

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed
District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Submissions Seeking
Amendments to the Planning Maps
covering Queenstown and
Queenstown Rural (Excluding
Wakatipu Basin)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES
ON BEHALF OF**

**Jardine Family Trust
Remarkables Station Ltd
Homestead Bay Trustees Ltd**

(Submitter 715)

Dated 5th June 2017

1.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Nicholas Karl Geddes. I hold a degree of Bachelor of Science majoring in Geography and Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science from Otago University.
- 1.2 I have fifteen years' experience as a resource management practitioner, with past positions as a Planner in local Government in Auckland, private practice in Queenstown and contract work in London, England. I have been a practicing consultant involved in a wide range of developments, district plan policy development and the preparation and presentation of expert evidence before Councils.
- 1.3 I was employed by a Queenstown consultancy in 1999 before moving to Auckland City Council in 2001 where I held a senior planning position with Auckland City Environments. Leaving Auckland in 2005 I worked in London as a planner for two and a half years before returning to Queenstown where I have been practicing as a planning consultant since. I currently hold a planning consultant position with Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Limited.
- 1.4 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court consolidated Practice Note (2014). I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.
- 1.5 I have authored submissions on the plan review, prepared evidence and attended hearings in relation to the following Chapters:
 - a. Chapter 4 – Hearing Stream 1B in relation to Submission 414;
 - b. Chapter 21 & 22 – Hearing Stream 2 in relation to Submissions 228, 233, 235, 411 & 414;
 - c. Chapter 27 – Hearing Stream 4 in relation to Submission 414;
 - d. Chapter 7 – Hearing Stream 6 in relation to Submission 336;
 - e. Chapter 41 – Hearing Stream 9 in relation to Submissions 342 & 715;

f. Planning Maps – Hearing Stream 12 in relation to Submission 314.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The submission seeks to re-zone land within the existing Homestead Bay part of the Jacks Point Structure plan and land zoned Rural. The re-zoning replaces: FBA with OSR, OSF with R(HB)E and OSH with R(HB)D. The re-zoning extends existing structure plan activities into Rural and creates additional residential and open space areas on land currently zoned Rural: R(HB)D, R(HB-SH)A-C, OSL, OSA and OSF.
- 2.2 The proposed re-zoning locates an additional intersection with SH6 and formalises an existing intersection for existing airport activities. All activities contained in the proposed re-zoning can be fully serviced.
- 2.3 Council's reports and the comments raised in further submissions have informed a number of changes to the proposed structure plan and amended policy provisions.
- 2.4 Expert evidence supports the proposed re-zoning in the areas of landscape, infrastructure, traffic and natural hazards.
- 2.5 In preparing this evidence I have evaluated these proposals against relevant National Policy Statements and Regional Policies both operative and proposed, relevant matters contained in Part 2 of the Act and addressed other relevant statutory matters.
- 2.6 An assessment of environmental effects has been undertaken where any adverse effects associated with the proposed re-zoning are considered to be acceptable while relative effectiveness and efficiency of amendments to Jacks Point Zone have also been assessed against the requirements of s.32AA.

3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 The purpose of this evidence is to assist the Hearings Panel within my expertise of resource management planning in relation to the submission

lodged by Jardine Family Trust, Remarkables Station Ltd & Homestead Bay Trustees Ltd (#715) on the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan.

3.2 I have prepared evidence where I assess and explain:

- a) Submission 715;
- b) National Policy Statements;
- c) Regional Policy Statements;
- d) Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Strategic Chapters;
- e) Part 2 of the Act;
- f) Assessment of Environmental Effects;
- g) Section 32A(A) Evaluation;
- h) Other Statutory requirements;
- i) Further Submissions;

3.3 In the preparation of this evidence I have reviewed the following:

- a. Section 32 Evaluation Reports, Council s.42A Reports and QLDC right-of-reply for the following PDP Chapters; Strategic Chapters 3-6, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle, Subdivision, Rural and Residential.
- b. Associated evidence submitted on behalf of QLDC prepared by Mr Glenn Davis, Mr Timothy Heath, Ms Wendy Banks, Dr Marion Read, Mr Ulrich Glasner, Mr Denis Mander, Mr Phillip Osborne and Mr Stephen Chiles.
- c. The relevant submissions and further submissions of other submitters

In addition to the above, I have reviewed the reports and statements of evidence of other experts including:

- a. Landscape from Mr Ben Espie - Landscape Architect, Principal, Vivan+Espie Ltd;
- b. Traffic from Mr Jason Bartlett - Traffic Engineer, Principal, Bartlett Consulting Ltd

- c. Infrastructure from Mr Chris Hansen - Surveyor, Survey Manager, Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd.
- d. Natural Hazards from Mr David Rider – Senior Engineer, RDAgritech Ltd.

Abbreviations:

Queenstown Lakes District Council - “QLDC”

Proposed District Plan – “PDP”

Operative District Plan – “ODP”

Resource Management Act 1991 – “The Act”

Strategic section 42A report – “Ss.42A”

Group 1D Queenstown Urban -

Jacks Point Zone Extension section 42A report – “s.42A”

National Policy Statement: Urban Development Capacity 2016 – “UDC”

Special Housing Area – “SHA”

Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement – “OORPS”

Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement – “PORPS”

Open Space Residential – “OSR”

Homestead Bay Residential State Highway Activity Areas A - C
– “R(HB-SH) A – C”

Highway Landscape Protection Area – “HLPA”

Open Space Area – “OSA”

Open Space Landscape – “OSL”

Homestead Bay Residential Activity Area D – “R(HB) D”

Homestead Bay Residential Activity Area E – “R(HB) E”

Open Space Foreshore – “OSF”

Dwelling Capacity Model – “DCM”

Outstanding Natural Feature – “ONF”

Outstanding Natural Landscape – “ONL”

Preliminary Site Investigation – “PSI”

