

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 Designation 2
(Aerodrome Purposes Designation – Queenstown Airport)

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF JOHN CLIFFORD KYLE

(REQUIRING AUTHORITY FOR DESIGNATIONS 2 AND 4)

2 NOVEMBER 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.

1.2 I presented evidence with respect to Designation 2 – Aerodrome Purposes Designation on Wednesday 20 October 2016.

1.3 On 21st October 2016, Ms. Rebecca Holden, the section 42A reporting officer for the Queenstown Lakes District Council presented summary evidence regarding Designation 2. Ms. Holden states, at paragraph 8 of her summary evidence:

“In my s 42A report, I recommended that the submission of RPL be rejected on most accounts, and that QAC’s proposed modifications to the designation be confirmed (with minor amendments sought by submitters). However, on reflection I note that the NOR does not assess whether it is appropriate to provide for retail activities, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities, or industrial and commercial activities by way of the designation. Based on the legal submissions of RPL, I consider that QAC should provide further information to justify the inclusion of retail, food and beverage, and other commercial activities in this designation and to demonstrate that limits on the nature and scale of such activities are not necessary.”

1.4 The purpose of this supplementary statement of evidence is to address:

1.4.1 Why it is appropriate to include the activities identified by Ms. Holden in the designation; and,

1.4.2 Whether additional controls are required on the designation to limit the nature and scale of activities.

2. APPROPRIATENESS OF RETAIL, FOOD AND BEVERAGE AND OTHER COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

2.1 As set out in my evidence in chief and summary evidence, modern airports are highly sophisticated and dynamic land uses which legitimately encompass a broad range of activities in order to provide for the needs and demands of

aircraft passengers, crew, ground staff, airport workers and those that meet and greet travelers.

- 2.2 Airports often provide for a range of industrial or logistical land uses as such uses either provide direct servicing to the aviation industry, or feed directly off it.
- 2.3 It is therefore important for airport operators to retain sufficient flexibility to properly enable forward planning and development necessary to respond to changing demands that arise at a modern airport.
- 2.4 It therefore remains my view that the purpose of the airport designation and the activities that it enables should be sufficiently broad in order to meet these imperatives over time.
- 2.5 I note that the Reporting Officer appears to agree with this general approach, at least insofar as it relates to activities at Wanaka Airport, stating in paragraph 16 that:

"I agree with the conclusions reached by Mr Kyle in relation to "modern and sophisticated aerodromes now demanding a diverse mix of commercial, industrial and retail land uses that serve the needs of passengers, crew, ground staff, airport workers and those that meet and greet travellers.""

- 2.6 It is not entirely clear why the Reporting Officer considers this approach to be appropriate for Wanaka, but not Queenstown Airport.

3. CONTROLS ON THE NATURE AND SCALE OF ACTIVITIES

- 3.1 In my view it is not necessary for the activities referred to by Ms. Holden to be limited in extent. As I explained in response to questions from the Commissioner, most of the activities in question are likely to be developed within the terminal complex to complement growing passenger and staff numbers over time. Moreover, the airport is land limited and significant areas are, and will continue to be required to facilitate aviation activities, thus

meaning that large scale, standalone development of the activities that appear to concern Ms. Holden cannot occur.

3.2 As a related matter, the designation currently sets out bulk and location standards (conditions) applicable to buildings within the Aerodrome Purposes Designation. Some discussion occurred at the hearing as to whether these methods have sufficient strength to manage the effects of these buildings at the designation/adjacent zone interface.

3.3 I retain the view that the outline plan process is sufficiently robust to enable the Council to undertake a detailed evaluation of the effects that are likely to arise from built development within the designation. As indicated during questioning at the hearing, I undertook to review the material attached to the submissions by RPL insofar as that related to the recently confirmed designations for Auckland Airport. The Auckland International Airport – Renton Road Area Designation (Designation 1101) includes some more specific guidance for those preparing and assessing outline plans to assist in better managing the effects of resultant buildings. I hold the view that the approach adopted for the cited Auckland Airport designation has some value and could be adapted to apply to the Queenstown Airport situation.

3.4 Specifically, in addition to the matters set out in section 176A of the Act, the following new conditions could be added to assist in addressing the types of concerns that RPL has raised in terms of effects from built development:

3.4.1 An outline plan of any work in the designated area must be submitted to the Council pursuant to section 176A of the RMA, unless, in the case of minor works, the Council waives the requirement for an outline plan.

3.4.2 The outline plan shall include, in addition to the matters required under section 176A of the RMA, an assessment of the following matters as relevant to the scale and location of the works proposed:

- 3.4.2.1 whether building form, colour and texture are used to reduce the apparent height and bulk of large buildings when viewed from adjoining sites;
- 3.4.2.2 whether there will be a consistency of building materials and colours between buildings;
- 3.4.2.3 whether the proposed building aligns with other buildings on the site (existing or potential) or on the relevant adjoining site;
- 3.4.2.4 whether the landscape treatment is in scale with the proposed development, providing for the visual softening of large buildings and the screening of parking, loading and storage areas, while recognising operational requirements of airside facilities;
- 3.4.2.5 whether the proposed plantings are to be placed so that they do not obstruct views of outstanding natural landscapes and/or features.
- 3.4.2.6 Whether any earthworks will alter the existing topography of the site and the impacts on the area's amenity values and cultural values.
- 3.4.2.7 The extent to which earthworks affect the stability and erosion potential of the site and surrounding site.
- 3.4.2.8 Details of traffic management proposals for the period of construction of the proposed works and for the operation of the proposed activities once established.
- 3.4.2.9 The timetable for the completion of works.

J C Kyle

2 November