

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Streams 2 –
Rural

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES
ON BEHALF OF**

**A Hutchinson (Submitter 228)
D Gallagher (Submitter 233)
G Sim (Submitter 235)
N T McDonald Family Trust (Submitter 411)
Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd (Submitter 414)**

Dated 18th April 2016

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1 My name is Nicholas Karl Geddes. I hold a degree of Bachelor of Science majoring in Geography and Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science from Otago University.
- 2 I have fifteen years' experience as a resource management practitioner, with past positions as a Planner in local Government in Auckland, private practice in Queenstown and contract work in London, England. I currently hold a planning consultant position with Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Limited.
- 3 I was employed by a Queenstown consultancy in 1999 before moving to Auckland City Council in 2001 where I held a senior planning position with Auckland City Environments. Leaving Auckland in 2005 I worked in London as a planner for two and a half years before returning to Queenstown where I have been practicing as a planning consultant since.
- 4 I have been a practicing consultant involved in a wide range of developments, district plan policy development and the preparation and presentation of expert evidence before Councils.
- 5 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court consolidated Practice Note (2014). I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 I have prepared evidence in relation to Chapters 21 and 22 where I assess and explain:
- a. Clarification of original submissions and the section 42A report;
 - b. Chapter 21, Policy 21.4.6;
 - c. Chapter 22, Policy 22.5.12.1.;
 - d. Chapter 22, Rules 22.5.12.2 & 22.5.12.3;
 - e. Conclusion.

Abbreviations: Proposed District Plan – PDP, Operative District Plan – ODP.

CLARIFICATION

- 7 The primary submissions contain reference to a 'subject site'. The submissions were compiled on the basis the submission would be heard on a site by site basis where merits of each site could be identified and any rationale behind the sites ability to accommodate the specified density of 1ha would be apparent.
- 8 Hearing the requested removal of this policy in isolation of these sites should not rule out the ability to provide a site specific exemption as per the ODP where subzones within the Rural Lifestyle zone.
- 9 Paragraph 8.16 of the section 42A report for Chapter 22 includes:
- "Where submitters have requested this rule is deleted I consider they should specify the landholdings specifically so the merits can be determined."*
- 10 Submissions 235 (Sim), 223 (Gallagher), 228 (Hutchinson) 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates) and 565 (NTM Family Trust) seek the removal of Rule 22.5.12.13. Based upon the advice contained in the section 42a report I have provided the legal description of the land holdings of each submission and a plan is contained in Attachment A to this evidence.

CHAPTER 21: POLICY 21.4.6

Submissions: 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates) and 565 (NTM Family Trust).

- 11 Rule 21.4.6 stipulates: *“One residential unit within any building platform approved by resource consent.”*
- 12 Rule 21.4.6 is not supported by the section 32 Evaluation Report. The report does not incorporate any analysis towards this revised policy.
- 13 The resource management issues set out in the section 32 Evaluation Report rely on reporting and material which date from 2003 to 2014. With reference to Rule 21.4.6; I consider relevant reporting includes the two reports by Read Landscapes Limited 2014 and the Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009.
- 14 While the 2009 Monitoring Report is referenced in the section 32 Evaluation Report no ‘link’ is provided on the final page of the report which directs the reader to the Monitoring Report. The Queenstown Lakes District Council website lists documents incorporated by reference. This list does not include the Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009. As such, this evidence does not include any consideration of this document.
- 15 The two Read Landscape reports do not include commentary in relation to requiring one residential unit within any building platform.
- 16 The construction of a residential flat in association with a residential unit in the Rural General Zone is a permitted activity under Part 21.4.12 of the Proposed District Plan.
- 17 Paragraph 2, page 22 of the section 32 report considers:

“Residential flat as a land use sits within the ambit of residential unit. The Operative District Plan’s Transportation provisions require car parking and access as permitted standards and, any servicing related aspects can be controlled via the building approval process.”
- 18 I interpret the above to suggest that the ‘effect’ of a flat within the platform can be accommodated within the consideration made towards the approval of the platform or addressed (if required) under other provisions of the ODP.
- 19 In terms of ‘effect’ I consider there is no distinction to be drawn between a two-bedroom flat which is constructed within the approved building platform or a two-bedroom unit which is constructed within any approved building platform. The demand on servicing is the same while the ODP has permitted standards (Transportation) relating to car parking and access and residential units.