4.0 SUBMISSION 715

- 4.1 As noted in my evidence towards hearing Stream 9 the Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd made a submission on the PDP in relation to land described as Lots 1-7 DP 452315 and Lot 8 DP 443832. Homestead Bay Trustees Ltd purchased Lots 6 & 7 DP 452315 in November 2016.
- 4.2 Since purchasing Lots 6 & 7 Homestead Bay Trustees Ltd have lodged a resource consent application to undertake a 12 lot subdivision with building platforms, including associated landscaping and earthworks in the ODP OSR area (RM161288) and applied for a bore permit from ORC to provide a community supply (RM17.134).
- 4.3 The s.42A report correctly records submission points 715.1 and 715.6 have been formerly withdrawn and paragraph 3.2 provides an accurate description of the contents of attachments to the memorandum filed dated 15th May 2017.
- 4.4 Appendix 6 of the s.42A report accurately describes the residential development yields within Homestead Bay under the existing ODP and the proposed re-zoning sought by submission #715.
- 4.5 Paragraphs 5.1 – 5.8 of the landscape evidence provided on behalf of submitters by Mr Ben Espie accurately describes the land contained within submission #715 and its surrounds. The land described by Mr Espie is set on the recommended structure plan which is contained in Appendix 1 to my evidence while the structure plan areas are more colourfully depicted in the plans attached to Mr Espie's evidence.
- 4.6 **Note:** The recommended structure plan (Appendix 1) has been amended following the filing of the memorandum 15th May 2017 and my evidence only refers to this plan.
- 4.7 All policy amendments are set out in Appendix 2.

Open Space Residential (OSR)

- 4.8 The OSR areas are split east and west where the eastern OSR extends along the foot of Jacks Hill and comprises of 14.4 hectares where 12 residential dwellings are anticipated. The resulting density within this OSR area is 1 dwelling per 1.2 hectares while the existing OSR density in the ODP is 1 dwelling per 1.28 hectares.
- 4.9 The OSR east replaces the ODP Farm Buildings and Craft Activity Area (FBA). Subsequently submission #715 recommends the deletion of PDP policies 41.5.1.15 and 41.5.12.2(e).
- 4.10 The western OSR extends south from the ODP OSR along a terrace formation and comprises of 36.7 hectares where 29 residential dwellings are anticipated. The resulting density within this OSR area is 1 dwelling per 1.26 hectares.
- 4.11 Submission #715 proposes a total of 41 dwellings in the re-zoned OSR activity area and recommends an amendment to Policy 41.4.9.15.
- 4.12 With the total area of OSR at 51.1 hectares the ODP policy requiring 50% of this area to be planted in native vegetation appears excessive and not entirely appropriate to the character of the land contained in the proposed OSR extensions. Dr Read comments in paragraph 12.31 and it is concurred:

“The submission also seeks the deletion of Rule 41.5.2.7 (as notified, 41.5.3.7 RoR version) which requires that at least 50% of any site within the OSR to be planted in native vegetation, prior to building. This is both onerous and could result in a haphazard planting pattern. Further, there is no requirement for the ongoing maintenance of this planting. Consequently I consider that this rule could be deleted.”

- 4.13 Dr Read’s recommendation is adopted and appears in the revised Chapter 41 contained in Appendix 2.

Homestead Bay Residential State Highway Activity Area D - R(HB) A - C

- 4.14 The proposed re-zoning seeks to locate three residential nodes some 350m from State Highway 6. Each node seeks a density of 10 - 15 dwellings per

hectare and an amendment to policy 41.5.8.1 in this respect. These residential areas have been grouped to provide open space areas in between akin to the design and density of Jacks Point (SH) residential areas.

- 4.15 A comprehensive earthworks design has been undertaken and a plan of proposed mounding appears in the recommended chapter policy 41.9(a). The mounding seeks to obscure any visual perspective of built form from State Highway 6.
- 4.16 The mounds are to be complimented with landscaping as detailed on the Landscape Plan which appears in the recommended chapter policy 41.9(b). Both the mounding and landscaping constitute the proposed State Highway Mitigation works. Policy 41.5.12 has been amended to require that these works are completed prior to the construction of any residential units within R(HB-SH) A - C and D - R(HB) D areas.
- 4.17 In order to ensure this screening remains effective cadastral computer modelling has been completed by Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd which calculates a maximum height datum (masl) where any built form constructed below this datum will be within the visual shadow of the mounds when viewed from the State Highway. This datum prescribes the maximum height limit as set out in recommended policy 41.5.12.2(l).
- 4.18 As part of any future subdivision consent the maximum height of any building above the finished level on the site can be registered on the title for the property informing any lot owner.
- 4.19 The volume of material required to construct the mounds can be found within the residential areas and the access roads which connect them. No machinery is expected to use Jacks Point Roads or the State Highway. Sediment control within the boundaries of the site is ensured by the nearest boundary being 350m upslope of the works area. The landscape plan is required to be completed prior to construction of residential buildings as discussed above. This will ensure exposed surfaces are treated immediately following mound formation.

- 4.20 On the basis that the appearance of the mounds is acceptable and their visual mitigation relied upon for residential areas I recommended that the mounds should not require a resource consent as set out in the amended policy 41.5.5.

Highway Landscape Protection Area (HLP A)

- 4.21 Between the State Highway and R(HB) A - C areas the same protection overlay has been applied as the one that currently extends along the State Highway and Jacks Point Zone boundary. The proposed overlay seeks to remain comparative with the Jacks Point and Hanley Downs and will be farmed. However, unlike Jacks Point and Hanley Downs HLP A this area will not be administered by a company rather retained in private ownership.

Open Space Area (OSA)

- 4.22 Areas between the residential nodes of R(HB-SH) are to be retained in Open Space to remain comparative to Jacks Point while the OSA area between the R(HB-SH) and R(HB) D is considered to provide a generous open space buffer and retain land in elevated locations free of any built form.

Open Space Landscape (OSL)

- 4.23 This area extends under the HLP A as directed by the existing Jacks Point and Hanley Downs sub-zones. Where this area extends between the State Highway and residential areas it is intended to be farmed and to facilitate this one dwelling house is to be identified in this area with a maximum height of 8m. The provision of this house is recommended in amended policies 41.4.9.11, 41.1.1.4 and 41.5.12.2.
- 4.24 OSL extends along the proposed northern boundary of the re-zoned Homestead Bay and Jacks Point to include the air strip which is currently operated by NZone Ltd. The provision of NZone operation is recommended in amended in amended policy 41.5.1.10.

Homestead Bay Residential Activity Area D - R(HB) D

- 4.25 A residential activity area similar in design and density as existing Jacks Point Neighbourhoods is contained over the area referenced in the ODP as Open Space Horticulture (OSH). As such, submission #715 seeks to delete policy 41.5.1.12 and amend policy 41.5.8.1 to provide a density of 10 – 15 dwellings per hectare.

