

Ulrich Glasner for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 3 May 2017
Ski Area Sub Zones – Hearing Stream 11

1. I have provided rebuttal evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) in relation to infrastructure matters regarding proposed extensions to the Ski Area Sub Zones (**SASZ**) in the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
2. My rebuttal evidence responds to Mr Dent's planning evidence on "Area 2: Proposed 'Ski Area Sub Zone B'" (**Proposed Sub Zone B**), which is sought to apply to approximately 21.6 ha at the base of the Remarkables Ski Field access road. His evidence is that there is a lack of water and wastewater servicing in this location and that any future development of the site will require the submitter to demonstrate and pay for any extension and increased capacity of Council reticulated services, or the provision of on-site facilities.
3. In relation to the former option of extending and joining Council reticulated services, there are no Council reticulated services in the vicinity, the closest being at Hanley Downs. Council has no plans to extend water and wastewater servicing to the base of the Ski Field access road, nor are there any projects in the current Long Term Plan (**LTP**).
4. In my opinion it is not in the Council's best interest for its water and wastewater networks to extend further into currently zoned rural land outside the urban limits, as this will result in increased operational, maintenance and renewal costs for the Council over the long term.
5. NZSki Limited's proposed provisions would not enable Council to recover the full costs of growth associated with the extension of services to this location (noting that there is no reticulated infrastructure in the vicinity to connect to in any event), and would not align with current strategic infrastructure planning processes under the LTP.
6. Council could not seek development contributions from the developer under any consent issued within an extended Proposed Sub Zone B, as the Council's current Policy on Development Contributions and Financial Contributions (**Policy**), does not allow the Council to impose development contributions within the Rural zone (under which the SASZ sits) for the three waters, unless the particular area is supplied by a scheme or the development is joining to an existing scheme.

-
7. Even if Council were to provide services to the site (which, even with the developer's initial funding is not Council's intention), I also consider that it would be difficult for the site to connect to services at Hanley Downs. This is because the capacity of the wastewater network is already fully allocated for the development of Hanley Downs and Jacks Point. This is similar in relation to the water supply for Hanley Downs.

 8. Any services would therefore need to be provided on-site and funded by the developer, as Mr Dent accepts at his paragraph 159. I am not opposed to on-site systems provided that they are designed to protect the environment and are suitable for on-site ground conditions. I note however, that given the location, there is no intention at all from the Council that such *on-site* services funded by the developer at this location, be joined to existing Council networks at a later date (and there is no existing infrastructure in any event). Such an outcome would result in increased operational, maintenance and renewal costs for the Council over the long term.