20 Paragraph 11.11 of the section 42A report:

“PDP Rules 21.4.5 – 21.4.12 list the contemplated activities associated with residential activity. Some submitters including 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd) request that rule 21.4.6, which requires that more than one residential unit within a building platform would require resource consent as a discretionary activity is deleted. I recommend that the request is rejected because it is generally contemplated that each building platform, and often associated fee simple computer freehold register created contemplates one residential unit.”

21 It is accepted that the computer freehold register for most rural platforms already consented include consent notices restricting platforms to one residential unit. I do not consider this reason alone should determine the introduction of rule 21.4.6 nor should the PDP necessarily reflect this restriction.

22 To require a discretionary activity status to the construction of an additional residential unit while a residential flat remains permitted is considered to be unnecessary and unbalanced.

23 It is accepted that a majority of approved platforms anticipate one unit and these are likely required to have any building in the platform subject to controlled resource consent. It would then require discretionary resource consent under section 221 of the RMA to construct an additional residential unit. I do not consider this reason is sufficient justification for policy 21.4.6.

24 Rule 21.5.16 of the PDP specifies that the maximum ground floor area for any building shall be 500m². This provides that the 500m² be balanced between a residential unit and flat. It is not understood why this balance could not be two residential units.

25 I consider the rules of the Rural zone which relate to the construction of buildings in any approved residential building platform are sufficiently robust to require that any additional residential unit in a platform will not compromise the intentions contained in Policy 21.4.6 and these include:

Rule 22.5.15:

Buildings

Any building, including any structure larger than 5m², that is new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, including containers intended to, or that remain on site for more than six months, and the alteration to any lawfully established building are subject to the following:

All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of browns, greens or greys (except soffits), including;*

21.5.15.1 *Pre-painted steel and all roofs shall have a light reflectance value not greater than 20%; and,*

21.5.15.2 *All other surface** finishes shall have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30%.*

21.5.15.3 *In the case of alterations to an existing building not located within a building platform, it does not increase the ground floor area by more than 30% in any ten year period.*

Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *External appearance.*
- *Visual prominence from both public places and private locations.*
- *Landscape character.*
- *Visual amenity.*

26 In summary, the effect of an additional residential unit within an approved residential building platform is equal to a residential flat, the PDP contains rules to require appropriate building development is contained within any residential building platform while no robust analysis exists in the section 32 evaluation report, section 42A report or evidence compiled on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council in relation to Policy 21.4.6.

CHAPTER 22: POLICY 22.5.12.1

Submissions: 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates) and 565 (NTM Family Trust).

27 Rule 22.5.12.1 stipulates: *One residential unit located within each building platform.*

28 Rule 22.5.12.1 is not supported by the section 32 Evaluation Report. The report does not incorporate any analysis towards this revised policy.

29 The resource management issues set out in the section 32 Evaluation Report rely on reporting and material which date from 2003 to 2014. With reference to Rule 22.5.12.1; I believe relevant reporting includes the two reports by Read Landscapes Limited 2014, the Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009 and Rural Living Zone Monitoring Report 2009.

30 The Queenstown Lakes District Council website lists documents incorporated by reference. This list does not include the Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009. As such, this evidence does not include any consideration of this document.

- 31 The two Read Landscape reports do not include commentary in relation to requiring one residential unit within any building platform.
- 32 The construction of a residential flat in association with a residential unit in the Rural Lifestyle Zone is a permitted activity under the Proposed District Plan. The section 32 evaluates this with similar reference as discussed in paragraphs 17-19 above.
- 33 Paragraph 8.9 of the section 42A report states:
- "I also consider that enabling more than one residential unit within a building platform could create an ill-conceived perception that it is anticipated that a subdivision is contemplated, based on the argument that the 'effect' of the resultant residential unit is already established".*
- 34 I do not consider the ODP creates an ill-conceived perception that it is anticipated that a subdivision is contemplated any more than a permitted residential flat. Subdivision is managed by a discretionary activity regime set out in Chapter 27.
- 35 Rule 22.4.6 provides for a residential flat as a permitted activity while rule 22.5.12.1 of the PDP specifies that the maximum ground floor area for any building shall be 500m². It is considered that the provision of more than one residential unit in any approved platform would provide a wider range of housing opportunities than the one unit one flat combination.
- 36 In summary, the construction of residential building within an approved platform is directed by the rules and standards of the zone which relate to bulk, location, materials, area. Other 'effects' associated with activities related to residential use are otherwise provided for within the other provisions of the PDP or ODP.