Homestead Bay Residential Activity Area E – R(HB) E

- 4.26 A residential activity area similar in design and density as Jacks Point Neighbourhoods and is contained over the area referenced in the ODP as Open Space Foreshore (OSF). The density of this residential area is 10 – 15 dwellings per hectare and submission #715 seeks to amend policy 41.5.8.1 accordingly.

Open Space Foreshore (OSF)

- 4.27 The OSF area has been extended where appropriate to ensure the consistent appearance and management of open space within the vicinity of Lake Wakatipu. This is intended to achieve the same balance between open space and residential activities as contained in the ODP.
- 4.28 Dr Read considers policy 41.5.12 requiring the planting of native species over 80% of this area to be “extremely onerous” and she recommends a revised policy as set out in paragraph 12.30 of her evidence. 80% does appear excessive and Dr Read’s revised policy is contained in the recommended revisions to Chapter 41.

Homestead Bay Access

- 4.29 The revised Structure Plan depicts a connection from Maori Jack Road which travels through R(HB) D and further to the State Highway. The point of intersection with the highway has been chosen as it affords generous sight lines in each direction and without prohibitive works will offer a intersection similar to Maori Jack Road. This is considered to offer a safe and level access point for traffic associated with the proposed re-zoning.

Air Strip Access

- 4.30 An existing access point is used by the NZone operation. To limit this access to its current level of use a new policy 41.5.7.4 specifies that formation of this access point shall not exceed a “New Zealand Transport Agency Diagram D – Special Use Access.”

Village Activity Area & Boating Facilities Activity Area

- 4.31 These areas remain as currently provided in the ODP.

5.0 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 The statutory framework for assessing the merits of any submission seeking to apply a zone has been correctly set out in paragraph 9.2 of the Ss.42A report where the matters listed (a) to (j) have been addressed under relevant headings within this Part of my evidence.

National Policy Statements

- 5.2 Section 75(3) requires that a district plan must give effect to any national policy statement; any New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement; and any regional policy statement.

- 5.3 The following National Policy Statements have been considered:

- Urban Development Capacity
- Freshwater Management
- Renewable Electricity Generation
- Electricity Transmission
- Coastal Policy Statement

- 5.4 With the exception of Urban Development Capacity, in my opinion, none of the remaining policy statements listed above are relevant.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (UDC)

- 5.5 QLDC provided a supplementary memorandum regarding the UDC on the 19th April 2017 which considered the definition of ‘urban environment’ as it

would apply to Queenstown. It was concluded and it is concurred that this environment should include the collection of areas within the Wakatipu Basin that together function as a single urban environment and should not be limited by the physical constraints (natural features) which may geographically dissect the basin.

- 5.6 Based upon the contents of the 19th April 2017 memorandum I consider that the subject site is firmly placed within the 'urban environment' for the purposes of assessment under the UDC.
- 5.7 A full copy of Objectives and Policies set out in the UDC are contained within Appendix 3.
- 5.8 The revised supplementary statement of evidence of Craig Barr (2nd May 2017) towards Hearing Stream 12 provides an assessment against the UDC as it applies to the Wanaka Urban Environment. I concur with the reasons set out in paragraphs 8.24 – 8.27 of Mr Barr's evidence which conclude Policies PB1-PB7, PC2, PC3, PC5-PC11 and PD1-PD4 are not relevant for assessment purposes.
- 5.9 The remaining applicable UDC Objectives and Policies are highlighted in bold within the set contained in Appendix 3.
- 5.10 Policy PA1 asks for sufficient housing development capacity at any one time over three time periods up to 2045. The capacity must be feasible (commercially viable) and identified in relevant plans and strategies.
- 5.11 Policies PA3 and PA4 have particular regards for requirements to be recognised at the time of any planning decision. These policies ask the decision maker to not only provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people but to have particular regard to providing for choices for a range of dwelling types and locations.
- 5.12 Paragraph 9.22 of the Ss.42A report outlines the DCM is to be addressed in supplementary evidence and confirms in paragraph 9.23 an informed and strategic approach to the delivery of additional capacity will be offered by the end of 2017.

- 5.13 Residential capacity was identified for the Upper Clutha through the evidence of Mr Phillip Osborne, 1st May 2017 and summarized in the supplementary evidence of Mr Barr. Within the “Summary of updated development capacity model for outputs for Upper Clutha” paragraph 7.13 Mr Osborne’s evidence includes:

“In assessing the sufficiency of the feasible and realised capacity there is economic justification for considering a longer period of time than that covered by the PDP reviews. A period of 10 years would suggest that a capacity of only 2,500 units would meet the estimated demand however it is considered that a well-functioning housing market requires a large number of potential development opportunities to be available, so that developers and prospective homeowners have a wide variety of choices, and the downward competitive pressure is applied to land prices across the district. If the market has confidence in the sufficiency of future development capacity and supply over the long term, then this will help reduce speculation-driven price increases, as well as encouraging landowners to develop their land sooner rather than hold out for higher prices later (i.e. land-bank).”

- 5.14 Speculative driven price increase was identified in the evidence of Mr Osborne towards hearing Steam 6 as being a concern to the Queenstown Residential Environment along with an insufficient supply of residential land and it was noted that a significant proportion of development opportunities are located in more dispersed high priced areas that do not cater for a growing proportion of the residential population.

- 5.15 I believe the proposed re-zoning results in feasible residential development capacity which increases the supply of residential land and creates development opportunities outside of existing high priced residential areas.

- 5.16 I believe Paragraph 7.13 of Mr Osborne’s evidence highlights that a well-functioning housing market requires a large number of potential development opportunities. Paragraph 5.2 of Mr Michael Copeland’s evidence towards Hearing Steam 2 is relevant and reproduced here:

“There is now a general acceptance in New Zealand and other countries that economic wellbeing and economic efficiency are maximised when

investment decisions are left to individual entrepreneurs or firms, without intervention from Government. The essence of this approach is that the efficient use of resources, and therefore "sustainable management" results from the creation of a climate where the market enables people to make investment decisions "to provide for their economic well being". Sometimes "market imperfections" or "externalities" arise because the actions of individuals or firms create positive or negative impacts on others."

5.17 Based upon the evidence of Mr Osborne and Mr Copeland I believe that notwithstanding the findings of the DCM and supplementary reporting to be released 16th June 2017 a healthy functioning market is required which is one that is supported by multiple development opportunities in multiple locations and these should be derived from people and communities providing choices for their social and economic wellbeing in the short and long term. I believe the proposed re-zoning contributes to a healthy market and provides for the social and economic wellbeing of the community. This should be supported by decision markers as set out in policies PA1, PA3 and PA4 of the UDC.

