

## ANNEXURE F

**PC34 – ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

## PC34 – ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT

### 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The changes proposed in PC34 will cause effects on the environment. This document presents the assessment of these effects. The assessment is prepared in fulfillment of the duties under clause 22(2) of the First Schedule to the Act, and it takes into account the provisions of the Fourth Schedule to the Act. The assessment is hereafter referred to as the **AEE**.
- 1.2 The application, and the section 32 documentation (**ANNEXURE E**) set out the purpose of and reasons for the specific changes proposed in PC34. **ANNEXURE E** also provides a detailed overview of the Remarkables Park Zone (**RPZ**) and the wider planning environment of the Frankton Flats. That background and overview are not repeated in this AEE.
- 1.3 The 13 components of PC34 are set out in full in the application and in the section 32 evaluation (**ANNEXURE E**).
- 1.4 The AEE is structured as follows:
- Part 2** Describes the consultation undertaken by the applicant;
  - Part 3** Assesses the effects of PC34 changes on the environment, taking into account the matters in clause 2 of the Fourth Schedule of the Act;
  - Part 4** Summarises and concludes the AEE.
- 1.5 The following technical assessments have been commissioned for PC34:
- ANNEXURE G** *Queenstown Catchment Assessment of Retail and Service Growth* prepared by Market Economics Limited (12 October 2010);
  - ANNEXURE H** *Transport Assessment* prepared by Traffic Design Group (October 2010);
  - ANNEXURE I** *Servicing Capability Report* prepared by Airey Consultants Limited (October 2010);
  - ANNEXURE J** *Landscape Assessment* prepared by Vivian + Espie (November 2010)
  - ANNEXURE K** *Cultural Values Report for Frankton Flats Proposed Plan Change* prepared by KTKO Ltd (17 August 2006).
- 1.6 The reports are further addressed in Part 3 of this AEE, and are an integral part of this AEE. They must be read alongside this AEE document.

## 2 CONSULTATION

2.1 When preparing a Plan Change, consultation may be undertaken in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 1974.

2.2 Consultation has been undertaken with relevant interest groups, as described below.

### ***Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC)***

2.3 Many meetings have been held with the Chief Executive Officer and planning advisors, from July 2007, in relation to the original version of PC34 involving the expansion of LFR activities into Activity Area 8. As a result of subsequent meetings and dialogue between the QAC and RPL, the use of a large part of AA8 for LFR activities (as was proposed in the original PC34) is no longer a potential option.

2.4 Component [8] of PC34 reflects and gives effect to the agreement between the QAC and RPL, dated 27 January 2009.

### ***Otago Regional Council (ORC)***

2.5 A meeting was held with a representative of the ORC on 23 July 2007. Following a review of relevant ORC information, it was found that the PC34 area contains no contaminated sites, and is not subject to any known hazards. It was recommended that when considering the implementation of PC34 provisions consideration is given to stormwater management, insulation for noise within dwellings, air quality and the need to comply with the Regional Air Quality Plan. It was also suggested that consideration is given to providing porous surfaces within car parks as a means to manage stormwater runoff.

### ***Ministry of Education***

2.6 Meetings were held with a representative of the Ministry of Education on 10 July and 8 August 2007. It was identified that given its distance from SH6, its location outside the OCB, and its proximity to and easy access from surrounding residential areas, good sunlight and flat topography, a site within the Activity Area 8 of the RPZ is suitable for the location of future schools. However, following consultation with the QAC there are concerns regarding potential noise issues.

2.7 In any case, educational facilities are a controlled activity in Activity Areas 4, 5 and 6, and PC34 (Component [3]) seeks that educational facilities are a controlled activity in AA3, to enable the potential for tertiary education / research institutions as part of the broad mix of uses in AA3.

### ***Kai Tahu Ki Otago Limited***

2.8 A meeting was held with a representative of Kai Tahu Ki Otago on 25 July 2007. Given the location of the site, and the Cultural Values Report provided for PC19, which also covered the RPZ, it was not considered necessary for a cultural values report to be prepared for PC34. The Kai Tahu Ki Otago representative recommended however that when considering the PC34, the landscape should be considered in a holistic sense; for instance, the Kawarau River should be considered in its wider landscape context.