CHAPTER 22: RULES 22.5.12.2 & 22.5.12.3

Submissions: 228 (Hutchinson), 233 (Gallagher), 235 (Sim), 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates) and 565 (NTM Family Trust).

Rule: 22.5.12.2: On sites less than 2 hectares there shall be only one residential unit.

Rule: 22.5.12.3: On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than one residential unit per two hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.

37 Rule 22.5.12.2 and 22.5.12.3 (the averages rules) were conceived to appropriately subdivide large blocks of land. The averages rule is considered to result in an

38 The origin of the 2 hectare requirement dates back to the issue of the decisions on the District Plan in 1998. One of these decisions related to the 'Dalefield Zone' which enabled existing allotments of 10 acres (4 hectares), to be subdivided into two allotments as a controlled activity. This resulted in the 2 ha average that is still proposed today. This average rule has become problematic and inefficient when determining appropriate densities when applied to existing smaller lots.

39 The averages rules have been carried over from the ODP to the PDP and subsequently have not attracted volumes of analysis in the section 32 evaluation report (Chapter 22).

40 Paragraph 8.2 of the section 42A report states:

"The majority of submitters identified above, have suggested that the relief sought should be granted because it would promote the efficient use of land to enable more housing to be provided within the District. None of the submissions appear to have attempted to qualify what the impact would be on the landscape, nor on the rural living character and amenity within any identified area."

41 I am unsure whether 'landscape' refers to the landscape within the proposed Rural Lifestyle zone or the wider landscape in which the zone is placed. However, I discuss landscape, rural living character and amenity under respective headings:

Landscape

42 Issue 1 of the section 32 evaluation report (Chapters 6, 21 & 23) lists five areas of proposed rezoning from rural general to rural lifestyle and comments:

"The reasons these are suitable for Rural Lifestyle zoning are set out in the Read Landscapes Limited Report. It is noted these areas have been considered in a landscape management perspective on the Wider Wakatipu Basin.

These areas have either had a degree of subdivision and development occurred, or has capacity for residential subdivision at the density provided in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. In the case of these areas, establishing a density baseline of 2ha average, with lots up to 1ha protects these areas from higher intensity subdivision and development."

43 The density of 2ha average and lots up to 1ha is considered to protect these areas from higher intensity subdivision and development. Further, paragraph 8.4 of the section 42A report states the average of 2ha is important at providing a design led response in terms of subdivision design that is sympathetic to the landscape.

44 All proposed Rural Lifestyle zones have been accepted as being able to accommodate a level of residential development. It is considered that all existing Rural Lifestyle zones must be logically considered able to do the same.

45 Paragraphs 10.2 – 10.4 of Marion Reads evidence states:

“The PDP includes several new areas of Rural Lifestyle zoning. In part this is intended to direct residential development into parts of the landscape better able to absorb development and away from the more sensitive areas which have remained Rural Landscape. From a pragmatic point of view, if subdivision to 1ha is allowed in the Rural Lifestyle zones (and more than one submitter has said they consider two dwellings could be constructed on each building platform making the density of a Rural Lifestyle zone almost indistinguishable from the Rural Residential zone) then people wishing to have a few horses, raise a few sheep or alpacas or grow a few olives will have to move, again, to the Rural Landscape zone. I consider the effects of this on the landscape, particularly in the Wakatipu Basin, would be adverse.”

46 I understand from the evidence of Marion Read above that a density within the Rural Lifestyle zone which accommodates two residential units in one building platform on a lot size of 10,000m² makes it indistinguishable from one unit on one platform on a lot size of 4000m² (Rural Residential). However, Ms Read considers there is a distinction between a 2ha minimum allotment size and 1ha.

