

Summary Statement

Craig Barr for Queenstown Lakes District Council

- 1.1 I prepared the section 42A report on behalf of the Council, addendum section 32AA further evaluation of my recommended amendments, and attended the planning expert conferencing and am a signatory to the Planning Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**).
- 1.2 My evidence generally supported the Requestor's proposal subject to the following matters which I summarise and note whether in my view they have been resolved.
- 1.3 Amendments to the Structure Plan (and amendments to any relevant plan provisions as necessary) to reduce the collective landscape effects of Home Sites (**HS**) 9-16, including the reconsideration of building heights, the Landscape Amenity Management Areas (**LAMA**) and the proposed new Structural Planting Area (**SPA**) strategies:
 - (a) I note the Landscape JWS agrees that landscape effects will be minor, and I consider that the provisions as recommended by Mr Brown in his evidence and the revised Structure Plan will provide an appropriate framework to manage the collective landscape effects of development on HS 9 to 16 (the Speargrass Valley HSs).
 - (b) In the Planning JWS, the matter of whether a restricted discretionary activity consent, resource consent application for exceeding the proposed new rule 47.5.3A (maximum height for HSs 10, 12, 15 and 16) should be subject to a notification assessment (and able to be notified if necessary). As stated in the Planning JWS I do not consider this to be necessary, and nor does there need to be a matter of discretion referring to cumulative adverse effects.
 - (c) I consider that matter is resolved.

- 1.4 Additional planting in relation to Submitter Simon Dan's (#15) property associated with visual mitigation of the walkway/cycleway where it is located near his property at 214 McDonnell Road:
- (a) The revised Structure Plan identifies the hedge along the submitters' property and I consider new matter of control (f) in Rule 47.4.1 tabled in Mr Brown's evidence to be appropriate.
- 1.5 Amendments to Policy 47.2.1.14 (landscape and amenity) to provide a link to new rule 47.5.23 associated with limiting the number of dwellings utilising the eastern Hogans Gully Road access:
- (a) Mr Brown agrees with my recommended amendment to Policy 47.2.1.14 and I agree that the new proposed Rule 47.5.23 is appropriate.
- 1.6 The Structure Plan is amended so that the eastern Hogans Gully Road Access is located eastwards from its current proposed location as recommended by Mr Facey:
- (a) As noted in the Traffic JWS, this matter is agreed by both traffic experts and the recommended revised location of the access is shown on the revised Structure Plan.
 - (b) I note that the Landscape JWS records that the new access location and alignment to adjoin the existing proposed accessway is appropriate from a landscape perspective.
- 1.7 A new staging rule is introduced which requires a minimum 14 visitor accommodation units be constructed within the dedicated visitor related activity areas (A1, A3, A6 and C), before HS 6-16 can be developed.
- (a) I note this matter was not agreed in Mr Brown's evidence or the Planning JWS. I remain of the view that the re-distribution of residential activity and its dispersal to this part of the Zone raises the potential for the proposal to not achieve Objective 47.2.1, and that to alleviate this, these new dedicated home sites should be tied into provisions that require a minimum amount of dedicated visitor accommodation.

1.8 The Structure Plan is amended to show the walkway/cycleway trail over Lot 6 DP 392663 (the adjoining site to the south east corner of the Zone also referred to as the Boxer Hills land):

(a) This matter was not agreed in Mr Brown's evidence and nor in the Planning JWS. Having considered the Requestor's legal submissions which contains communication with the Queenstown Trails Trust, and that the Queenstown Trails Trust appear comfortable with the current proposed Trail location, I am comfortable with the Trail location as currently proposed. I no longer recommend that the trail be shown on the Structure Plan to locate over the Boxer Hills land.

1.9 That Rule 27.7.22(d)(ii) retains the reference to auditing by the council no sooner than 6 months after completion:

(a) I agree with the reasoning provided by Mr Brown in his evidence, as noted in the Planning JWS and I support the amendment to this rule.

1.10 That the proposed deletion of the following existing rules be rejected:

- (i) 47.4.5 (buildings where the relevant LAMA has not yet been established)
- (ii) 47.4.7 (buildings in Activity Area G)
- (iii) 47.4.22 (service activities)

(a) As noted in the Planning JWS, Mr Brown and I agree to retain these rules as currently drafted in the operative THRZ.

1.11 That proposed amendments to Rule 47.4.10 that would remove the requirement for AA S1 and S2 being in the same ownership as AA C and AA G be rejected:

(a) As stated in the Planning JWS, I now support the amendment to Rule 47.4.10.

1.12 I also considered that it would be appropriate for the Marshall Day noise assessment on helicopter landings (dated 2015) to be provided, this to confirm my support for the location of the new AA H:

(a) I have reviewed this report which is appended to Mr Browns' evidence (Attachment C) and I remain of the view that proposed new AA H is appropriate.

1.13 I have also reviewed Mr Todd's evidence and Mr Galloway's recreation evidence. As noted in the Planning JWS I support the recommended amendments of Mr Brown to the proposed SG Activity Area. I consider these will assist to manage nuisance effects on Submitters Todd and Brown who reside at Advance Terrace. I do not recommend any additional amendments to the provisions in relation to this submission.

1.14 I have reviewed Mr Dans' evidence. I note that he recommends at his paragraph 7 that the northern boundary is also provided the same treatment. In the absence of any further clarification from Mr Dan, I note that the hedge is shown on the northern boundary of Mr Dan's property on the revised Structure Plan, but not along the entire frontage. I also understand from Mr Brown's summary that the Trail has been relocated slightly which further assists with the intentions of Mr Dan's submission. However, as noted above I agree with the current provisions and Structure Plan.



Craig Barr

13 April 2026

