

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of a Variation to the proposed
Queenstown Lakes District Plan (Te
Pūtahi Ladies Mile) in accordance with
Part 5 of Schedule 1 to the Resource
Management Act 1991

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICK GEDDES FOR FURTHER
SUBMITTERS: FS 143 – 147.**

Dated: 6th December 2023



Nick Geddes Resource Management
Planner
BSc, Grad Dip ES

DD: +64 3 441 6071

Cell: 021 0527 311

E: ngeddes@cfma.co.nz

Qualifications and Experience

1. My name is Nicholas Karl Geddes. I prepared a statement of evidence on behalf of Submitter 55 and Further Submitters FS 143 – 147, 149 & 150, dated 20th October 2023. I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs [1] – [5] of my statement of evidence (SOE).
2. In this statement, I provide an update following the Planners Joint Witness Statement (Friday 3rd November only) in relation to my statement of evidence as well as a summary of what issues remain within my evidence.

Planners Joint Witness Statement (Friday 3rd November only)

3. The Planners Joint Witness Statement accurately records my view that the 2.4 ha area identified in fig 4 p 11 of my evidence should remain as lifestyle precinct subzone of PDP chapter 24 and not be included as part of the proposed rezoning under the Variation as sought by Submission 107.
4. The Supplementary Joint Witness Planning Statement from Werner Murray dated 10th November 2023 confirmed the area referred to in my evidence was to be retained as Lifestyle Precinct on the Submission 107 structure plan.
5. I filed a Supplementary Joint Witness Planning Statement 14th November 2023 confirming this revised Submission 107 relief alleviates the unacceptable adverse effects identified in my evidence in relation to residential privacy / amenity as well as rural amenity values and noise upon those properties owned by further submitters 143 – 147.

Statement of evidence

6. Putting aside residential privacy / amenity as well as rural amenity values and noise, the only remaining unacceptable effect from the proposed re-zoning sought by submission 107 relates to landscape and visual amenity values¹.
7. My evidence was reliant on the expert opinion of Landscape Architect Mr Steve Skelton (29th September 2023) who considered the re-zoning sought by submission 107 would result in moderate to high visual effects,² moderate adverse

¹ Paragraph 52 to 58 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

² Paragraph 54 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

effects on natural character of the subject site as well as the Shotover River ONF.³ For these reasons my evidence concluded the re-zoning sought by submission 107 would not achieve:

- Objective NFL–O1 and policy NFL–P3 of the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement.⁴
- Policies 3.2.5.3 and 3.3.31 of the Proposed District Plan’s Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction).⁵
- Objective 4.2.2 B of the Proposed District Plan’s Chapter 4 (Urban Development).⁶

8. I have read the landscape evidence of Mr Tony Milne (20th October 2023) on behalf of submitter 107. I disagree with Mr Milne where he states that the ‘status-quo’ would restrict open rural views that are currently afforded by the Extension Area.⁷ I believe Mr Milne’s position may stem from his reliance on Mr Weir’s theoretical ‘status-quo’ subdivision layout which depicts 16 rural living allotments across the 12.93ha extension area. This number of rural living allotments can only be achieved in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Lifestyle Precinct) as a discretionary activity.⁸
9. In my opinion, discretionary activity status should not be relied upon to form a baseline consideration for what is suggested to be the status quo. A more suitable baseline may be 12 rural living allotments in accordance with minimum allotment sizes, yet this relies on the approval of a restricted discretionary resource consent.
10. I believe the starting point for Mr Milne’s landscape assessment of the re-zoning sought by submitter 107 is incorrect by considering a 16 allotment baseline. For this reason, I prefer the assessment of Mr Skelton and reliant on Mr Skelton’s assessment, my opinion remains that the re-zoning sought by submission 107 does not achieve the provisions listed above nor those sections of the RMA referenced in my SOE.⁹

³ Paragraph 55 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

⁴ Paragraph 75 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

⁵ Paragraph 79 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

⁶ Paragraph 82 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.

⁷ Paragraph 42, Tony Milne SOE, 20th October 2023.

⁸ Pursuant to Rule 27.5.10, PDP Chapter 27.

⁹ Paragraph 85 of my SOE, 20th October 2023.