

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

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –  
Chapter 21 – Rural, Hearing Stream T02.

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE - SEAN DENT ON BEHALF OF TOTALLY TOURISM  
LIMITED (#571) & SKYLINE ENTERPRISES LIMITED (#574)**

Dated: 24<sup>th</sup> May 2016

---

**SOUTHERN PLANNING GROUP**

Resource Management Consultants

PO Box 1081

QUEENSTOWN

Phone: (03) 409 0140

Fax: (03) 409 0145



## INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Sean Dent. I am a resource management planning consultant with Southern Planning Group and I am here today presenting expert planning evidence on behalf of Totally Tourism Limited and Skyline Enterprises Limited. My primary evidence has already been pre-circulated in accordance with the directions of the Hearings Chairman.
- 1.2. The primary matters which have been addressed in my pre-circulated evidence relate to the simplification and streamlining of the management of Informal Airports and the provisions relating to Commercial Recreation Activities.
- 1.3. With respect to the PDP provisions for Informal Airports I agree with the Council's approach to recognise and stipulate through its Objectives and Policies that the Rural Zone is the appropriate Zone for this activity. Quite simply there is no other proposed Zone in the District Plan that more readily provides for the open space, low density of residences and urban infrastructure that make aircraft operations desirable from a commercial tourism perspective, as well as being safe and with suitable separation distances to maintain rural amenity.
- 1.4. The proposed provisions that enable limited scenarios and/or numbers of Permitted flights are a significant improvement on the status quo in which every single aircraft landing in the District requires resource consent. In my opinion the status quo has not been effective and efficient for either the aircraft operators or the Council who must process the required applications.
- 1.5. I understand a number of submitters believe the proposed limitations on flights for private Rural Zone land to be an impediment to their current use. With respect, if these submitter's can prove existing use rights the proposed provisions have no effect on them. Alternatively, if no existing use rights apply then the provisions are again an improvement on the status quo.
- 1.6. I have considered the recommendations in the Section 42A Report and I agree with the change from a maximum weekly flight limit to a daily flight limit on private Rural Zone land primarily due to the ease of monitoring and compliance.
- 1.7. I have made recommended changes to the relevant Objectives and Policies for Informal Airports on pages 4 & 5 of my primary evidence and to Rule 21.2.25 on page 7. I support the Council officers proposed Rule 21.5.26 as drafted on page 78 of the Section 42A Report.

1.8. I do note that while the Further Submission I lodged on behalf of TTL supported a policy protecting informal airports from reverse sensitivity issues I have omitted to outline such in my primary evidence. As such I suggest now that an additional policy numbered 21.2.11.3 be added to the PDP that reads as:

*“Protect existing informal airports from incompatible land use and development locating within the Rural Zone”.*

1.9. In my opinion this proposed Policy sends a clear directive that proposals for rural residential development in particular need to be cognisant of existing informal airports and the separation distances necessary to co-exist in the Rural Zone.

1.10. In regards to the PDP provisions for Commercial Recreation Activities it is my opinion that there were no specific Objectives and supporting Policies for Commercial Activities. The most relevant provisions were in my opinion found at Part 21.2.9 of the PDP (page 21-6). These provisions refer to Commercial, Industrial, Retail and Forestry Activities but do not once refer specifically to Commercial Recreation Activities.

1.11. Accordingly, it is my opinion that their relevance to the proposed rules for Commercial Recreation Activities contained within Table 5 are limited. Accordingly, I proposed a new Objective and four new supporting Policies at pages 11 and 12 of my primary evidence. These provisions direct and inform proposed Rules 21.4.16 and Standard 21.5.21 that Commercial Recreation Activity can be appropriate in the Rural Zone but specific regard must be given to group sizes in order to control overcrowding and diminished amenity for other users and acknowledgement of the special character of some Rural Areas particularly with regard to peace and tranquillity.

1.12. Overall, subject to the amendments discussed herein and those in my primary brief of evidence I consider that the provisions of the PDP are an appropriate response to informal airports and commercial recreation activities in the Queenstown Lakes District.

1.13. I am happy to answer questions from the commissioner that are within my area of expertise.