

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

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed
District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Submissions Seeking
Amendments to the Planning Maps
covering Queenstown and
Queenstown Rural (Excluding
Wakatipu Basin)

**SUMMARY STATEMENT TO PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES ON
BEHALF OF**

**Jardine Family Trust, Remarkables Station Ltd
& Homestead Bay Trustees Ltd**

(Submitter #715)

Dated 7th August 2017

INTRODUCTION

- 1 QLDC Planner Ms Vicki Jones filed rebuttal evidence 11th July 2017 (rebuttal evidence) in relation to submission 715 which clearly and concisely confines outstanding matters. Primarily, I would like to address matters raised in her evidence and where relevant matters raised by other parties. Secondly, I provide a summary of my supplementary evidence on the Dwelling Capacity Model (DCM).

Visibility

- 2 My opinion on matters relating to the management and protection of landscapes (including their character) from adverse effects of subdivision, use and development relies heavily upon the assessment and evidence of Mr Espie. As confirmed in my primary evidence I believe that based upon Mr Espie's assessment and evidence any adverse effects in this regard are acceptable.
- 3 Ms Jones finds the proposed re-zoning inconsistent with the Chapter 6 Objectives 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.4 and Policy 6.3.1.10. I disagree, and based upon the assessment and evidence of Mr Espie I believe the proposed re-zoning is consistent with these Objectives and Policy.
- 4 Residential areas A to C are not intended to be visible from any visual perspective afforded from the State Highway by virtue of the mounds located some 350 metres from the highway itself.
- 5 I accept that this makes for a larger mound than would be otherwise be required if roof spaces were to be visible. However, given the setback of the mounds from the road coupled with the landscaping as outlined in the evidence of Mr Espie I consider that the recommended mounds in time will appear more natural than any suitably recessive roof space.
- 6 Ms Jones finds the proposed re-zoning inconsistent with policy 6.3.2.4. This policy asks whether subdivision and development constitutes sprawl along roads. I believe urban sprawl as viewed from a road needs to be a sustained view of development and in my experience this typically appears as an elongated pattern which is reasonably well aligned with the road.

- 7 I do not believe the proposed re-zoning offers direct or sustained visual perspective of built form from the road. Therefore, I do not believe residential areas A to C constitute subdivision or development sprawl along a road and the proposed re-zoning is consistent with Policy 6.3.2.4.
- 8 The proposed mounds stand a maximum height of 4.5 metres some 350 metres from the State Highway. I do not consider the proposed height in relation to the roadside boundary is sufficient to compromise the current level of openness experienced from the highway.
- 9 The land visible from the State Highway is currently zoned Rural General where land practices often require large Pinus Radiata wind breaks which I believe could reduce the level of openness across this area and views to Lake Wakatipu to a greater degree than the proposed 4.5m mounds. Therefore, I believe the proposed re-zoning is consistent with Policies 6.3.2.5 and 6.3.4.3 of the PDP.
- 10 In addition, the proposed zoning offers a Highway Landscape Protection Area which seeks to preserve a level of openness through PDP Policy 41.5.3.1:
- “Within the Highway Landscape Protection Area (refer Structure Plan) the planting and/or growing of any tree shall not obscure views from the State Highway to the mountain peaks beyond the zone.”*
- 11 As outlined above, I believe the mounds are visually acceptable. The construction of the mounds and landscaping is required by recommended Policy 41.5.12 prior to the construction of any residential units within Areas A-C and D.
- 12 I believe a discretionary resource consent assessment of the mounds if they are accepted as part of the current process is unnecessary as any future assessment in terms of visual amenity, landscape, scale and nature could only logically confirm the same. The remaining assessment criteria for any earthworks consent application will be achieved through recommended policy 41.9(b) which requires the submission of a construction management plan while all works must be in accordance with QLDC’s Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice.

- 13 Ms Jones's recommends removing the requirement to plant 80% of the OSR lots in favour of planting the gully area located centrally on the site within the OSF area and she recommends an amended Policy 41.2.1.26:

"41.2.1.26 Ensure substantial native revegetation of the gully within the lake foreshore (OSF) and the ~~open spaces within Homestead Bay and Home site activity areas within the Tablelands Landscape Protection Area~~ and encourage native planting of the open space Activity Areas (OSF, OSL, and OSG) within Homestead Bay."

- 14 I concur with the intention and wording of the policy promoted by Ms Jones above. As such, I have identified a "Foreshore Gully Area" on the structure plan and included the recommended policy in the revised policy set contained in Attachment A.

Acoustic

- 15 Paragraph 3.11 of Ms Jones's evidence reinforces the recommendation made in Scenario B of her primary evidence that the existing OSG activity area is better alignment with the existing NZone operation than the expanded wording of the recommended OSG area.
- 16 I concur with Ms Jones and I have removed reference to the airport activities within policy 41.5.1.10 and amended the structure plan to extend the OSG activity area over the existing NZone operation. These amendments are contained in Attachment A to my evidence.
- 17 Paragraph 3.29 of Ms Jones's primary evidence notes that there is no detailed mapping of the 55dbA contour to the south of the existing airstrip and the evidence of Dr Chiles authors a reluctance to locate residential activities within the 55dbA contour.
- 18 I believe that the mounding around residential activity areas A-C coupled with the accentuated depression these residential areas will be located within may influence noise contours by comparison to any assessment undertaken across the existing topography.
- 19 I recommend a requirement to ascertain the noise contours following the completion of the mounding and prior to subdivision be included as a new policy in the subdivision Chapter as 27.7.14.8. This proposed policy appears in Attachment B and reads:

27.7.14.8: Following the construction of State Highway Earthworks and prior to the subdivision of Residential Activity Areas R(HB) A – C an acoustic assessment (Homestead Bay Noise Contours) shall determine the extent of the 55dBA contour to the south of the existing air strip. Should any residential sites be located between the 55dBA contour and the airstrip the following consent notice shall be registered:

“Any residential building shall be designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB Ldn within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the Homestead Bay Noise Contours. Compliance shall be demonstrated by either installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 4 of Chapter 36 or by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open.”

