

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

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 14:  
Wakatipu Basin hearing  
and transferred Stage 1  
submissions related to  
Arrowtown and Lake  
Hayes

---

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MARCUS HAYDEN  
LANGMAN ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**PLANNING: WAKATIPU BASIN – REZONING SUBMISSIONS**

**Primary submitter:**  
Trojan Helmet Limited (2387)

**6 June 2018**

---

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / C J McCallum  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Marcus Hayden Langman. I am an independent planning consultant engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to prepare the planning report under s 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or **the Act**) for proposals for re-zonings as part of Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), located in the Wakatipu Basin (**Basin**).
- 1.2 My relevant expertise and experience is set out as Appendix 1 to my evidence-in-chief dated 30 May 2018. In my evidence-in-chief, I have also set out the evidence I have relied on, and those matters that are relevant for the consideration of the following submissions. I adopt that here.
- 1.3 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witness contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.
- 1.4 In the same way as my evidence in chief, I refer to the following versions of the PDP text, as follows:
- (a) Provision X.2.1: to refer to the notified version of a Stage 2 provision (i.e. Objective 31.2.1); and
  - (b) S42A Provision X.2.1: to refer to the recommended version of a Stage 2 provision as included in Appendix 1 in Mr Craig Barr's s42A report. (i.e. S42A Objective 31.2.1)
- 1.5 When referring to the Stage 1 PDP provisions, I am referring to the Council's Decisions Version notified on 5 May 2018, (i.e. Decisions Objective 3.2.1).

## 2. TROJAN HELMET LIMITED (#2387)

- 2.1 Trojan Helmet Limited filed a submission on the Stage 2 Variation for the Wakatipu Basin, opposing the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone

**(Amenity Zone)** as it applies to its property encompassing the Hills Golf Course. The submission included a number of reports supporting its request for rezoning the site as the proposed Hills Resort Zone. The reports are acknowledged at section 55 of my evidence-in-chief.

**2.2** I address this submission in Section 55 of my evidence in chief. At paragraphs 55.1 to 55.3 I provide a summary of the key concerns in relation to infrastructure and traffic that were raised in the evidence of Ms Jarvis and Mr Smith respectively. I also provided a summary of Ms Gilbert's evidence at paragraphs 55.4 to 55.6 in relation to the proposed Hills Resort Zone, before setting out my planning analysis.

**2.3** The following evidence replaces paragraph 55.6 of my evidence in chief, and should be read in addition to the remainder of section 55.

**2.4** Ms Gilbert's evidence-in-chief had not considered the Boffa Miskell Limited Report (**BML Report**) that was filed following the close of submissions further to a decision of the Panel to accept a late addition to its submission.<sup>1</sup> Ms Gilbert has now had the opportunity to consider the BML Report, which supports the Graphic Supplement for Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment, dated February 2018, and prepared by BML which was included with the originally filed submission. Ms Gilbert has prepared a supplementary statement addressing the BML Report, to be filed alongside this statement.

**2.5** Ms Gilbert's supplementary evidence can be summarised as follows:

- (a) concern over ad hoc rural residential development was one of the key drivers for the Council undertaking the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study (**WB Study**). The proposed Hills Resort Zone does not represent a landscape benefit in this regard;
- (b) the report relies on a lack of visibility and modified golf course use in support of its findings that the Resort Zone will be appropriate;
- (c) the proposal fails to meaningfully evaluate the resort style development in the eastern end of the Basin and how it

---

<sup>1</sup> Fourth decision on late submissions, dated 13 April 2018

influences the sense of place or identity of the wider Basin. In particular, the proposal will tip the balance to a landscape that is dominated by urban parkland (or resort) type development;

- (d) the proposal needs to be considered cumulatively alongside Hogans Gully Farm Limited (2313), Waterfall Park Developments Limited (Ayrburn Farm/Waterfall Park), and Millbrook;
- (e) the density and character is a significant departure from the more rural residential development character in the Basin and the very carefully considered (and visually discreet) consented development on the property;
- (f) when considered alongside Millbrook, it runs the risk of a perception of urban type development sprawling across the Basin; and
- (g) this outcome would significantly undermine the Wakatipu Basin Chapter Strategy of nodes of rural residential development interspersed with open and undeveloped rural areas.

**2.6** For these reasons, Ms Gilbert remains opposed to the submission.

### **Planning analysis**

**2.7** I have considered both the evidence of Ms Gilbert and reviewed the BML Report. I rely on Ms Gilbert's evidence in relation to landscape matters, and in particular the potential cumulative effects on rural character in the eastern end of the Basin.

**2.8** In relation to the Hills site, I note that this is on the very edge of the existing Arrowtown township. Pocket development on the site in close proximity to Arrowtown has the potential to erode a clear, defensible boundary to the existing settlement, and to compromise future development patterns should urban expansion be determined to be appropriate. This has been a key concern raised in the analysis of proposals elsewhere in my evidence-in-chief in relation to Landscape Character Unit (**LCU**) 22 - South Arrowtown.

- 2.9** Ms Gilbert also raises the impact of views and experiences from within the site. I note that for users and visitors to the resort, the concept of a rural setting will be diminished. This will impact on the overall experience of the Basin as an amenity landscape, which the objectives of the plan seek to maintain or enhance.<sup>2</sup>
- 2.10** Notwithstanding my comments above, I am not generally opposed to resort activities taking place in some form within the Basin.
- 2.11** To that extent, the s42A Chapter 24 does provide for a range of non-residential activities at 24.4.10 to 24.4.24, including visitor accommodation, cafes and restaurants and commercial recreation activities (which include golf courses) as a discretionary activity, within a clear objective and policy framework.
- 2.12** It is my opinion that the resource consent process reduces the need for multiple zones and provides an integrated means of managing effects across boundaries, within LCUs and across the Basin. It provides for equitable assessment against the LCU values that are set out in Schedule 24.8, no matter where a proposal is sought.
- 2.13** Noting Ms Gilbert's evidence, I do remain concerned, however, of the potential cumulative impacts of urban-type development and clusters impacting on the integrity or the rural landscape, particularly in relation to the eastern end of the basin.
- 2.14** Having considered Ms Gilbert's supplementary evidence on this matter, and having reviewed the BML Report myself, it remains my opinion that the submission from Trojan Hemet Limited is rejected.



**Marcus Langman**

**6 June 2018**

---

<sup>2</sup> Objective 24.2.1 and Objective 24.2.2 and Policies 24.2.1.1, 24.2.1.2, 24.2.1.3, 24.2.1.6, 24.2.1.9, 24.2.2.1, and 24.2.2.3