

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions in relation to the
Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Council
Stage 2 - Proposed District Plan

BY Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Submitter

AND Queenstown Lakes District Council
Respondent

Statement of Evidence of

Kim Louise Reilly

On behalf of Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc

Dated 6 August 2018

VISITOR ACCOMMODATION VARIATION

Federated Farmers of New Zealand
P O Box 5242, Dunedin 9054
Ph: 021 887 537
Email: kreilly@fedfarm.org.nz

VISITOR ACCOMMODATION VARIATION

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Kim Louise Reilly. I am the Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) South Island Regional Policy Manager. I am authorised to speak on behalf of Federated Farmers.
2. I have a Bachelor of Laws degree from the University of Otago and come from a proud farming background. I have represented the needs and interests of farming members across the South Island for the past six years.
3. I am a member of the national Biodiversity Collaborative Group, which is a stakeholder-led collaborative group established to look at the development of a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS).
4. During my time with Federated Farmers I have gained significant experience in the implementation of the Resource Management Act (the Act), including an understanding of the impact it has on farmers, communities and primary production.
5. The planning and policy aspects of my role include preparing submissions, further submissions and hearing presentations on a wide range of regional and district council plans, and supporting our members to effectively represent their own interests in planning matters.
6. I have experience with resource management planning matters across the South Island, including involvement in the Invercargill City District Plan, Southland Regional Policy Statement, Southland District Plan, Otago Regional Council Plan Change 6A, Otago Regional Council Plan Change 5A (Lindis Integrated Water Management), Southland Water and Land Plan, Marlborough Environment Plan, Queenstown Lakes District Plan, Central Otago District Plan, Christchurch City Plan, Hurunui District Plan, West Coast Regional Policy Statement and many others.
7. My comments today are made in the context of the significant contributions primary production make to the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the Queenstown Lakes District and the wider region.

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Rural Zones – Visitor Accommodation

8. Federated Farmers submitted requesting RVA rules that apply to the rural areas of the District be amended to enable 5 lets and 40 cumulative nights per annum. It is our view potential adverse effects on RVA activities in the Rural Zone are distinct to the urban environment in terms of residential development capacity and amenity.
9. Furthermore, some visitors will have a preference to over-night in the rural setting rather than the urban environment which is in keeping with a broad range of recreation activities such as tramping, hunting or fishing.
10. We support the explanation and proposed amendments at 10.9 of the Section 42A report.
11. **Recommendations:**
 - That the amendment at 10.9 of the Section 42A report be accepted.

Permitted Standards relating to Homestay Activities

12. Federated Farmers sought that the rules for homestays in the various rural chapters be amended to include references to residential units or farmhouses. This submission point was rejected, as the term farmhouse was not sufficiently defined.
13. We accept the lack of clarity in our submission point, however note the addition of the term “residential flat” to the definition of homestay. This addition will provide some comfort to our members who seek the ability to provide homestay activities to guests within a separate residential unit which is ancillary to the primary residential activity.
14. From a practical sense, rural homestay providers offer a distinctly different experience to those in the residential zones. Our interest in providing for homestay accommodation in standalone buildings reflects the feedback from guests to our member’s. We hear guests seek a level of privacy and independence from the homestay provider, who resides in a nearby but separate residential unit. We encourage the Hearing Panel to retain and incorporate the term residential flat to rural homestay activities to cater for this experience.
15. We also sought the maximum numbers of permitted guests that could be accommodated under the homestay provision from five as notified to eight. After considering the s42A report, we now accept that a permitted activity providing for five guests is sufficient.
16. **Recommendations:**
 - That “residential flats” is retained for permitted activity provisions in each chapter relating to the Rural zones. These provide for homestay activity in separate, stand-alone residential units that are solely for providing visitor accommodation that are secondary to the residential activity, and
 - That the notified recommendation for the maximum number of permitted homestay guests is retained.

Homestay Definitions (2540.60)

17. Federated Farmers supported the inclusion of the term farm-house to the homestay definition. The s42A report recommended the term residential flat for the provision of stand-alone homestay activity. We support the retention of the definition as proposed.
18. **Recommendation**
 - That the Section 42A report recommendation for the homestay definition is retained.

21.4 Rules – Rural Zone Activity Status Table 1 (2540.61)

19. Federated Farmers support the recommendation of the s42A report that accommodation and homestays in the Rural zone are a permitted activity subject to specific performance standards as set out in Table 1.
20. Having read the s42A report, we firmly consider the Plan must provide for visitor accommodation or homestays as a permitted activity provided certain criteria are met to ensure any effects of the activity are commensurate with the underlying zone.

21. **Recommendation**

- That visitor accommodation and homestays as set out in Rule 21.4.37 is retained as a permitted activity.

Recommended Amendments to Rule 21.5.53 (2540.62)

22. Federated Farmers submitted on Rule 21.5.53 for Residential Visitor Accommodation in the Rural, Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle Zone and Gibbston Valley Character Zone.
23. We submitted that Rule 21.5.53 be amended to provide for up to 5-let nights not exceeding a cumulative total of 40 nights. The s42A recommendation removes reference to the cumulative number of let-nights in favour of a cumulative total not exceeding 42-nights occupation by paying guests per 12-month period. Non-compliance with this threshold will require resource consent as a discretionary activity, which in our view is appropriate.
24. We support the pragmatic approach shown by the s42A report author for this provision.
25. **Recommendation**
- That the Section 42A report recommendation for Rule 21.5.53 is adopted.

Recommended Amendments to Rule 21.5.55.1 (2540.63)

26. Federated Farmers submitted that Rule 21.5.54.1 be amended to include an occupied farmhouse or an unoccupied flat adjacent to a farmhouse in the standards for Residential Visitor Accommodation and Homestays, and removing the prohibition of both on a site.
27. We note again that the term “farmhouse” was considered ambiguous and had no support from the s42A author. However, Federated Farmers is opposed to the position of the report writer that RVA or homestays may occur within either an occupied residential unit or an occupied residential flat on a site, and must not both occur within the same site.
28. **Recommendation**
- That Rule 21.5.54.1 is amended to provide for RVA or homestay activity within an occupied residential dwelling or an unoccupied residential flat adjacent to the primary dwelling and removing the prohibition of both residential activity and homestay activity on a site.