

Trojan Helmet Limited (S2387, FS1157), Boxer Hill Trust – McDonnell Road (S2386), Boxer Hill Trust – Hogans Gully Road (S2385) – J Brown – Summary Statement, 25 July 2018

Jeffrey Andrew Brown – Hearing Stream 14 – Wakatipu Basin Chapter

1. My name is Jeffrey Brown. I have prepared three statements of evidence addressing planning matters in respect of submissions by:
 - (a) Trojan Helmet Limited (Submitter 2387 and Further Submitter 1157) in relation to the Hills Resort Zone (HRZ) dated 19 June 2018; and
 - (b) Boxer Hills Trust (BHT) in relation to sites at:
 - (i) McDonnell Road (Submitter 2386), dated 15 June 2018; and
 - (ii) Hogans Gully Road (Submitter 2385), dated 13 June 2018.
2. I have the experience as set out at paragraphs 7 – 9 of my evidence.
3. In this statement I briefly summarise my evidence and respond to rebuttal evidence.

The Hills Resort Zone

4. My evidence evaluates the two key options before the Commission: the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ) and the HRZ in the context of the zoning principles and other factors that should be applied when considering the most appropriate provisions of the District Plan. My overall conclusion from that evaluation is that the HRZ is more consistent with and better achieves the rezoning principles than the WBRAZ.
5. More specifically:
 - the HRZ better achieves the objectives and policies in Chapters 3 and 6, because it enables significant socio-economic benefits while not causing significant, or adverse, change to the landscape values of the Hills land or the wider Basin;
 - the HRZ better achieves the relevant RPS provisions than the WBRAZ;
 - the economic benefits of the HRZ significantly outweigh the costs, and significantly outweigh the economic benefits of the WBRAZ;
 - the site can absorb the HRZ development due to the careful siting of the development areas within the Structure Plan and the development standards.
6. I have addressed the cumulative effects of the HRZ in combination with the effects of other existing and proposed development. Based on Ms Pfluger's evidence I do not consider that the new developments proposed in the HRZ, Hogans Gully Zone and Ayrburn Zone, when considered along with the existing development and future development promoted by the Council, will have adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values.
7. I consider that the HRZ better meets the s7 imperatives than the WBRAZ and is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.
8. I have reviewed the updated HRZ provisions prepared by Ms Wolt and Ms Hutton responding to Mr Langman's comments and following the 18 July hearing.

Council's rebuttal evidence on the HRZ

9. I disagree with Mr Langman's rebuttal. In particular I disagree with his suggestion that the development should be undertaken by way of a resource consent rather than the new zoning. A resource consent in this case does not take into account potential market changes and trends (for example in any given development cluster, would some attached units or some

standalone homes be preferable?). There is sufficient information available about the Zone now to enable a comprehensive review of the landscape and other values, and there is no reason for putting off the zoning determination in favour of a later process.

Zoning of BHT's land at McDonnell Road

10. In my view the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (**WBLP**) is a better option than the WBRAZ for the 8ha block at McDonnell Road because it enables a more efficient use of the land and better achieves the higher order PDP provisions.
11. However, the Council has indicated that there is potential for urban development of the land, and nearby land adjacent to McDonnell Road. Applying the WBLP would likely foreclose efficient urban development of the land. I understand that there is no scope for applying either a live urban zone or some form of "future urban" zone. In any case a live urban zone now would be premature because the requisite background work (the range of investigations and design effort, as required by the Chapter 4 provisions) has not been undertaken.
12. Landowners do not wish for their land to be sanitised indefinitely.
13. The most appropriate way forward in my view is for the Council to commence the necessary background investigations and design work with a view to promoting a live urban zone during one of the upcoming Stages of the District Plan Review.
14. In the interim period, the WBRAZ would not be a very resilient holding pattern because of the ability of the land to absorb development.
15. Under the HRZ's suite of provisions, development in the "G" areas of the Structure Plan (which comprise the significant majority of the Zone) would be very difficult, and hence the HRZ would provide a more defensible boundary to the westward edge of the UGB, if it were to be shifted west of McDonnell Road, than the WBRAZ.

Council's rebuttal evidence on the McDonnell Road land

16. I agree with Ms Gilbert's view that urbanising a rural residential area requires a deliberate rural residential planning strategy that flags the need to consider future urban access, connectivity, open space and infrastructure requirements to ensure that any interim rural residential layout does not stymie later intensification.
17. I disagree with Mr Langman in relation to the value of a future urban zone (**FUZ**). A properly conceived FUZ, such as the Auckland example I presented in my primary statement, can enable some development but avoids the problems identified in the previous paragraph. A FUZ akin to the Auckland example would be far superior to the WBRAZ as a holding pattern zone. However, there is a scope problem.
18. Mr Langman indicates that the Council's timeframe for earnestly contemplating urban development is anywhere between 5 and 50 years. The WBRAZ is not a sustainable long term option for the land for this period. For example, there is no policy basis in the WBRAZ for maintaining the land's potential for future urban development. I consider that the Council needs to withdraw the land from the Chapter 24 variation and commence the works in paragraph 16 above. If the Council is not serious about urban development in the near term (and not taking advantage of the current staged review process) then the WBLP should be preferred, or a FUZ should be promoted in a later stage of the review.

WBLP of the Hogans Gully land

19. I agree with the various landscape witnesses and Mr Langman that the WBLP is appropriate over the land at Hogans Gully.

20. My evidence for BHT's Hogans Gully is largely the same as the evidence I presented for the Lake Hayes Investments et al group of submitters. Rather than repeat that summary, I will address some points from yesterday's hearing.

Objective 24.2.5

21. In relation to the discussion about the WBLP objective, I agreed with the Panel that my suggested wording could be expanded to more specifically address the matters that are sought to be regulated in the Precinct. Further suggested wording is as follows:

24.2.5 ~~Objective – The landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct are maintained and enhanced in conjunction with enabling rural residential living opportunities.~~ Rural residential living opportunities are enabled while effects of subdivision and development on the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct are managed [by controlling subdivision design, the location of future buildings, the external appearance of buildings, access location, and landscaping.](#)

Policy 24.2.5.2

22. I agree that the words "to the extent practicable" are better than "wherever possible", and hence I support the following change:

24.2.5.2 ~~Promote design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development that maintain and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall. Ensure that new subdivision, use and development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on, and wherever possible~~ [to the extent practicable](#) maintains and enhances, the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, taking into account the relevant values described in Schedule 24.8.

J A Brown
25 July 2018

