

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Stage 3b of Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan
Stream 18 – Chapter 46 Rural Visitor Zone – Text Variation
and Mapping.

STATEMENT OF ELLA LOUISE HARDMAN ON BEHALF OF JAN HIGHTON, HILARY JOHNSTONE, ROB
AND JEAN JOHNSTONE, MALCOLM AND SALLY LAW, LLOYD AND DEBS MORSHUIS, KYM AND SIMON
MARSHALL, AND MARC AND TANYA SIMMONDS (FURTHER SUBMITTER #31073).

05 August 2020



- 1 My name is Ella Louise Hardman. I am a Resource Management Planner with Southern Land Ltd and I have been engaged by Jan Highton, Hilary Johnstone, Rob and Jean Johnstone, Malcolm and Sally Law, Lloyd and Debs Morshuis, Kym and Simon Marshall, and Marc and Tanya Simmonds to provide a statement in relation to their further submission (#31073) lodged on 5 March 2020.
- 2 Since the further submission was lodged the further submitters have had the benefit of receiving Councils Section 42A Report prepared by Emily Grace, along with Councils expert witness evidence prepared by Robert Bond, Geotechnical Engineer and Matthew Jones, Landscape Architect.
- 3 The submission site Lot 1 DP 367753 Comprises 34.4ha of land located at 280 Wanaka – Mount Aspiring Road and is otherwise known as Barn Pinch Farm. The site also includes ‘The Olive Grove’ a weddings and events venue. The submission site is surrounded by Rural and Rural Lifestyle zoned land.
- 4 The site is currently zoned RG under the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan and RZ under the Proposed District Plan. The site includes a portion of land identified as Outstanding Natural Landscape which is also contained within in a QEII National Trust Covenant Area.
- 5 In their submission the Blennerhassetts have sought to rezone the site to RVZ and to amend the policy and rule framework of Chapter 46 to allow for residential activity alongside visitor accommodation activities, and to enable land outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscape to be accommodated within the RVZ.
- 6 As outlined in the further submission (#31073), the further submitters consider that the relief sought by the submitter (#31053) in relation to rezoning of the submission site to RVZ and accommodation of residential activity alongside visitor accommodation does not align with the purpose, objectives or policies of the RVZ and therefore should be disallowed.
- 7 The RVZ is not appropriate in relation to the submission site because the site is not in a remote location and the site is unable to absorb the effects of development without compromising the landscape value of the District as required by the purpose of the RVZ.

- 8 Rezoning of the site to RVZ would provide for substantially more built form within the site than could currently be anticipated and would provide for the construction of buildings associated with visitor accommodation as a controlled activity whereby Council must (in most circumstances) grant consent subject to conditions being imposed. Controlled activity status in relation to the construction of future development would reduce Councils ability to decline applications based on adverse landscape effects.
- 9 The RVZ provides for up to 15 Flights per week from anywhere within the site as a permitted activity. At present, due to the proximity of the site to surrounding residential units, and in relation to rules regarding informal airports, far fewer flights would be anticipated. Increased flights under the RVZ would negatively impact the surrounding properties and due to the permitted nature of the flights no mitigation measures could be required to protect the amenity of the surrounding properties.
- 10 The natural hazard identified within the site requires site and proposal specific assessment that cannot be provided at plan level. Therefore, the appropriateness of a location within the site and mitigation proposed should only be assessed in relation to a specific proposal under discretionary status as is currently provided by the RZ.
- 11 RVZ manages landscape effects through location, while the current RZ uses discretionary status to manage effects on landscape. At this point and based on Councils expert evidence provided by Mr Jones it is not possible to identify that the site can protect, maintain, or enhance landscape values. Therefore, the current RZ zoning is more appropriate and allows applications for future development to be assessed on a case by case basis.
- 12 The proposed amendments to the policy and rule framework of Chapter 46 to provide for residential activity alongside visitor accommodation are unclear and would be contrary to the purpose of the Rural Visitor Zoning.
- 13 The current RZ is appropriate and allows for applications for residential and visitor accommodation activities to be assessed on a case by case basis under a discretionary activity and provides Council with greater control and discretion in terms of mitigation of adverse landscape and amenity effects.

