

Andrea Jarvis for QLDC – Hearing Stream 14 - Infrastructure

1. The submissions I have assessed with regard to infrastructure can be broadly grouped into the following categories:
 - (a) Rural (i.e. Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone) and rural lifestyle (i.e. Precinct) submissions;
 - (b) Requests for new urban areas;
 - (c) Requests for lower density resort-type zones; and
 - (d) Submissions regarding land surrounding the existing Millbrook zone.
2. In general, the Rural Amenity and Precinct zones are located outside of Council scheme boundaries and are to be serviced privately, on site, and thus any changes to these zones do not adversely affect the Council's infrastructure networks. I therefore do not generally oppose this type of rezoning request.
3. Requests for new zones that are of an urban nature, such as submissions by the Middleton Family Trust (#2332) and A Feeley, E Borrie & LP Trustees Limited (#2397) require connection to Council infrastructure to be adequately and sustainably serviced from an infrastructure point of view. I have considered the reports and/or evidence provided by the relevant submitters, and where they have not conclusively demonstrated that there is capacity within the existing infrastructure or there is a planned upgrade, I oppose the rezoning requested. I have also considered any infrastructure upgrades described and required, and the long-term maintenance and operation of key infrastructure components, such as sewage pumping stations, and water booster pump stations, bores or reservoirs in my assessments. If capacity is adequately demonstrated, and ongoing maintenance costs will not unduly burden ratepayers, I do not oppose the rezoning requested.
4. For lower density resort-type rezoning requests, such as Trojan Helmet's proposed Resort Zone (#2387), I have considered the proposed method of servicing from an infrastructure point of view, and the proposed ownership, management and maintenance of any stand-alone community systems or privately-owned infrastructure components. Where connection to Council-owned infrastructure is proposed, I have considered whether the submitters have demonstrated either capacity or on-site feasibility to service the proposed zone. For the resort zones requested, this has generally been demonstrated and where this is the case, I do not oppose these rezoning requests.
5. The area surrounding Millbrook is subject to a number of submissions requesting an extension to the Millbrook Resort Zone. Council have planned a set of upgrades to both the Arrowtown water network and the Wakatipu wastewater scheme. The capacity provided by these upgrades can be increased incrementally during the design phase, to accommodate the requested extensions to the Millbrook zone. However, this assumes that a new or separate developer agreement, development contributions or similar can be negotiated to offset the headworks required to ensure that capacity is available. If this condition (of a developer agreement or similar) is met, I do not oppose the rezonings requested.