5.18 Paragraph 9.24 of the Ss.42A report reads:

"Further, the PDP is not the only method by which the Council may give effect to the NPS-UDC. Other statutory (for example, Special Housing Areas (SHAs) under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013) and non-statutory methods are available."

5.19 The table contained in Policy PA1 of the UDC states that long term development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies. Plans are defined under the UDC as any plan under s.43AA of the Act or proposed plans s.43AAC of the Act:

s.43AA: *Plan means a regional plan or a district plan.*

s.43AAC: *Means a proposed plan, a variation to a proposed plan or change, or a change to a plan proposed by a local authority that has been notified under clause 5 of Schedule 1 or given limited notification under clause 5A of that schedule, but has not become operative in terms of clause 20 of that schedule; and*

Includes a proposed plan or a change to a plan proposed by a person under Part 2 of Schedule 1 that has been adopted by the local authority under clause 25(2)(a) of Schedule 1.

5.20 SHAs are approved as specific land use / subdivision consents under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 and the Act. Mindful of the definition above, I question whether a consent approval for a SHA should be considered as being “identified in relevant plans” as required by Policy PA1 of the UDC. The SHA offers a process for approval rather than the identification of areas suitable for housing.

Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement

5.21 Objectives and Policies of the Operative Regional Policy Statement are contained within Appendix 4 of my evidence along with those of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement. In particular;

5.22 Objective 5.4.1 relates to the sustainable management of Otago land resource and 5.4.2 seeks to avoid, remedy or mitigate degradation of the natural and physical resources from activities using the land resource.

5.23 Objective 5.4.3 seeks to protect outstanding natural features and landscapes.

5.24 Policy 5.5.4 promotes the diversification and use of the land resource to achieve sustainable land use and management systems and uses. This is supported by Objective 3.2.1.4 and must be considered with reference to UDC Objectives and Policies.

5.25 Policy 9.5.4, addresses the effects of urban development and settlement.

5.26 Policy 9.5.5 promotes the quality of life for people and communities within Otago’s built environments, though the identification and provision of an acceptable level of amenity; management of effects on communities’ health and safety from the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources; and managing effects on landscape values.

5.27 I believe that submission 715 is consistent with relevant Objectives and Policies of the Operative Regional Policy Statement for the following reasons:

- a. The environmental effects of the proposed re-zoning have been assessed in Part 6 where it is concluded that any adverse effects associated with the proposed re-zoning are acceptable.
- a. The submission provides appropriate development protecting the outstanding natural landscapes and as confirmed in the evidence of Mr Espie.
- b. The area to be re-zoned is not considered to contain any high class soils. Any loss of rural productive capacity must be appropriately balanced with contributing to a healthy functioning housing market in creating development opportunity in a central location and offering people and communities choices for their social and economic wellbeing in the short and long term.
- c. The proposed zoning is not within a statutory management area with respect to lwi and is not considered to frustrate the partnership between Council and Ngai Tahu to collaboratively manage the District's natural and physical resources.
- d. No significant areas of existing indigenous vegetation within the area of the proposed re-zoning have been identified.
- e. No significant areas of existing indigenous vegetation within the area of the proposed re-zoning have been identified. Areas within the proposed Structure Plan have been identified for the introduction, maintenance and protection of native species.
- f. Air quality will be maintained by Air Standards under the Regional Plan: Air.
- g. Assessment of natural hazards has been undertaken and discussed in the evidence of Mr Rider where it is concluded that while hazards do exist these should not preclude the proposed re-zoning.

- h. Efficient and effective infrastructure can be developed to service the proposed re-zoning.
- a. PSI and DSI investigations have been discussed in Part 6 of my evidence where it is considered that any areas subject to HAIL activities will be limited. If identified, these areas can be adequately avoided and/or remedied to provide land fit for residential occupation.
- i. It is acknowledged there is a need for further residential land uses.

Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement

- 5.28 I believe the most relevant Objectives and Policies with the PORPS relate to the identification and management of landscape values, urban growth and development and ensuring there is sufficient residential and commercial land capacity to cater for a 20 year demand. This is supported by Objective 3.2.1.4 and must be considered with reference to UDC Objectives and Policies.
- 5.29 Objectives and Policies of the Jacks Point zone promote the principles of good urban design. I believe the extension of this zone over land within Submission 715 will not compromise the ability of these Objectives and Policies to establish and administer successful living amenities.
- 5.30 Open Space areas protect key landscape amenities, re-generate indigenous species in areas with mechanisms to protect these areas in the future. Existing walking / bike trails within the Jacks Point Structure Plan remain unaffected and the ongoing enjoyment of this network will be continued.
- 5.31 I consider that the Objectives and Policies of the PORPS are not materially different to those of the OORPS. As such, for reasons outlined in paragraph ** in my evidence I confirm that submission 715 is consistent with key Objectives and Policies within the PORPS.

Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Strategic Chapters

Chapter 3 - Strategic Directions

- 5.32 A synopsis of this Chapter has been provided in paragraphs 8.2 – 8.7 of the Ss.42A report and I believe this is an accurate description of Chapter 3. I adopt these paragraphs for the purposes of preamble.
- 5.33 For the reasons outlined in paragraphs ** to **earlier in my evidence, I believe that submission 715 is consistent with each Objective and Policy within Chapter 3.
- 5.34 In addition, I would like to place particular emphasis on Objectives 3.2.6.1 and 3.2.6.2 which directly correlate to the obligations, objectives and policies of the UDC discussed earlier. For the reasons outlined earlier in my evidence I believe that submission 715 provides added security that these objectives will be met.

Chapter 4 – Urban Development

- 5.35 A synopsis of this Chapter has been provided on paragraphs 8.8 – 8.14 of the Ss.42A report and I believe this is an accurate description of Chapter 4. I adopt these paragraphs for the purposes of preamble.
- 5.36 I must note that by adopting paragraphs 8.8 – 8.14 this does not change my evidence filed towards Hearing Stream 1B in relation to Submission 414. I remain of the opinion that the intentions of this Chapter will largely be met by bespoke provisions within each relevant lower order Chapter.
- 5.37 Notwithstanding, I do not see this as an impediment to consider any extension of the UGB to include the land proposed to be re-zoned as depicted on the Structure Plan contained in Appendix 1 on the basis that the proposed re-zoning:
- Is adjacent existing settlement and not sporadic;
 - Can be efficiently and effectively serviced with infrastructure to accommodate the demand from the proposed residential development;
 - Provides direct access to the State Highway;
 - Contributes to a healthy functioning housing market in creating development opportunity in a central location and offering people and

communities choices for their social and economic wellbeing in the short and long term;

- For the reasons outlined in paragraph ** the proposed re-zoning does not adversely affect the environment, rural amenity or any ONF or ONL.

