IN THE MATTER	of the Resource Management Act (Actq	
AND		
IN THE MATTER	of the submission by Ngãi Tahu Tourism Limited on the QLDC Proposed District Plan 2015 (Stream 13) to rezone a piece of land from Rural to Rural Visitor	
SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BEN FARRELL FOR Ngãi Tahu Tourism Limited (Submitter #716)		

22nd August 2017

INTRODUCTION

 My name is Ben Farrell. This statement of supplementary evidence is written in response to matters raised by Ms Devlin in her summary of evidence dated 21 July 2017.

COMPATIBILITY OF REZONING WITH EXISTING RESERVE VALUES

- 2. Ms Devlin recommends the submitters rezoning request to rezone the subject land from Rural General to Rural Visitor Zone to be rejected due to "the scale anticipated by the ODP RVZ being incompatible with the reserve's conservation, historic heritage and recreation values¹.
- 3. I respectfully disagree. In my opinion there is no evidence (which I am aware of) to suggest that the scale of development anticipated in the Operative District Plan Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) is incompatible with the reserve's conservation, historic heritage and recreation values. On the contrary, I believe there is a very low risk that any conservation and heritage values of the land will be significantly threatened:
 - a. The land is owned by the Crown and is administered by the Department of Conservation in accordance with the respective requirements of the Reserves Act and the Conservation Act.
 - b. Councils landscape and ecological evidence does not oppose the rezoning request on landscape or ecological grounds.
 - c. Archaeological values are protected by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act. There are no listed or identified heritage features on the land.
 - d. The RVZ does not permit development or activities that would undermine or significantly degrade the values associated with the land. In this regard the effects of development can be managed through the resource consent process and applicable provisions in the district wide chapters. For example the provisions in chapter 22 manage earthworks; and buildings in the RVZ are controlled in respect of [among other things]: adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values, nature conservation values and the natural character of the rural environment².

-

¹ Summary evidence par 27

² Rule 12.4.3.2(iii)

e. Table 1 below compares the activity status of the established activities on the land against the RVZ and the Proposed Rural General Zone. In my opinion the activity statuses under the RVZ are more aligned to the nature and scale of the existing activities on the land compared to the PDP Rural.

Table 1 Comparison of activity status for existing activities in the subject land

Activity	PDP RZ	Operative RVZ
New buildings	Discretionary	Controlled
Commercial Recreation (Jet Boating/Rafting)	Discretionary	Controlled
Community Activity (DOC Offices)	Non-Complying	Permitted
Service Activity (DOC workshop)	Non-Complying	Permitted
Recreation Activity (carpark and walkway)	Permitted	Permitted
Commercial Activity (Cavell's Café/Bar, Gallery)	Discretionary	Discretionary
Residential Activity	Permitted	Permitted

4. Having regard to the above matters, I conclude the scale of development and activities provided for in the RVZ will not be incompatible with the reserve's conservation, historic heritage and recreation values.

FIT WITH THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN FRAMEWORK

5. It should be relative easy to fit RVZ provisions into the structure of the proposed district plan. For example:

New Rural Visitor Zone Chapter

a. A new Rural Visitor Zone Chapter could be inserted into the PDP. The contents of the chapter could mirror the operative district plan provisions in respective of the zone purpose, objective, policies and rules.

New Rural Visitor Sub Zone Provisions in Chapter 21

- b. Alternatively, Chapter 21 could be amended to include bespoke Rural Visitor Sub Zone provisions (in a similar way to the Rural Industry Sub Zone). The amendments could include:
 - i. A new paragraph in 21.1 explaining the sub-zone purpose (this could be the same or similar as the RVZ purpose);

- ii. A new objective and associated policies in 21.2 relating to the subzone (these could be the same or similar as those set out in the RVZ);
- iii. A new Rules Table in 21.5 setting out sub-zone activities and standards (these could be the same or similar as those set out in the RVZ).
- Additionally, new bespoke provisions could be inserted into the above framework. In this
 case, it seems appropriate (based on the evidence of Ms Banks and Mr Glasner) to
 manage the effects of new residential development on public infrastructure via a
 discretionary status.
- 7. I have reviewed the Strategic Direction provisions in Chapter 3 (as notified) and I cannot see how inclusion of a Rural Visitor Zone or a Rural Visitor Sub Zone into the proposed district plan framework would be inconsistent with the direction given.

ONL BOUNDARY LOCATION

8. Dr Read considers that the ONL could be moved to exclude the site³. This position is not opposed by any party and would partly address the concerns raised in the submission by Ngãi Tahu Tourism Limited. I therefore consider it would be appropriate to exclude the land from the ONL.

CONCLUSION

- 9. Zoning the land rural visitor is not incompatible with the reserve's conservation, historic heritage or recreation values.
- 10. Zoning the land rural visitor can fit within the proposed district plan framework.
- 11. The relief sought by Ngãi Tahu Tourism Limited can be partly implemented by amending the district plan maps to exclude the land from the ONL.

SIGNED

22 AUGUST 2017

-

³ Ms Devlin (24 May par 46.8)

Evidence of Ben Farrell to QLDC, 22nd August 2017 Attachment 1: Aerial Image of Morning Star Reserve area