Infrastructure

- 20 Mr Hansen has reviewed Mr Ulrich Glasner’s rebuttal evidence and responds with further information and assessment in his supplementary evidence. Based upon the body of his primary evidence supported by his supplementary evidence I believe that effective and efficient infrastructure can be developed and the proposed re-zoning is consistent with relevant Objectives and Policies of the Operative and Proposed Regional Policy Statement and remains fully consistent with purpose and principles of the RMA.

Natural Hazards

- 21 Ms Jones recommends an amended Rule 41.4.3.2 to account for natural hazards within the OSR activity area. On the basis that residential buildings may precede subdivision and require natural hazard consideration I have adopted Ms Jones’s Rule which appears in the recommended Chapter 41 contained in Attachment A.

Traffic

- 22 Activities permitted under the Operative District Plan within Homestead Bay are anticipated to use Maori Jack Road and its intersection with State Highway 6. These permitted activities equate to approximately 244 dwelling equivalents.

- 23 The evidence of Mr Ferguson on behalf of JPROA confirms concerns in terms of the safety and amenity for the residents at Jacks Point with reference to traffic on Maori Jack Road which is above that anticipated by the Operative District Plan.
- 24 Based upon these concerns and supported by the primary evidence of Mr Bartlett policy 41.5.7.4 that seeks to limit traffic on Maori Jack Road from Homestead Bay to 244 dwelling equivalents:
- “Only 244 residential lots, or non-residential activity that is projected to generate the equivalent traffic volumes, may be built within the Homestead Bay Area of the Jacks Point Zone and utilise Maori Jack Road.”*
- 25 I have not included JPROA in this policy as I do not believe the PDP policies should require approval from third parties. Should an agreement be reached to use Maori Jack Road for any part (or all) of the 541 lots included in the proposed re-zoning I am confident this would help facilitate resource consent approval to breach the standard above.
- 26 Notwithstanding the above, I believe it would be extremely difficult to mitigate the adverse effects upon the residential amenity of Jacks Point residents if Maori Jack Road was intended to service the proposed re-zoning.
- 27 Mr Tony MacColl’s evidence on behalf of NZTA endorses Mr Bartlett’s primary evidence where Mr Bartlett has suggested the development of Homestead Bay is not to increase beyond the current provisions of the Operative District Plan without the prior agreement of NZTA to establish an additional access to the State Highway.
- 28 The evidence of Mr Ferguson on behalf of JPROA confirms no opposition to a further State Highway access point in principal but remains concerned about potential adverse effects on the transportation network within Jacks Point.
- 29 I did not include Mr Bartlett’s recommendation in my recommended policy set contained in my primary evidence as I believe PDP policy 41.5.4.1 will effectively do the same. This policy requires access from the State Highway as a restricted discretionary activity where discretion is confined to ensuring the safe and efficient functioning of the road network where road is defined in the PDP as it appears within part 315 of the Local Government Act 1974

which includes “public highways”. I do not believe resource consent under part 41.5.4.1 could be obtained without the approval of NZTA.

- 30 Mr Bartlett’s summary evidence discusses two scenarios where the second recommends a separate access point onto the State Highway with upgrading to the intersection of Maori Jack Road which I believe satisfies concerns raised by JPROA. Coupled with policy 41.5.4.1 I believe scenario 2 satisfies the concerns raised by NZTA and accompanied by modelling this satisfies concerns raised by Ms Banks on behalf of QLDC.
- 31 Mr Tony MacColl’s evidence on behalf of NZTA raises concerns with the reference to Diagram D in the Standard 41.5.7.4 recommended in my primary evidence. As such, I have removed reference to this access point in the recommended Chapter 41 contained in Attachment A.

Dwelling Capacity Model

- 32 The summary evidence of Ms Kim Banks goes a long way to addressing the concerns raised in my supplementary DCM evidence with two exceptions:

Previous QLDC Reporting

- 33 Paragraph 29 of Ms Banks’s evidence confirms that the strategic chapters of the PDP have been authored in the absence of accurate dwelling capacity estimations yet paragraph 4 of her evidence reinforces that these chapters give effect to Part 2 of the RMA. I have reservations how strategic an urban growth boundary is without a full understanding of the dwelling capacity which it encircles.

Development Zones – Capacity Estimates

- 34 The second table in Appendix 1 of Ms Banks’s evidence details 70% of the capacity to be relied upon in the UGB has been confirmed as realisable through discussions with developers whom own a majority of land within these development zones. This results in only 30% of the dwelling capacity to be relied upon in the UGB has had the “model” applied to it.
- 35 I do not believe this meets the intent of NPS-UDC standards which I believe expect a more robust assessment to confirm actual realisable dwelling capacity.

36 Reliance upon the advice of developers also appears at odds with QLDC reporting on Council's Lead Policy for Special Housing Areas which specifies reservations about the lack of development within the UGB in the last ten years.

Nick Geddes

7th August 2017