2.9 It was also suggested that:

- If anything is found during earthmoving, work is stopped and the correct procedures followed.
- Once PC34 has been determined, a meeting is held with the Runanga as an information sharing exercise.

2.10 These requirements typically form conditions of subdivision and land use consents. Condition 24 of consent RM090321, which authorises subdivision and associated earthworks over much of the RPZ, requires that if koiwi, waahi taoka, waahi tapu or other artifact material is discovered during the earthworks, then the work ceases and the runanga and New Zealand Historic Places Trust are notified.

### ***Queenstown Golf Club***

2.11 A meeting was held on 12 August 2007 between the Chief Executive Officer of the QLDC, one of the Directors of RPL and representatives of the golf course. Provision for a future golf course within AA8 of the RPZ was supported. The potential for a golf course within AA8 is enhanced by Component [12] of PC34, which seeks to increase the maximum height of buildings from 7 to 18 metres (zone standard). This change would better enable, for example, a tall fence for a driving range, or a gymnasium or other facilities that may be associated with a golf course.

## **3 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

3.1.1 In this section of the AEE the effects of PC34 changes on the environment are assessed, taking into account the matters in clause 2 of the Fourth Schedule of the Act, under the following categories of effects:

- (a) Any effect on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community including any socio-economic and cultural effects;
- (b) Any physical effect on the locality including any landscape and visual effects;
- (c) Any effect on ecosystems, including effects on plants or animals and any physical and any physical disturbance of habitats in the vicinity;
- (d) Any effect on natural and physical resources having aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual or cultural, or other special value for present or future generations;
- (e) Any discharge of contaminants into the environment, including any unreasonable emission of noise and options for the treatment and disposal of contaminants;
- (f) Any risk to the neighbourhood, the wider community, or the environment through natural hazards or the use of hazardous substances or hazardous installations.

3.1.2 The various components of PC34 are addressed where relevant for each of the categories of effects.

### **3.2 Any effect on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community including any socio-economic and cultural effects**

3.2.1 These effects are assessed under the following sub-headings:

- Effects on the airport;
- Traffic effects
- Social and functional amenity of existing retail areas;

3.2.2 Cultural effects are addressed in [3.5.10](#) below.

#### ***Effects on Queenstown airport***

3.2.3 The PC34 proposed LFR expansion area is situated towards the centre of the existing RPZ. Given that all four of the boundaries of the proposed AA5 are within the RPZ, most effects are internalised within the Zone. The only nearby property which may be affected by the expanded AA5 is the airport (QAC) which flanks the northern and western boundaries of Activity Area 8. Buildings in the new part of AA5 would not be visible from other zones except from a considerable distance.

3.2.4 Buildings within the expanded AA5 will be partially visible from parts of the airport. However, this would be the case with development of the current RPZ which already enables substantial buildings in the location of new area of AA5. There are no adverse effects arising from visibility of buildings when viewed from the airport.

3.2.5 The changes promoted by Component [8] of PC34 are consistent with the agreement between the QAC and RPL, and do not generate adverse effects on the airport or on users within the RPZ. The expansion of AA6 to the northern edge of the former location of the EAR results in potentially more noise sensitive activities within the OCB. However the effects of this are managed by the existing RPZ rules and standards for acoustic treatment of buildings accommodating any residential, visitor accommodation, or community activities. This is consistent with the method for managing effects at or near the interface between the airport and the RPZ.

3.2.6 Overall, the proposed PC34 will have no adverse effects on the operations of the airport, the visual amenity of the airport or on the way in which effects at the interface with the airport are managed.

#### ***Traffic effects***

3.2.7 The transportation assessment report ([ANNEXURE H](#)), prepared by Traffic Design Group, addresses the transportation issues associated with development enabled by the provisions of PC34. In considering the transportation effects of the proposed plan change this report takes into account planned upgrades and improvements of the roading network within the Frankton Flats.