Chapter 5 – Tangata Whenua

5.38 A synopsis of this Chapter has been provided on paragraphs 8.15 – 8.23 in the Ss.42A report and I believe this is an accurate description of Chapter 5. I adopt these paragraphs for the purposes of preamble.

5.39 I believe that submission 715 is consistent with each Objective and Policy within Chapter 5 for the following reasons:

- The proposed re-zoning is not within a statutory management area with respect to Iwi.
- The proposed re-zoning is not considered to frustrate the partnership between Council and Ngai Tahu to collaboratively manage the District's natural and physical resources.
- There is no known waahi tapu within the area of the proposed re-zoning.
- If required, Accidental Discovery Protocol can be imposed by conditions of any future resource consent.

Chapter 6 – Landscape

5.40 A synopsis of this Chapter has been provided on paragraphs 8.24 – 8.35 in the Ss.42A report and I believe this is an accurate description of Chapter 6. I adopt these paragraphs for the purposes of preamble.

5.41 Key to this strategic chapter are the management and protection of landscapes, areas from adverse effects of subdivision, use and development. Particular emphasis must be attributed to the protection of ONF and ONL landscapes. Provision for residential subdivision and development is afforded only in areas where the character and value of landscapes are maintained.

5.42 Mr Espie has provided a comprehensive assessment of any effects upon the landscape and visual amenity in his evidence and his conclusions are recorded in Part 6 of my evidence. Based upon the evidence of Mr Espie I believe that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of Chapter 6.

Part 2 of the Act

Section 5

5.43 Submission 715 seeks to change zoning and has been prepared in order to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 “the Act”, which is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

5.44 Matters listed (a) to (c) within section 5(2) have been considered and this submission is considered to support the purpose of the Act for the following (but not limited too) reasons:

- Provides for additional residential land to meet future needs enabling the community to provide for their economic well-being;
- Can be efficiently and effectively serviced;
- Affords direct access to State Highway 6;
- The effects of the proposed re-zoning have been discussed in Part 6 where it is concluded that any adverse effects associated with the proposed re-zoning are acceptable.
- The proposed re-zoning creates development opportunity and offers people and the community to provide for their social and economic wellbeing.
- No significant natural systems have been identified within the areas proposed to be rezoned.
- The proposed zoning is not within a statutory management area with respect to Iwi and is not considered to frustrate the partnership between Council and Ngai Tahu to collaboratively manage the District’s natural and physical resources.
- No significant areas of existing indigenous vegetation within the area of the proposed re-zoning have been identified.
- Air quality will be maintained by Air Standards under the Regional Plan: Air.

- Efficient and effective infrastructure can be developed to service the proposed re-zoning.
- Residential development can be undertaken within land proposed to be re-zoned without giving rise to reverse sensitivity effects.
- Natural hazards can be adequately addressed at the time of any future resource consent.
- It is acknowledged there is a need for further residential land uses.

5.45 I believe that proposed re-zoning does not compromise the potential of any natural or physical resources. The life supporting capacity of air, water and ecosystems will be safeguarded.

5.46 The life supporting capacity of soil will be slightly diminished by the introduction of residential buildings which must be balanced with contributing to a healthy functioning housing market in creating development opportunity in a central location and offering people and communities to afford choices for their social and economic wellbeing. On balance, I consider that any loss of life supporting capacity of soil to be acceptable.

Section 6

5.47 Matters of National Importance. This requires that any submission seeking to locate any zone shall recognise and provide for the appropriate management, use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.

5.48 Matters listed (a) to (g) under this section of the Act provided for in the PDP by ONF, ONL and SNA areas with particular reference to the strategic chapters of the PDP which have been discussed above in Paragraphs 4.34 to 4.45. For reasons listed in these paragraphs the submission is considered to recognise and provide for the protection of natural and physical resources.

Section 7

5.49 Matters listed (a) to (j) in s.7 of the Act have been considered and for the reasons listed in paragraph 4.47 and further supported by paragraphs 4.34

to 4.45 (UDC, Economic Discussions) I believe submission 715 is fully consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act.

6.0 Assessment of Environmental Effects

Landscape and Visual Amenity

6.1 Mr Ben Espie has provided a comprehensive assessment of any effects upon the landscape and visual amenity and concludes:

“In relation to landscape character, I consider that the relief that is now sought will accord with the landscape character of the Coneburn valley at a broad scale. Additional suburban development will be situated on a part of the valley floor that is already characterised by suburban and/or resort development; the rural and pastoral character that dominates the eastern part of the valley floor (including the SH6 corridor) will be preserved; and the character of the Homestead Bay lake edge will not be degraded.

The relief sought by the submission would mean that the visual experience that is had by SH6 users that are adjacent to the built part of Jack’s Point would continue further south (but built form would be less visible). A rural outlook will remain for highway users, one that is dominated by the Remarkables, pasture land and the lake.

For viewers on the lake surface that are to the south and southwest of Homestead Bay, development enabled by the situation sought by the submission will increase the intensity of visible development that sits around the village. This will amount to a moderately increased detracting from the naturalness that currently characterises these views.

From some private viewpoints within elevated southern parts of Jack’s Point the midground in views will be less uniform and simple and will include some visual evidence of built development. The amenity derived from these views will remain high but views will become slightly less natural.

Some visibility of new development will be experienced from the northernmost parts of Lakeside Estate. For most viewers, the effect will be slight but for some that are closest to the extended OSR area, effects could be described as moderate.”

- 6.2 Based upon the evidence of Mr Espie I conclude that the any adverse effects upon the landscape and visual amenity in relation to the proposed re-zoning are acceptable.

Traffic

- 6.3 Mr Jason Bartlett has provided a comprehensive assessment in terms of traffic and concludes:

“The Jardine Family Trust and Remarkables Station Limited Submission (715) seeks to rezone an area of rural land to facilitate the development of residential lots within the Homestead Bay area of the Jacks Point zone. It is possible that this zone change could provide up to 541 additional residential lots.

