

Emma Turner for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 18 – Arthurs Point North

1. My evidence covers my recommendations for the rezoning of Arthurs Point North and the consequential changes to the HDRZ chapter.

General

2. My recommendation for the zoning of Arthurs Point North is a mixed zoning approach taking into account the landscape and hazards evidence available as well as consideration of other positive and adverse economic, social and environmental effects. My recommended zoning and overlays for Arthurs Point North is shown in Figure 9 of my s42a report.
3. After receiving evidence (planning, landscape and hazard) on behalf of submitters, I do not recommend any further amendments to zoning, overlays or associated provisions of the MDRZ and HDRZ. I consider the HDRZ is the most appropriate zone for the flat areas of Arthurs Point North and MDRZ with VASZ and BRAs for areas, which are sloped and/or more visible or have other characteristics that make it more vulnerable to development. I consider Rural Zone is the most appropriate zone for land identified as being part of an ONL.
4. I do not consider that bespoke plan provisions are an efficient or effective way to manage effects when an appropriate existing zone framework exists for managing the activities. In my s42a report I have recommended a minor amendment to the HDRZ purpose (as it applies to Arthurs Point North only) and the addition of a new policy (for Arthurs Point North) not already covered by the existing framework. Submitters proposed other amendments to the provisions including policies related to amenity and rules related to building height and density. I consider these proposals are either already covered by the existing framework or are inappropriate for the Arthurs Point North Area.

Key issues still unresolved:

Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society (31041)

5. The submitter seeks amendments to the UGB and ONL boundary locations. Additionally, the submitter requests amendments to the provisions and that MDRZ is not adjacent to the ONL boundary. The full extent of the relief sought is considered partially out of scope. No landscape evidence was provided by the submitter to support their proposed amendment to the ONL boundary. I consider the notified location of the ONL boundary will adequately protect the landscape values at Arthur Point North while allowing the already consented lots to be effectively utilised for urban development. I consider my recommended approach to zoning is consistent with the outcomes sought in the strategic objectives and results in appropriate management of the effects of development on landscape values.

Robert Stewart (31038)

6. Chapter 28 includes objectives and policies that direct hazards to be managed to avoid significantly increasing risks associated with natural hazards, and preclude exposing vulnerable activities to hazard risk, or creating risks to human life where this is deemed to be “intolerable”. My assessment against Chapter 28 and the greater statutory context of the PORPS and the RMA is that the relief sought is inconsistent with this direction. No assessment was provided against Chapter 28 nor was any evidence on community tolerance of hazard provided by the submitter. Rezoning as requested to MDRZ would indicate this land is suitable for urban development, however, based on Mr Bond’s evidence for Council, it may not be possible to sufficiently reduce risk from natural hazards through site specific design. My recommendation is that the land remains as Rural Zone as this gives a clear indication that urban development is not anticipated and allows for a discretionary activity status for building so that effects can be appropriately investigated and assessed.
7. I note that I have read the consent order on Chapter 28 natural hazards and the changes made to Chapter 28 through that order do not alter my recommendations.

Matt and Yuko Baumfield (31017)

8. I have recommended that the BRA be removed but that the zone remain as MDRZ not HDRZ as requested by the submitter due to the site being largely identified as having moderate landscape sensitivity.

Totally Tourism (31026)

9. The submitter requested BRAs extend further to protect their established flight paths. I consider this is a private issue which the existing consent notices recognise. I have recommended BRA 1 be removed and BRA 2 be reduced in size in response to other submissions and my assessment of landscape, social and economic effects.

Arthurs Point Land Trustees (31042)

10. I have recommended that BRA 2 be reduced in size to just be on the sloped part of the site as per Ms Helen Mellsop’s evidence. Additionally, I have recommended that BRA 3 remains to protect the landscape values of the adjacent ONL as directed by Chapter 3. BRA 3 is important in relation to strategic objectives that seek to avoid adverse effects of the landscape and natural character of the District’s ONLs.

Arthurs Point Wood Limited Partnerships (31031) and QRC Shotover (31032)

11. The submitters both seek amendment to the provisions of the MDRZ in relation to building height, and Arthurs Point Wood additionally seek amendments to the density and road setback requirements. I consider the requested amendments will have significant adverse effects on the landscape values. While used elsewhere in the plan I do not consider bespoke planning provisions an effective or efficient way to manage the effects on landscape, when in my view the MDRZ provisions appropriately manage this for the Arthurs Point North area.

Koia Architects Queenstown Ltd, Koia Investments Queenstown Ltd and Rakau Queenstown Ltd (31041)

12. Koia requests a more permissive GFA above 100m² in the HDR. While I can see that this could have local economic and social benefits, the submitter has not provided sufficient evidence to enable this to be adequately assessed. Specifically, at what point the GFA would have negative economic effects on other centres. Without this, I am unable to recommend a threshold and criteria that would be appropriate for an RD activity status.

Coronet Peak Properties (31040)

13. I have recommended a split HDRZ and MDRZ at the base of Mt Dewar as this provides a legible edge for HDRZ development and allows for effects on landscape values to be better managed by providing for less dense development on the slope while still allowing the landowner to develop their land.

Goldstream Properties Limited

14. The submitter seeks their property be rezoned ODP RVZ. The submission particularly opposes the Rural Zone ONL as notified (no recommended change). Goldstream Properties Limited did not provide any landscape or planning evidence. I consider the ODP RVZ to be an inappropriate zone for the area and agree with the assessment of the ODP RVZ in the s32 report. The landscape Assessment by Ms Mellsop identified part of the site as having high landscape sensitivity and noted where an appropriate ONL boundary should be positioned. While I rely on Ms Mellsop's assessment for the landscape sensitivity and location, my view is that the most appropriate zone to protect the landscape values, in the way directed by the strategic objectives, is the Rural Zone.