

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan Hearing Stream
13 (Queenstown Mapping Hearings)

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY JOHN CLIFFORD KYLE

(SUBMITTER 433 AND FURTHER SUBMITTER 1340)

14 August 2017

- My name is John Kyle. I am a founding director of the firm Mitchell Daysh Limited.
- I prepared evidence in chief and eight rebuttal statements of evidence with respect to Hearing Stream 13 (Queenstown Mapping Hearing).
- I have read and reviewed the relevant section 42A reports, evidence in chief and rebuttal evidence of submitters insofar as they relate to QAC's submissions.

Within PC35 Aircraft Noise Boundaries

- QAC submitted in opposition to a number submissions seeking to upzone land where they would enable the intensification of activities sensitive to aircraft noise ("ASAN") within the Plan Change 35 ("PC35") aircraft noise boundaries.
- With the exception of one submission, all of the section 42A reporting officers have recommended rejecting submissions that would allow for the intensification of ASAN within the PC35 aircraft noise boundaries.
- In response to these recommendations, a number of submitters have still sought to up zone their landholdings, however they have recommended the inclusion of new land use provisions that would prohibit the intensification of ASAN within the PC35 aircraft noise boundaries.¹
- I support these recommendations insofar as they are consistent with the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805) and the (uncontested) expert evidence presented by Mr Day.
- While I acknowledged that there are measures available to try and mitigate the effects of aircraft noise (such as through acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation), such measures are not effective at addressing effects on outdoor amenity.

¹ Submitters 399, 717 and 751

- In my view, allowing the intensification of ASAN with the aircraft noise boundaries and exposing more people to the effects of aircraft noise will also inevitably give rise to reverse sensitivity effects for QAC. This may ultimately result in the curtailment of aircraft operations, as has been observed at other airports both nationally and internationally.
- With respect to Submission 790, the section 42A reporting officer has recommended accepting this submission despite its location within the PC35 aircraft noise boundaries. The section 42A reporting officer has treated this submission as “an exception” because she considers that it remains consistent with the intent of PC35 and only enables the development of one additional residential unit within the relevant noise boundary.²
- I do not agree with this recommendation and remain concerned³ that making such an exception could establish and precedence for other proposals which enable “just one more” dwelling.
- QAC also filed submissions with respect to rezoning proposals located beyond the PC35 aircraft noise boundaries. With respect to these rezoning proposals, the section 42A reporting officers have generally recommended that the proposals be rejected but not for the reasons set out in QAC’s submission or evidence.
- As noted in my primary evidence:
 - Aircraft noise effects do not stop at the OCB and are still experienced, albeit to a progressively lesser extent, beyond the OCB.⁴
 - Rezoning proposals will ultimately bring more people to the aircraft noise effect both now and into the future.⁵

² Refer to paragraph 4.8 of the rebuttal evidence of Kimberley Banks, dated 7 July 2017.

³ Refer to Paragraph 5.17, Statement of Evidence of John Kyle, dated 9 June 2017.

⁴ Paragraph 6.4, Statement of Evidence of John Kyle, dated 9 June 2017.

⁵ Paragraph 6.4, Statement of Evidence of John Kyle, dated 9 June 2017.

- QAC has experienced a sustained period of passenger growth in recent years, with recent forecasts indicating that this growth has the potential to reach 3.2 million passengers per annum by 2025.⁶
- With such significant growth on the horizon, it is appropriate to adopt a cautious approach for rezoning requests beyond the OCB, as the built form outcomes arising from the PDP are likely to extend beyond the life cycle of the PDP.
- This approach is consistent with the recent direction provided by the Proposed RPS. Specifically, the direction that:⁷

Policy 4.3.4 Protecting nationally and regionally significant infrastructure

Protect infrastructure of national or regional significance, by all of the following:

- a) *Restricting the establishment of activities that may result in reverse sensitivity effects;*
- b) *Avoiding significant adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure;*
- c) *Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure;*
- d) *Protecting infrastructure corridors from sensitive activities, now and for the future.*

⁶ Paragraph 6.5, Statement of Evidence of John Kyle, dated 9 June 2017.

⁷ Note this policy is currently subject to appeal, however all appeals will only serve to bolster rather than diminish this policy.