47 Attachment B contains an aerial photo of the proposed Rural Lifestyle zone above the Hawthorne Triangle as an example of land with allotment sizes which range from 600m² to 8.3ha. I accept that the difference between 1ha and 2ha is somewhat apparent from aerial observation directly above the subject landholding.

48 However, when this area is viewed from surrounding roads and public places the difference between 1ha and 2ha becomes considerably blurred by the presence of trees and domestic landscaping which is prevalent and accepted in the Rural Lifestyle zone.

49 I have provided some photographs within Attachment C. However, I must advise that these are included for broad illustrative reasons only.

50 I consider it difficult to distinguish between 1ha and 2ha as the distance between the subject landholding and view point increases.

51 Page 9 of The Read Landscape Limited Report June 2014 states:

“It is my observation that allotments of less than 5ha in area are small enough that land management practices which are essentially domestic in nature (mowing, tree planting, gardening) are feasible.”

52 Paragraph 10.3 of Marion Reads evidence states:

“It is my general observation that 2ha enables the keeping of animals and other productive land uses which are characteristic of the broader rural landscape and which cannot be sustained on smaller lots. Such an area ensures a sense of spaciousness and the maintenance of some other aspects of rural amenity such as quietness.”

53 I do not consider the keeping of domestic livestock a key driver for the retention of a 2ha allotment average and I do not consider that allotments of 1ha necessarily preclude the keeping of domestic livestock.

54 I undertook roadside observations throughout every rural lifestyle zone in the Wakatipu Basin with the exception of Wyuna over three days beginning 11.04.16. Approximately 212 allotments were observed where 13 (6%) contained livestock (Sheep, Horses, Alpacas and/or Chickens). Of the 13 containing livestock only 6 allotments contained a residential building and/or approved platform where 3 of the 6 were 2ha or greater in area.

55 Allotments were identified from the road side. The area of the allotment was identified by Quick Map Software.

56 Based upon my observations I believe that an allotment of 1ha does not necessarily preclude the keeping of domestic livestock as suggested in Ms Read’s evidence.

57 I do not believe that the removal of the 2ha average will result in the owners of domestic livestock will have to move to the Rural Landscape zone as suggested in paragraph 10.4 of Ms Read’s evidence. I concur with the section 32 evaluation report (Chapter 22) Issue 7 that the opportunity exists for domestic livestock within one to two hectare sized allotments. I believe this opportunity will continue should the 2ha averages rule be removed.

58 In summary, I do not believe that a 2ha average lot size should be retained to facilitate the keeping of selected domestic livestock and other productive land uses in an attempt to align with the characteristics of the broader rural landscape.

59 Paragraph 10.4 of Marion Read’s evidence states and I concur:

“The PDP includes several new areas of Rural Lifestyle zoning. In part this is intended to direct residential development into parts of the landscape better able to absorb development and away from the more sensitive areas which have remained Rural Landscape”.

60 However, I consider that a 1ha minimum allotment size without the 2ha average enables a subdivision design to achieve a more efficient and rational use of land within the Rural Lifestyle zone. A zone where appropriate residential use is accepted and can be absorbed. I consider this would promote greater relief upon the demand for residential development within more sensitive areas which have remained Rural Landscape.

61 Rule 22.4.3.3 stipulates that the identification of a residential building platform for the purposes of a residential unit is a discretionary activity. Consent is determined in this discretionary regime following consideration of the Objectives and Policies of the Landscape Chapter 6 which require critical consideration towards any development and its impact upon the landscape.

62 In addition to Chapter 6, Objectives and Policies of the Rural Lifestyle zone which I consider to be the most relevant are listed below:

Objective 22.2.1 The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values are maintained and enhanced while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can absorb development avoid detracting from those landscapes.

Policy 22.2.1.1 Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, remedied or mitigated particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines.

Policy 22.2.1.2 Set density and building coverage standards in order to maintain the open space, rural living character, amenity and landscapes values.

Policy 22.2.1.4 Manage anticipated activities that are located near Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes so that they do not diminish the qualities of these landscapes and their importance as part of the District's landscapes.

