4. MIDDLETON FAMILY TRUST (336/338)**

**4.1** Mr Geddes filed a summary statement of primary evidence dated 14 August at the hearing and attached, as his Attachment A, a copy of an email between myself and Chris Hansen dated 15 August 2017. In that email I confirm that I agree in principal to Mr Hansen's solution to the wastewater problem, being a low pressure sewer system.

**4.2** In principle, I agree with the content of Mr Hansen's email from 28 July 2017, which is the last page of Mr Geddes' Attachment A. In this email, Mr Hansen explains the low pressure sewer system as a solution as he could not attend the hearing.

**4.3** A low pressure sewer system with on-site storage for up to 24 hours could reduce peak flows and stagger discharge in the existing network out of peak times.

**4.4** Based on this I no longer oppose the rezoning request.

**5. BODY CORPORATE 22362 (389)**

**5.1** Mr McLeod for the Body Corporate questioned at the hearing, and in his summary, the 130 additional units I use to estimate whether the water and sewage infrastructure near the existing Goldfields area is

nearing capacity if the land were rezoned from Low Density Residential (**LDR**) to Medium Density Residential (**MDR**). Mr McLeod considers the 130 figure is unrealistic and considers the real figure is more likely to be zero (as stated in his summary), or perhaps 30 additional units (as Mr McLeod explained at the hearing), with no increase in demand on infrastructure.

**5.2** Having considered Mr McLeod's explanation as to how he got to the 30 additional unit figure, I agree with his opinion. However, while I consider that this decrease in the number of units is an improvement, I consider that the information is just not available to say whether 30 additional units would be acceptable or not from an infrastructure perspective. From the models we do not know what the trigger point is for an upgrade. Therefore I continue to oppose this rezoning.

**6. HURTELL PROPRIETARY LIMITED & OTHERS (97)**

**6.1** Hurtell and others have sought that 1.5 ha of land be rezoned from LDR to High Density Residential (**HDR**), which I opposed because the existing model shows FW3 firefighting demand is not available. I have been asked to consider what my view would be if the land was rezoned from LDR to MDR instead.

**6.2** An HDR zoning could yield 67 additional residential lots, while a MDR zoning would yield an additional 18 additional residential lots. I consider that this is an improvement over an HDR zoning. FW2 firefighting demand would be anticipated in an MDR zone and the model shows that FW2 can be provided in the future without any upgrades.

**7. ALPINE ESTATE LIMITED (450)**

**7.1** Alpine Estate sought that 1.9 ha of land be rezoned from LDR to HDR, which has a potential yield of 84 additional residential lots. I opposed this submission, from an infrastructure perspective, because it would be a substantial increase in load that may require an upgrade of the existing wastewater infrastructure.

- 7.2** However, subsequent to filing my evidence in chief a Special Housing Area is now being implemented on this land for 88 units, which is less than the potential yield under an HDR zoning (112 in total).
- 7.3** Through the SHA process infrastructure will be considered, however no evidence has been provided through the PDP process that shows an upgrade of existing infrastructure is not required. Therefore there is insufficient evidence in this hearing for me to change my position. Consequently, I still oppose the rezoning.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Glasner', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

**Ulrich Glasner**  
**6 October 2017**