The existing access to Homestead Bay is via Maori Jack Road. The proposed zone change would maintain this road link and is seeking to establish two new access intersections from SH6. The assessment that I have undertaken shows that one of these access intersections is possible, the Homestead Bay Access. The second proposed access, Airport Access, will require further design work if this is to serve a portion of the proposed residential zone change.

To manage the approvals, from NZTA and JPROA, regarding access to the additional residential lots I have suggested possible conditions. With this conditions I consider that additional access(es) can be provided prior to any additional residential development at Homestead Bay.”

- 6.4 Based upon the evidence of Mr Bartlett I conclude the proposed intersection Homestead Bay Access is possible but requires formal approval from NZTA.

Infrastructure

- 6.5 A comprehensive assessment of infrastructure required by the proposed re-zoning has been undertaken and outlined in the evidence of Mr Chris Hansen. Mr Hansen concludes:

“The proposed re-zoning of the Homestead Bay Residential Area is not considered to have any impacts on the infrastructure network. Infrastructure already exists that can be augmented as required to cater for additional demand or new infrastructure can be developed to service the residential activity proposed.

The infrastructure will be constructed and paid for the by the applicant as the development proceeds. It is anticipated that new infrastructure required would be constructed at little or no cost to QLDC. It is possible that the construction of new infrastructure required for this development could also have a wider network or community benefit by augmenting or providing additional security to existing infrastructure.

Stormwater would be managed for the development on site and is not expected to have any effects on existing infrastructure.

Other non-Council infrastructure and network utilities exist and have capacity to supply this development. Should additional capacity to accommodate the cumulative demand of the residential on the non-Council infrastructure be required, it can readily be provided.”

- 6.6 Based upon the evidence of Mr Hansen I conclude that the proposed re-zoning can be adequately serviced and no adverse effects upon any existing infrastructure or the environment in this regard have been identified.

Ecology

- 6.7 A comprehensive assessment of any adverse effects form the proposed re-zoning on the ecology of the land contained within the submission has been completed on behalf of QLDC by Mr Glen Davis. Mr Davis’s assessment comments:

“In general I do not oppose the submission on the grounds that most of the development footprint will occur on former pastoral land with no existing indigenous vegetation. The only area of ecological constraint associated with the proposal that I consider should be addressed is the area of open space residential activity proposed on the lower southern slopes of Jacks Point. This area is shown in Error! Reference source not found. and contains strongly regenerating bracken fern with shrubland developing through the bracken. This vegetation is situated within an environment where the indigenous vegetation cover remaining nationally is less than 20%. It is therefore a priority for protection. The area is also connected to the wider area of Jacks Point where bracken fern is regenerating strongly. Furthermore, there is a source of broadleaf indigenous forest on the northwest lower faces of Jacks Point that will supply the ongoing regeneration of Jacks Point.”

- 6.8 The comments of Mr Davis are accepted and the boundary of the OSR (west) has been amended to avoid the area depicted in the Diagram provided in Mr Davis’s evidence. The amended structure plan is contained in Appendix 1 of my evidence.
- 6.9 Based upon the comments of Mr Davis and the amended structure plan I conclude that any adverse effects of the proposed re-zoning on the ecology of the land contained within submission 715 are acceptable.

Natural Hazards

- 6.10 Land identified for Large Lot Residential zoning is identified on the Council’s hazard information as comprising of alluvial fan, debris flow and flooding (rainfall) hazards where the s.32 evaluation report submits that *“Prior to any further development, potential hazards would be required to be assessed and the hazard mitigated or avoided as required.”*
- 6.11 By way of comparison, land at 361 Beacon Point Road is proposed by QLDC to be re-zoned from Rural General to Large Lot Residential. This land is an area identified on the Council’s hazard register as comprising a LIC 2 ‘Possibly Moderate’ liquefaction risk and is within the flooding return period 75 – 150 year return period. The s.32 evaluation report for this re-zone states:

“These hazards are located within other urban areas and any future development should be entitled to the opportunity to undertake design and mitigation investigations.”

- 6.12 I concur with the s.32 evaluation report for Large Lot Residential zoning that hazards can be assessed at the time of subdivision and at this point any mitigation or avoidance of the hazard will provide for the social well being of any future end-resident. Likewise, the development pursuant to the proposal now before you.
- 6.13 Notwithstanding the above, a natural hazard assessment has been undertaken by Mr David Rider, RDAgritech Ltd and summarized in this evidence. Based upon the evidence and recommendations of Mr Rider I conclude that any adverse effects in terms of natural hazards are acceptable.

Economics

- 6.14 Section 32 Evaluation Reports which support the Strategic Chapters and the Residential Chapters confirm the thrust of the PDP is to intensify existing residential areas whilst providing some additional residential areas to satisfy the growing demand for housing as set out in the economic evidence relating to the these Chapters.
- 6.15 I believe the executive summary of Mr Osborne’s Economic Evidence towards hearing stream 6 provides an accurate synopsis of the existing residential environment and the intended PDP intensification ambitions. I have paraphrased his summary below:
- Substantial growth in the residential market;
 - Demand for residential housing rises where a shortfall in 2013 was already at 800 homes;
 - Housing prices and sales continue to rise;
 - A highly speculative vacant site market exists;
 - Overall affordability for the District is one of the lowest in the country;
 - By 2045 the District is expected to require 10,000 – 16,000 new houses to cater for demand;

- To maintain the growing employment base affordability must be addressed;
- Issues are not primarily insufficient supply of residential land but development locations and options currently provided by the market;
- Intensification of residential activity is often accompanied by both economic costs and benefits;
- There are factors which are likely to mitigate / reduce risks of medium / high density developments;
- There are economic benefits of intensification;
- Medium / high density residential options offer significant economic benefits rather than adding to land available;
- Encouraging medium / high density will improve community well-being and economic viability of the District.

6.16 Based upon my 13 years of experience in this District seeking approval for resource consents within existing residential zones in Queenstown I believe that the intensification will not facilitate sufficient housing to meet demand, as insufficient emphasis has been placed on the constraints imposed by gradient or geography of the existing residential areas. In the Wakatipu Basin a majority of centrally located residential areas are located on hillsides. In my opinion this has the following limiting factors:

- Confines the ability to increase the existing capacity of arterial roads without prohibitive costs.
- Site size is required to be 30%-50% greater to facilitate conventional residential building platforms if seeking to establish between 30-40% of the net site area.
- Building costs are greatly increased on any sloping site.
- Minimum useable outdoor living areas required by District Plan standards are unachievable.
- Provision of two car parking spaces per allotment is difficult in some circumstances and to introduce further residential units and further parking to service is almost always problematic if not implausible.
- Second and third storey levels cannot be achieved without compromising the amenity values on properties downslope of the development site.