63 Paragraph 8.14 of the section 42A report states and I concur:

"I consider that a discretionary activity status is appropriate to ensure that the Council has the ability to assess the potential broad spectrum of issues that could arise for applications under this rule. In addition to matters such as servicing, access, landscape and amenity matters and natural hazards, an analysis could be require to ensure the proposed residential building platform would not undermine the overall density and resultant activity of any previous subdivisions."

64 Paragraph 11.1 of Ms Read's evidence contains and I concur:

"When building platforms are approved the visibility of a dwelling on the platform is assessed from all relevant public locations both within and outside of the zone."

65 I believe that the discretionary status, Chapter 6, Objectives, Policies and Rules of Chapter 22 are sufficiently robust to ensure inappropriate residential development is precluded.

66 In summary, I consider that the Rural Lifestyle zones have been accepted and largely already established with rural living. These zones have been accepted in the wider landscape and they can accommodate further rural living in appropriate places without compromising the landscape. The removal of the 2ha average enables a more rational approach to the subdivision of land in the Rural Lifestyle zone while the discretionary regime to identify residential building platforms considers Chapter 6, Objectives, Policies and Rules Objectives and Policies of the Rural Lifestyle zone which are considered to be sufficiently robust to amendment and/or refusal of any resource consent which seeks to identify a residential building platform where it will result in unacceptable adverse effects upon the landscape of the zone and/or adjoining zone.

Rural living character and amenity

67 Issue 3: "Protecting amenity values for inhabitants" of the section 32 evaluation report considers activities which impact upon amenity values and management of non-residential activities. Other residential activities has not been identified as requiring protection from the amenity values of inhabitants.

68 No issues have been raised in terms of a reduction in amenity value resulting from other residential activities being located on an allotment of 1ha within the Rural Lifestyle zone. However, I am mindful I have not been able to obtain a copy of the Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009 and Rural Living Zone Monitoring Report 2009 prior to completing this evidence.

69 The summary of Issues contained on page 8 of the section 42a report lists (f):

"The maintenance of amenity values and a pattern of development consistent with the expectations of inhabitants is an important determinant of the character and amenity of the two zones."

70 Issue 3 seeks to confirm the expectations of inhabitants of the Rural Lifestyle zone. The section 32 evaluation report does not discuss how these expectations have been specifically identified or referenced. A list of sources appears on Page 9 of the report and I have read the following which I considered relevant to these expectations:

- Plan Change 33 – Non-Residential Activities in the Residential, Rural Living and Township Zones.

- Read Landscapes Limited ‘...Landscape Character Assessment’ 2014.

71 As noted in paragraph 92 above I could not obtain a copy of the 2009 Monitoring reports.

72 I could not correctly identify how the expectations of inhabitants of the Rural Lifestyle zone has been ascertained.

73 The identification of a residential building platform is administered by a discretionary planning regime. I consider that rural living character and amenity can be adequately addressed within this regime.

74 Objectives, Policies and Rules of the Rural Lifestyle zone which I consider to be the most relevant are listed below:

Policy 22.2.1.6: Have regard to the location and direction of lights so they do not cause glare to other properties, roads, public places or the night sky.

Policy 22.2.5: Recognise existing and permitted activities, including activities within the surrounding Rural Zone might result in effects such as odour, noise, dust and traffic generation that are established, or reasonably expected to occur and will be noticeable to residents and visitors in rural areas.

Rule 22.4.3.2: The exterior alteration of buildings located outside of a building platform not exceeding 30% of the ground floor area of the existing building in any ten year period.

Non-compliance with rule 22.4.3.2 is a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *External appearance.*
- *Visibility from public places.*
- *Landscape character.*
- *Visual amenity.*

Rule 22.4.9: Home Occupation activity involving retail sales limited to handicrafts or items grown or produced on the site. Control is reserved to all of the following:

- *Privacy on neighbouring properties.*
- *scale and intensity of the activity.*
- *Traffic generation, parking, access.*
- *Noise.*
- *Signs and Lighting.*

Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours

All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m², new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:

Exterior colours of buildings:

22.5.1.1 *All exterior surfaces* shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;*

22.5.1.2 *Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a light reflectance value not greater than 20%;*

22.5.1.3 *Surface finishes** shall have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30%.*

Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.*
- *Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.*
- *The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.*

Rule 22.5.2: Building Coverage (Rural Residential Zone only)

The maximum ground floor area of any building shall be 15% of the net site area.

Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *The effect on open space, character and amenity.*
- *Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties.*
- *Ability of stormwater and effluent to be disposed of on-site.*

Rule 22.5.3: Building Size

The maximum ground floor area building shall be 500m². Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *Visual dominance.*
- *The effect on open space, rural living character and amenity.*
- *Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties.*
- *Building design.*

Rule 22.5.4: Setback from internal boundaries

The minimum setback of any building from internal boundaries shall be:

22.5.4.1 *Rural Residential zone - 6m*

22.5.4.2 *Rural Lifestyle zone - 10m*

22.5.4.3 *Rural Residential zone at the north of Lake Hayes - 15m*

Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- *Visual dominance.*

- *The effect on open space, rural living character and amenity.*
- *Effects on privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties.*
- *Reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties.*
- *Landscaping.*

75 The discretionary activity status for the identification of a residential building platform coupled with the above criteria and those contained in Chapter 6 are considered sufficiently robust to ensure that any future platform identification across a 1ha minimum allotment size are located where they will not compromise the landscape and/or rural character / amenity.

76 Issue 4, section 32 evaluation report (Chapter 22) states:

“Subdivision of an urban density has occurred in the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones and it is not appropriate for these areas to remain under the current zoning.

It would be prudent for a new objective and policy framework to start with a clean slate to uphold the integrity of the provisions for the remaining zones. This would also assist the Council resisting proposals for subdivision and development in appropriate rural locations or where they would be better dealt with as a plan change.”

77 Urban density ranges from 1 residential unit per 250m² to 1 unit per 4000m². I do not consider that any of the land appropriated for re-zoning to Rural Lifestyle by the Read Landscape Limited report June 2014 as being at an urban density.

78 Paragraph 11.1 of Ms Read’s evidence contains and I concur:

“One area which I consider could absorb development at the density of 1ha lots is within the Hawthorn Triangle, specifically the land bounded by Lower Shotover, Speargrass Flat and Domain Roads. This is for two reasons. The first is that a significant proportion of that land has already been subdivided into lots approximating 1ha in area already. The second is that there is little if any rural character remaining within that area now. It would seem sensible to increase the potential density of development there and protect the amenity of the surrounding landscape.”

79 Summary, I consider that providing a minimum allotment size for the current level of development is an ‘ad hoc’ resource management approach which does not seek to provide for the efficient subdivision of a finite land resource within the Rural Lifestyle zone. A correct approach would enable subdivision to a 1ha minimum allotment size where ‘effects’ can be considered and addressed as part of any discretionary resource consent application which must be assessed against the criteria contained in Chapter 6 and Chapter 22 of the Proposed District Plan.

CONCLUSION

- 80 Policy 21.4.6 In summary, the effect of an additional residential unit within an approved residential building platform is equal to a residential flat, the PDP contains rules to require appropriate building development is contained within any residential building platform while no robust analysis exists in the section 32 evaluation report, section 42A report or evidence compiled on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council in relation to Policy 21.4.6.
- 81 Policy 22.5.12.1 In summary, the construction of residential building within an approved platform is directed by the rules and standards of the zone which relate to bulk, location, materials, area. Other 'effects' associated with activities related to residential use are otherwise provided for within the other provisions of the PDP or ODP.
- 82 Rules 22.5.12.2 and 22.5.12.3: In summary, I consider that the Rural Lifestyle zones have been accepted and largely already established with rural living. These zones have been accepted in the wider landscape and they can accommodate further rural living in appropriate places without compromising the landscape. The removal of the 2ha average enables a more rational approach to the subdivision of land in the Rural Lifestyle zone while the discretionary regime to identify residential building platforms considers Chapter 6, Objectives, Policies and Rules Objectives and Policies of the Rural Lifestyle zone which are considered to be sufficiently robust to amendment and/or refusal of any resource consent which seeks to identify a residential building platform where it will result in unacceptable adverse effects upon the landscape and/or rural character / amenity of the zone and/or adjoining zone.

Nick Geddes

PLANNER

BSc (Geog), GradDip EnvSci

18th April 2016