

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –
Upper Clutha Mapping Hearing

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE – IAN GREAVES ON BEHALF OF LESLEY AND JERRY
BURDON (#581)**

Dated: 7 June 2017

- 1.1. My name is Ian Greaves. I am currently employed by Southern Ventures Limited as their Development Manager. I am presenting this evidence under contract to Southern Planning Group who I was employed by up until the 13th of April 2017. I am here today presenting expert planning evidence on behalf of Lesley and Jerry Burdon in relation to the zoning of their property, Lot 1 DP 396356, State Highway 6, Lake Hawea ('the Site'). My primary evidence has been pre-circulated in accordance with the directions of the Hearings Chairman.
- 1.2. The submission from Lesley and Jerry Burdon seeks the inclusion of their site in the Rural Lifestyle zone. The submission includes a proposed no build restriction area over much of the site with five discrete locations identified for house sites, one of which includes the existing residence. The submission also seeks the inclusion of a new objective, policies and rules that specifically relate to future development within the Site.
- 1.3. One of the key resource management issues is the landscape and visual effects arising from the proposed rezoning. The site sits within an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL). Ms Snodgrass has set out within her evidence the key findings with respect to the potential effects on the landscape and visual amenity values as a result of the proposed rezoning. Ms Snodgrass's opinion is with suitable mitigation the proposed zone can be absorbed into the site without adversely effecting landscape values. Ms Snodgrass also opines that with the addition of native planting on the site, the naturalness of the site will be enhanced which would be a positive landscape effect. For the purposes of my evidence, I accept and adopt Ms Snodgrass's assessment.
- 1.4. There appears to be some level agreement from Mr Barr and Ms Mellsop for the Council that the site can absorb additional residential development. However, Mr Barr prefers the retention of the site within the Rural Zone and reliance on the Rural Zone provisions to manage the effects of this development. My opinion differs in that I consider that the planning framework of both the Rural Lifestyle Chapter (22) and Subdivision Chapter (27) of the PDP, and the additional provisions recommended in this submission, provide Council with a robust planning framework to manage any adverse effects from the development and promote positive ecological enhancement. This planning framework will ensure:

- (a) The proposed rezoning avoids inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the ONL through locating proposed development within parts of the Site that are capable of absorbing change from a landscape effects point of view, the avoidance of any development from the most prominent and sensitive parts of the site and ensuring built form will be discreet from important viewpoints such as State Highway 6, Lake Hawea and the surrounding beaches; and
 - (b) The proposed rezoning will enhance the natural character of the Site resulting in a positive contribution to the wider landscape appreciation of the ONL setting.
- 1.5. I note that there are a number of submissions on the PDP that seek to change the discretionary status of subdivision Rule 27.4.1 to a controlled activity status. The Council Officers in their assessment of these submissions have recommended a change to restricted discretionary. Any change in the status of Rule 27.4.1 will have no bearing on the level control for future development on this Site. Any future houses will require the establishment of a building platform under Rule 22.4.3.3, a full discretionary activity.
- 1.6. It is my opinion that the relief sought in the submission is consistent with the Operative and Proposed Regional Policy Statement. It is also my opinion that the relief sought in the submission is consistent with the higher order PDP provisions of the Strategic Direction and Landscape Chapters. The proposed rezoning will enable rural living development within an area of the ONL that can absorb change whilst the sensitive parts of this landscape will be protected from any further development for the life of the PDP. Policy 6.3.1.6 of the PDP is particularly relevant to this point. This policy promotes enabling rural lifestyle living through applying Rural Lifestyle Zone and Rural Residential Zone plan changes in areas where the landscape can accommodate change. This evidence and in particular that from Ms Snodgrass confirm that this scenario should be applied to the Site.
- 1.7. Overall, I consider the proposed zone change of the site to a Rural Lifestyle Zone with the inclusion of additional provisions into the PDP provides a comprehensive solution for the development of the Site, along with suitable long-term protection of the Site's important values. It is my opinion that the zone change, when assessed against the requirements of s32, is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA.
- 1.8. I am happy to answer questions from the Panel.

Ian Greaves

Ian Greaves

7 June 2017