

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan
Chapter 7 (Low Density Residential)
Chapter 27 (Subdivision)

SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF JOHN CLIFFORD KYLE

(SUBMITTER 433 AND FURTHER SUBMITTER 1340)

26 OCTOBER 2016

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
PO Box 701
Queenstown
Solicitor Acting: Rebecca Wolt
Phone: 03 409 0321
Email: rebecca.wolt@laneneave.co.nz
Fax: 03 409 0322

Mitchell Daysh
Level 2, 286 Princes Street
PO Box 489
Dunedin
Kirsty O'Sullivan
Phone: 03 477 7884
Email: kos@mitchelldaysh.co.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is John Kyle. I am a founding director of the firm Mitchell-Daysh Limited.

1.2 I filed evidence with respect to Chapter 7 on 30th September 2016.

1.3 This statement of evidence summarises what I consider to be the key matters arising from my evidence in chief (EIC) dated 30th September 2016.

1.4 My colleague, Ms Kirsty O'Sullivan pre-circulated evidence with respect to Chapter 27 on 15th July 2016. I have read and agree with the evidence of Ms O'Sullivan and am happy to take questions regarding this matter.

1.5 For context around the discussion that follows, I note that the Low Density Residential Zone is located to the west of Queenstown.

2. INTENSIFICATION OF ACTIVITY SENSITIVE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE WITHIN THE LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

2.1 PC35 put in place a land use management framework for the Low Density Residential Zone that would achieve a balance between accommodating the needs of the Airport on an on-going basis and providing for the health, amenity values and development aspirations of those people occupying and using land surrounding the Airport. QAC's submission with respect to this chapter generally seeks to retain this approach and carry it forward into the PDP.

2.2 By way of background, the PC35 provisions have been subject to recent and extensive Environment Court proceedings involving QAC, QLDC and other affected parties. The provisions enable Queenstown Airport to continue to grow and operate in line with its 2037 growth projections and will thus allow the Airport to continue to fulfil its role as a contributor to the social and economic wellbeing of the community.

2.3 Parts of the Low Density Residential Zone are located within the PC35 Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and Outer Control Boundary (OCB). These areas will therefore be exposed to the increasing effects of aircraft noise as aircraft operations expand in line with QAC's 2037 growth projections.

- 2.4 While the land use management approach established under PC35 goes some way to addressing the potential noise inside residential dwellings, it is important to understand that such measures are not effective at addressing the effects of outdoor amenity.
- 2.5 Residents located within close proximity to the airport can and do find that the utilisation and enjoyment of their property (particularly outdoors in the summer months) is affected by aircraft noise. Acoustic treatment cannot mitigate this effect.
- 2.6 Allowing the intensification of ASAN within the ANB or OCB will ultimately increase the number of people exposed to the increasing effects of aircraft noise over time. Experience at other airports show that this inevitably leads to an increase in reverse sensitivity concerns and a curtailment of aircraft operations.
- 2.7 In light of the above, I therefore support the Council Officer's recommendation to require a minimum residential density of one residential unit per 450m² (an increase from the 300m² contained in the originally notified plan). I also consider that some further amendments are required to the Low Density Residential Zone provisions in order to give full effect to PC35. These are set out in detail in Appendix A of my EIC.
- 2.8 I understand that during Council's opening, Dr Chiles was queried on the appropriateness or otherwise of land use covenants to address reverse sensitivity concerns. I agree with the Dr Chiles position, that covenants do very little to manage the effects of community health and wellbeing.
- 2.9 I also understand that Mr Osborne was queried on the economic value of increasing development and density in the area of the Airport. I agree with Mr Osborne, that the significance of the Airport should not be put at risk by increasing development, and note that this is consistent with Policies 4.3.4 and 4.5.1(h) of the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2016.

John Kyle

26 October 2016