

Before the Queenstown Lakes District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a submission under clause 6, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 on Stage 3B of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan

Between **Wayfare Group Limited (#31024)**

Submitter

Summary of Evidence Ben Farrell

22 June 2021

Applicant's solicitors:
Maree Baker-Galloway |
Anderson Lloyd
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348

p + 64 3 450 0700
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz |

**anderson
lloyd.**

May it please the Commissioners

Natural Hazards

- 1 Considerable effort has been taken by Wayfare to understand and address natural hazard (alluvial fan) and liquefaction risks affecting parts of the site. I support amending the proposal to include measures that appropriately manage the natural hazard risks including avoidance of significant natural hazard risk, namely:
 - (a) Avoiding residential activities in the two alluvial flow paths
 - (b) Restricting all development in the two alluvial flow paths
 - (c) Controlling development in the Natural Hazard Management Area (NHMA).
- 2 For clarity, I do not agree it is appropriate to avoid or restrict development or activities within the NHMA. This area is the focal point of the long-established tourism activities at Walter Peak, including the homestead and a house [until recently] used for residential activity.
- 3 Based on the evidence of Mr Bond, Mr Meldrum, various conversations with Real Journeys' Staff, and my own experience, I consider the natural hazard risk associated with the amended proposal to be insignificant.

Landscape

- 4 Council is unconvinced the proposal for an Exception Zone and [primarily] controlled activity regime may not achieve the relevant 'protect' policy direction. Mr Mathee says the proposal will not result in "appropriate regulatory control over the spatial extent or form of built development across the site". Central to this issue appears to be whether or not decision-makers should be given discretion to decline resource consent applications for visitor industry activities, versus controlling development outcomes via the controlled activity status, within the site along the lakefront/northern side of the "Von Peninsula".
- 5 Council is proposing the RVZ and landscape sensitivity mapping regime. Ms Mellsop has identified the majority of the site being of high landscape sensitivity and unsuitable for development.
- 6 Council's proposed RVZ regime for the site is restrictive and will make resource consent application process uncertain, expensive, and lengthy. I consider development across the site as a controlled activity to be appropriate. The proposal is a bespoke "special zone" that has a legacy of anticipated development rights which no party (other than QLDC) is concerned with.
- 7 Council appears to be of the position that the proposal must "protect landscape values", without qualification. The policy framework, as I interpret it, does not

prescribe such a strict requirement. The key landscape protection test in my opinion is whether or not the proposal will result in the maintenance of the values that contribute to the ONL being outstanding (being the higher order direction in the operative RPS).

- 8 While the actual extent and description of ONL values in play have not been agreed or accurately articulated (that I'm aware of), I consider the values that make the ONL outstanding will be maintained on the basis that:
- (a) Actual landscape effects will be low (as identified by Mr Skelton) not significant and adverse (as identified by Ms Mellsop).
 - (b) The extent of the site, while prominent from certain (but not many) public locations, is almost negligible in scale compared to the broader ONL. The site's landscape values do not "stand out" compared to the other 97% of ONL in the District.
 - (c) Built development on foothills in close vicinity to the lakeshore is a feature of Whakatipu wai-māori.
 - (d) The landscape characteristics of the site are modified and represent use and development over time including as a well known visitor destination, and it is not appropriate for the District Plan to preserve or protect the current modified landscape characteristics without qualification. There is no evidence that the site has suddenly reached a cumulative tipping point. I observe Ms Mellsop appears determined to preserve the current pastoral open space characteristics of the site, rather than acknowledging and supporting landscape change.
 - (e) The proposal includes discretionary activity status for many activities and development and permitted or controlled activity status only for farming and visitor industry related activities, on the same basis as Ski Area Sub Zone and the Gibbston Character Zone classify the primary activities provided for in those zones in ONLs.

Residential activity

- 9 I do not share Mr Mathee's concern with the provision for residential activity in the proposed Tourism Zone on the same Discretionary basis as the Rural Zone. Residential activity (and subdivision) which is not ancillary to visitor industry activities at the site will be discretionary. I do not understand how the proposed provisions will result in inappropriate adverse effects.

Ben Farrell