

Ben Farrell - Summary Statement of Planning Evidence on behalf of the Real Journeys Group¹

TRANSPORT

1. Private tourism companies (including but not limited to) Real Journeys provide transport services. These services are part of the transport network and it is appropriate for the district plan to be amended so that it recognises the benefits of, and provides for:
 - (a) The role of private transport infrastructure and services alongside public transport services
 - (b) Water transport services and infrastructure
 - (c) Reducing traffic congestion issues in Queenstown.
2. In my opinion the definition of *Public Water Ferry Services* (and associated provisions) should not exclude tourism passenger transport services such as that provided by Real Journeys. The proposed policy and rule framework promotes one form of passenger service over the other without any resource management basis for doing so.

EARTHWORKS

3. I maintain Policy 25.2.1.2(a) could still be interpreted as discouraging and avoiding earthworks Outstanding Natural Landscapes and I do not agree with Mr Wyeth that the term “help” will inappropriately water down the policy. This clause could be amended to include the wording “from inappropriate subdivision, use and development” for the reasons Mr Wyeth supports amending sub-clause (f).
4. Council’s reasons for introducing earthworks rules to the SASZs is to manage earthworks that have the “**potential for environmental effects on water bodies and roads**”². This, in my view, has not been justified:
 - (a) The proposed rules introduce new costs and consenting risks on CARL, including the ability for earthworks applications to be declined without consideration of the benefits.
 - (b) The operative district plan excludes all earthworks provisions (in Chapter 22) from applying to SASZs and as far as I am aware there is no problem with the operative regime insofar as SASZs are concerned.
 - (c) The rules duplicate the responsibilities of ORC to control effects of discharges (sediment) into waterbodies. Sediment runoff that is not mitigated is prohibited under the Regional Water Plan (rule 12.C.0.3) and sediment discharges are only permitted if they do not result in a conspicuous change in colour or visual clarity, or noticeable increase in local sedimentation (rule 12.C.1.1).
 - (d) Other methods in the District Plan provide a mechanism for controlling the effects of activities, for example the Rules 21.12.2 and 21.12.3 control earthworks associated with buildings and lift systems within SASZs.
5. I do not agree with Mr Wyeth that Method 4.1.4 of the Proposed RPS places an obligation on QLDC to impose land use rules for management earthworks in Ski Area Sub Zones. Method 4.1.4 only places an obligation on QLDC to include provisions to manage the discharge of dust, and silt and sediment associated with earthworks and land use in relation to the matters addressed in Policies 3.1.7, 3.1.8 and 5.4.1 (being soil values, soil erosion, and objectionable discharges).

SIGNAGE

6. I agree with Ms Leith’s evidence and recommended amendments except for the reasons provided by Ms Black and page 8 of my evidence that interpretation signage should be

¹ Real Journeys #2466; Go Orange #2581; Te Anau Developments #2494; Cardrona Alpine Resort #2492)

² Table 1 on pages 29-30 of the s.32 Report

provided for in the same way as information and directional signage. In summary interpretation signage plays a similar role as directional and informative signage. I therefore support the relief sought by the Real Journeys Group to amend the Zone purpose, policies 31.2.1.5, 31.2.1.7, Objective 31.2.4, and policy 31.2.4.2.

OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

7. I remain of the opinion that it is appropriate to amend Objectives 38.2.1 and 38.2.3.2, and Policies 38.2.1.3, 38.2.1.4, 38.2.1.5, and 38.2.2.5 as sought by the Real Journeys Group:
- (a) Objective 38.2.1 (as currently worded) implies that only the Council reserves and recreation assets are required to meet the open space and recreation needs of the District's residents and visitors.
 - (b) In respect of Policy 38.2.1.3 it is not always possible, practical or particularly beneficial to always "protect and enhance" ecological values that are of no significance.
 - (c) Policy 38.2.1.5 is very stringent and it is appropriate to focus the compatibility of new activities with existing activities.
 - (d) It is appropriate that the term "significantly" should be introduced into Policies 38.2.2.5, 38.2.3.2, and policy 38.2.3.2 because it is almost inevitable that any new proposal in a public space can be argued to "degrade" a visual amenity values or natural character or landforms.
 - (e) Objective 38.2.3 as currently written does not provide for some commercial activities that could potentially be appropriate.