

**BEFORE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 13 -  
Queenstown Mapping

---

**STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY WILLIAMS**

**Dated 09 June 2017**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My name is Timothy Williams. I hold the Qualifications of Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University and Masters of Urban Design and Development with Distinction from The University of New South Wales. I reside in Queenstown.
- 1.2 I have practised in the planning and urban design field in the Queenstown Lakes District since 2003 and am currently employed by Remarkables Park Ltd as their Project Design and Planning Manager. Since 2003 I have been involved in a wide range of resource management matters including landuse, plan changes, subdivision and comprehensive development applications relating to the Resort Zones and including within Jacks Point.
- 1.3 My wife and I are residents of Jacks Point, 96 Jacks Point Rise having recently completed building our family home that we reside in with our two children. We lodged a submission (No 601) and further submission (NoFS1252) relating to the resort zones and in particular the Jacks Point Resort Zone.
- 1.4 I note although I have been involved in numerous relevant matters as an expert witness, my statement today is provided on behalf of our family, as residents of Jacks Point.

## **VISIBILITY FROM JACKS**

- 2.1 Rural outlook particularly to those neighbourhoods on the periphery of Jacks Point is an important characteristic to these areas. Residents within Jacks Point understand there is a structure plan controlling the location of development and the structure plan also directs where future development would occur within Homestead Bay. Therefore they have a legitimate expectation that there would be very limited if any visibility of dwellings to the south of the Jacks Point neighbourhoods given the structure plan for Homestead Bay largely restricted development to the contained basin near the lake.
- 2.2 The proposed expansion of the Homestead Bay has the potential to degrade and adversely affect this outlook. Proposed residential pods R (HB) A – C are new areas located within the balance open space/rural land that is effectively filling in the important open space area between the existing Jacks Point neighbourhoods and Homestead Bay.
- 2.3 Filling in this area has the potential to undermine the open space qualities that characterise the Jacks Point zone and the outlook that characterises the residential amenity that residents of Jacks Point have been provided through the zone and its associated structure plan.

- 2.4 In a similar manner the proposed southern OSR pod located at the foot of Jacks Point has the potential to alter the outlook and detract from the views residents currently appreciate associated with this natural feature.
- 2.5 Mounding is proposed, which I understand is intended to limit visibility of future development within proposed R (HB) A – C. In my opinion the same level of scrutiny to potential visibility provided to consideration of views from the State Highway should apply to potential visibility from the existing neighbourhoods within Jacks Point given the importance the rural outlook and absence of buildings plays in the nature and character of residence in the southern neighbourhoods.
- 2.6 In my opinion if development within the R(HB) A-C is to be provided for, mounding should ensure future development within these areas is not visible from the existing neighbourhoods within Jacks Point. Analysis in a similar manner to that provided for the State Highway should demonstrate how the mounding can achieve this screening whilst ensuring the mounding can achieve a natural form to blend in with the surrounding topography.
- 2.7 Accordingly, the proposed provisions should also be amended to ensure visibility from the Jacks Point neighbourhoods is considered in the same manner and given the same level of importance as from the State Highway.
- 2.8 Specifically, the following amendments to the provisions as proposed by Homestead Bay:
- 41.2.1.38 amended to read ‘as experienced from SH6 & Jacks Point residential neighbourhoods
  - 41.5.5 amend the title to ‘State Highway/Jacks Point Earthworks’
  - 41.5.12 amend wording ‘until Highway & Jacks Point Residential Neighbourhood Mitigation Works’
  - 41.5.12 Possible typo where it states R(HB) D & R, might meant to be E not R?

## **TRAILS**

- 3.1 The general approach of the proposed zoning expansion follows a similar density and layout pattern to Jacks Point. However provision of trails has been a key component of Jacks Point and to some extent Hanley Downs. There appears to be very limited trail connection proposed as part of the zoning.

- 3.2 If the expanded Homestead Bay zone is to integrate well with Jacks Point then additional trail connections should form part of the zoning approach. Otherwise the very basis of the rationale for the re-zoning is undermined by the lack of integration and consideration of its existing context.
- 3.3 In my opinion a network of trails should connect the proposed Homestead Bay pods to each other and the existing Jacks Point neighbourhoods and these trails should be identified on the structure plan. A corresponding rule should be provided that requires the formation of the trails in a logical manner in step with the development of Homestead Bay.

## **ROADING**

- 4.1 It is unclear to me how access to the expanded zoning will be provided. The operative zoning anticipated access via Maori Jack Road a private Road maintained by the residents of Jacks Point. This Road was never intended to accommodate the density and therefore increased traffic that would result from the proposed submission on behalf of the Homestead Bay entities. This additional traffic will have a significant impact on the ongoing maintenance of the road and therefore be at significant cost to the Jacks Point residents.
- 4.2 Therefore the zoning should not be able to progress until appropriate legal mechanisms are in place to address this issue.
- 4.3 The operative zoning for Homestead Bay and associated Stakeholder Deed also anticipated a private roading network integrating with the existing private structure for Jacks Point. Existing resource consents in place for subdivision at Homestead Bay indicate the future roading network within Homestead Bay may no longer be intended to be private.
- 4.4 Given the importance of adequate access to any development in my opinion it makes good planning sense to ensure roading access and any land ownership and maintenance issues surrounding access are resolved before the Panel can have confidence access can be provided to the zone without significant upfront or ongoing cost to the community.

Tim Williams

9 June 2017