6.17 I find it noteworthy that affordability and supply of housing are key objectives of SHAs. Nearly all of which are located on flat land located

outside Urban Growth Boundaries and those which are being constructed or have recently been completed on land which was actively farmed within the last ten years. None of these are located in existing residential zones.

- 6.18 Land with flat or moderately sloping topography has a higher chance of a comprehensive design creating efficiencies in infrastructure design, flexibility in access and roading alternatives and often enables extensive reserve spaces. Flat unoccupied land facilitates the adequate provision of residential amenities within the site and ensures amenity between the sites.
- 6.19 Land which has been traditionally farmed is outside Urban Growth Boundaries and is more likely than its residential counterpart to afford a 'raw' land value which is considerably lower. A factor which I consider is essential for residential development to offer affordability.

Queenstown-Lakes Housing Accord

- 6.20 QLDC and the Minister for Building and Housing signed an accord on the 23rd of October 2014 which clearly records issues relating to the supply of housing in the District. Four of these are summarised as follows:
- Housing affordability and an adequate supply are key elements to maintaining a well-functioning, dynamic community with a strong economy.
 - Home ownership for many residents of the Queenstown Lakes District is unaffordable contributing to increased pressures on families, communities and government support agencies.
 - There is a very high demand for housing based upon projected growth and meeting this demand will require a large number of new dwellings.
 - Housing affordability is potentially acting as a constraint on the local economy with businesses reporting difficulties attracting and retaining staff due to high housing prices.
- 6.21 The Accord seeks to support the Council to address immediate housing issues and agreed targets to be achieved based upon housing projections supplied by Statistics New Zealand and an independent report commissioned by Council which predicted higher population growth than the Statistics New Zealand projections.

- 6.22 74-69% of the target outlined in the Accord will be met providing the seven SHAs approved to date are successful in obtaining resource consent and providing that the development set out in each SHA is fully implemented. However, only three of these approved SHAs have successfully obtained resource consent and only one has reached completion over two years from its conception.
- 6.23 The seven SHAs are expected to provide 74-69% of the Accords target yet 47-52% of this provision lies in residential units within retirement villages. The larger of these offers lease arrangements only and would not appear to promote home ownership. This results in some 33% of the expected housing yield from SHAs that cannot be purchased in longevity.
- 6.24 In summary, I remain dubious about the ability of residential intensification to yield a large supply of housing within the short to medium term which is affordable and addresses the issues raised in Mr Osborne's evidence. SHAs should account for an increased supply of housing but to date cannot contribute significantly to addressing the issue of home ownership.
- 6.25 As such, I believe there is a greater demand for the type and location of housing sought by submission #338 and in promoting 1105 residential allotments this is considered to be a positive effect of the proposed re-zoning.

National Environmental Standard (NES) for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health.

- 6.26 Land pertaining to submission 715 is and has been farmed for generations. Further investigation towards whether land is actually or potentially contaminated within the subject site will be required at the time of any future subdivision consent as a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI).
- 6.27 In my experience of subdividing former farmland for residential purposes NES considerations relate to the nature and location of potential HAIL activities which are generally associated with activities such as sheep dipping and the storage of pesticides, fertilisers, machinery and/or fuel. The areas in which these activities occur are not widespread but confined and

are able to be avoided or remediated to provide land fit for residential purposes.

7.0 Section 32 Evaluation

Section 32A(A)

7.1 The submission seeks to re-zone land from Rural to Jacks Point Zone with amendments to the Jacks Point Structure Plan and Chapter 41 policies as set out in Appendix 2.

7.2 Reasonably practicable options are:

- 1 Retain the Rural Zone;
- 2 Re-zone all of the land through the creation of a new Special Zone;
- 3 Re-zone all of the land Jacks Point Zone.

Retain the Rural Zone

7.3 *Costs:*

- Unlikely to cater for predicted levels of growth.
- Rural Zone objectives and policies will not facilitate residential development.
- An attempt to seek development on the basis of the Rural Zone rules would involve a detailed prescription of controls relating to residential building platforms to replicate appropriate building design, height and landscape controls and significant detail relating to the staging of development to sequence the development over the construction period.

7.4 *Benefits:*

- Fewer costs resulting in the District Plan Review Process.

Special Zone

7.5 *Costs:*

- Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process.
- Does not achieve the goal for a streamlined District Plan.

7.6 *Benefits:*

- Enables additional areas that are currently undeveloped to be considered for inclusion in the zone.
- The re-zoning enables diversity of housing options in the District, and makes a positive contribution to the District's economy.

Jacks Point Zone

7.7 *Costs:*

- Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process.
- The proposed residential uses are activities which are sensitive noise environments and expect appropriate levels of amenity.
- Providing acoustic treatments for critical listening environments will increase development costs.
-

7.8 *Benefits:*

- Achieves the goal of a streamlined District Plan.
- Provides for a diverse range of residential activities to occur to serve the needs of the community.
- Enables the policy framework to be critically assessed and strengthened where necessary.
- Enables additional areas that are currently undeveloped to be considered for inclusion in the zone.
- Increased population and greater densities – especially if within well designed built development - can help support community safety.
- The re-zoning enables diversity of housing options in the District, and makes a positive contribution to the District's economy.
- Supports 5(2) of the RMA through ensuring development enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. Meets the intent of Section 7 (Other Matters) of the RMA which requires particular regard to “*the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*”.

- Supports the purpose of the RMA through mitigating adverse effects of development, whilst enabling social and economic wellbeing through support for efficient land densities.

7.9 The proposed re-zone to Jacks Point Zone remains the primary relief sought by submission 715.

8.0 Other Statutory requirements

8.1 A number of requirements remain outstanding in relation to the proposed re-zoning where I consider:

- There are no relevant management plans or strategies prepared under other Acts;
- There are no relevant entries on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero;
- There is no relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, that has a bearing on the resource management issues of the land affected by this submission or any land further afield;
- The submission does not give rise to any potential for trade competition.

9.0 FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

9.1 Submission 715 received further submissions from Grant and Cathy Boyd (1218), David Martin Poppleton and Margaret Poppleton (1225), Kristi and Jonathan Howley (1237), Mark and Katherine Davies (1247), Sonia Voldseth and Grant McDonald (1250), Joanna and Simon Taverner (1293), Thomas Ibbotson(1299), John Holland and Mary Catherine Holland (1321), Greg Garthwaite (1073), Carol and Peter Haythornwaite (1096), Ben and Catherine Hudson (1103), L and J Moodley (1114), C and N Cunningham (1108), S and K Pearson (1116), M and J Butler (1192), G and C Boyd (1218) whom seek that the whole of submission 715 be disallowed. A summary of these is contained in Appendix 5 and the reasons for opposing submission 715 are listed below:

- Development is inappropriate in a rural zone

- Would have more than minor effect on the immediate neighbours, the Jacks Point residents, the general public who use the tracks and QLDC reserves adjacent to the proposal and users of State Highway 6; and
- Would have more than minor adverse effects on the visual and landscape amenity of the adjacent environment;
- Set a precedent for infill development;
- Create over domestication of the landscape;
- Result in urban sprawl;
- It is contrary to the Coneburn Resource Study and the existing and proposed provisions of the QLDC District Plan.

9.2 I believe the issues raised by these further submissions have largely been addressed in the evidence of Mr Espie. I disagree that the proposed re-zoning will set a precedent for infill development. The residential areas proposed in the re-zoning are set amongst open space areas which restrict any future building development.

9.3 Further submitters Paula and Tim Williams (1252), J M Smith, Bravo Trustee Company & S A Freeman (1219) and Grant & Anne Harris as trustees of the Harris-Wingrove Trust (1316) seek that the submission 715 be disallowed due to the following reasons:

- The submission does not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act;
- Matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act;.
- Are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits;.
- Adverse effects on residential amenity and outlook from existing residential properties within Jacks Point;
- No certainty is provided regarding potential access to the State highway and therefore the use of existing private roads including Maori Jack Road may be required;
- Potential to result in adverse effects including maintenance issues of existing roads within Jacks Point.

9.4 An assessment of matters contained in Part 2, section 32 and section 74 of the Act have been undertaken in Part 5 of my evidence. An assessment of environmental effects is contained in Part 6 of my evidence. A revised structure plan is contained in Appendix 1 detailing the proposed access to Homestead Bay which has been discussed in Part 1 of my evidence and supported by amendments to Chapter 41 as set out in Appendix 2.

- 9.5 Further Submitter Michael Coburn (1277) supports submission 715 and seeks that it be allowed subject to refinements to the structure plan and JPZ provisions to provide for the matters raised below:
- Protection of including landscape protection further submission areas;
 - A sensitively designed marina village;
 - Additional water transport connections;
 - Sensitively designed and limited residential and other activities that complement and do not adversely affect or detract from the wider JPZ activity areas, staged development and overall integration of the Homestead Bay Activity Area with the JPZ.
- 9.6 Landscape and amenity values are addressed in the evidence of Mr Espie. The proposed re-zoning does not include any amendments to the ODP Village Activity Area. Water transport is likely to be a consideration at the time any marina development occurs under the provisions of the ODP. I do not believe the proposed re-zoning detracts from the wider JPZ for the reasons set out in the evidence of Mr Espie.
- 9.7 Further Submitter M J Williams and RB Brabant (1283) oppose submission 715 for the following reasons:
- The provision for development at Homestead Bay in the operative Jacks Point zone is appropriate to the landholding and its location and ought to be retained;
 - The proposed additional residential opportunities would create sprawling development along SH6;
 - If the request for further development opportunities were to be considered, a separate zone would be necessary;
 - Any development as proposed would need to be conditional on separate access to a proper engineered standard from SH 6;
 - The proposals for expansion at Homestead Bay are opportunistic, would not meet the tests of s32, or the purpose of the Act and other part 2 provisions.
- 9.8 Landscape and amenity values were considered in the evidence of Mr Espie along with considerations of any “sprawl”. A separate zone was a matter considered in Steam 9 hearings where QLDC right-of-reply denounced this proposition. However, putting considerations of scope to one side, the submitter remains neutral to the proposed re-zoning forming a subzone of the Jacks Point Zone.

9.9 A revised structure plan is contained in Appendix 1 detailing the proposed access to Homestead Bay which has been discussed in Part 1 of my evidence and supported by amendments to Chapter 41 as set out in Appendix 2. An assessment of matters contained in Part 2, section 32 and section 74 of the Act have been undertaken in Part 5 of my evidence.

9.10 Further Submitter Lakeside Estate Homeowners Association Incorporated (1284) oppose submission 715 and seek that the submission be refused for the following reasons:

- Will not enable the efficient and effective use of resources both within the JPZ and the land adjoining the JPZ Chapter 41 as notified is generally appropriate to give effect to the higher order provisions of the Proposed Plan;
- The section 32 evaluation produced by Council does not support the alternative zonings and provisions produced in submission 715;
- Submission is not an appropriate alternative to the Operative Planning provisions;
- Relocating the proposed Urban Growth Boundary over currently zoned rural land to extend the JPZ is not considered to be an effective planning outcome;
- Re-zoning such as that proposed in Submission 715 adjacent to already developed residential areas without policies encouraging co-ordinated services will not create cohesive planning design;
- Land proposed to be rezoned is currently characteristic of rural land which is symbolic to the District in retaining its valued pastoral and farming characteristics.

9.11 An assessment of matters contained in Part 2, section 32 and section 74 of the Act have been undertaken in Part 5 of my evidence. Policies relating to services were addressed during Stream 9 where the QLDC right-of-reply remains in support of integrated servicing. The s.42A report seeks to “encourage” integrated servicing. The submitter is amenable to the revised wording of this policy. Infrastructure design and servicing has been addressed in the evidence of Mr Hansen. The characteristics of the landscape are addressed in the evidence of Mr Espie.

9.12 Further Submitter NZTA (1345) opposes proposed Rule 41.5.6.1 of submission 715 for the following reasons and seeks that the submission be disallowed:

- The proposed two new accesses could adversely affect the safety, efficiency and functionality of the adjacent state highway.

9.13 The submitter has a statutory requirement outside the Act to address the concerns raised in this submission. The safety and efficiency of the proposed access has been addressed in the evidence of Mr Bartlett.

9.14 The further submission of John Martin Management Company Limited (1145) fully supports submission 715 for the following reasons:

- Sustainable management of natural and physical resources and meets the objectives and policies of the proposed district plan.

Nick Geddes

3rd April 2017