3.2.8 The upgrades/improvements include those proposed as part of the Wakatipu Transportation Strategy (WTS). These include: the completion of the EAR from SH6 around the eastern end of the runway to connect with Hawthorne Drive, improvements to the SH6/SH6A intersection and a roundabout at the intersection of SH6/Grant Road.

3.2.9 The transportation assessment report concludes that, with the improvements to the existing road network, there will only be small, not discernable, increases in the average vehicle delay at some major intersections as a result of development enabled by PC34. The report provides that both the arterial and local road networks (through the Frankton Flats and servicing the RPZ) would be able to provide an

adequate level of service for all road users. Accordingly, the report states that no further major upgrades to the road network are required as a result of PC34.

- 3.2.10 The TDG report concludes that PC34 can be supported from a transportation engineering perspective.

***Effects on the social and functional amenity of existing retail centres***

- 3.2.11 The assessment of retail and service growth ([ANNEXURE G](#)), prepared by Market Economics Ltd, provides a detailed analysis of future retail floorspace demand arising in the Queenstown Lakes District, with respect to scenarios of future household and economic growth to 2031. This analysis finds that considerable additional floorspace (for both total retail, and LFR as a sub-set of retail) is required in the District over the foreseeable future.

- 3.2.12 The anticipated level of development enabled by the PC will provide approximately 30,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA of additional retail floorspace (including LFR). This additional capacity would cater for approximately 25-32% of total Queenstown demand growth over the 2009-2031 period.

- 3.2.13 This report also provides an assessment of the urban form and efficiency implications of providing such additional retail floorspace within the RPZ.

- 3.2.14 The report concludes that:

- the development (specifically the development of additional retail floorspace, including LFR) enabled by PC34 will provide for a portion of the future retail and service sector growth anticipated in the Queenstown catchment;
- the retail floor space enabled by PC34 would be integrated with and expand on the existing commercial centre within AA5, and would support the consolidation of Queenstown's established centres structure and urban form;
- enabling the additional floor space would enhance urban efficiency and amenity, which are important aspects of sustainable management and community wellbeing; and
- On the basis of future demand for retail and service floorspace in the Queenstown catchment, and that the new AA5 would be an expansion of the existing RPTC (the RPZ commercial/retail centre), the additional retail and service capacity provided in AA5 is an appropriate use of an existing zoned area and represents an appropriate step in achieving the comprehensive development plan envisaged for the RPTC and the RPZ overall.
- In the event that expansion of the RPTC (particularly as a result of PPC 34) is the focus of retail and service growth throughout the Queenstown catchment in the short term (i.e., if developed by 2016), it is anticipated it will not have a material effect on existing town centres and will enhance the travel efficiency and social and functional amenity delivered by existing centres to the Queenstown catchment community.
- In the event that expansion of the RPTC is one of a number of locations developing retail and service floorspace capacity at the same time in the Queenstown catchment, the rate and timing of total capacity developed relative to market growth will determine the degree and duration of impacts on Town Centre zones.

### **3.3 Any physical effect on the locality including any landscape and visual effects**

- 3.3.1 The potential impact of PC34 in terms of its effect on landscape and visual amenity values has been assessed by Vivian+Espie Limited. The report is contained in [ANNEXURE J](#).
- 3.3.2 The report prepared by Vivian+Espie Limited [ANNEXURE J](#) assesses the landscape and visual effects of PC34. It identifies that, of the 13 components, Component [1] (expand AA5), Component [6] (changes to enable parking in AA4 and AA8) and Component [7] (changes to facilitate passenger ferry transport) and Component [12] have landscape and visual implications.
- 3.3.3 On Component [1] the report states (paragraphs 14 – 15) that the landscape effects of Component [1] are of a relatively minor nature and not adverse, given the development currently provided for by the DP, and that the introduction of LFR and commercial activities may lead to a different pattern of open space and built form, but this is not of itself an adverse effect.
- 3.3.4 On Component [6], the report concludes (paragraphs 19 and 34) that car parking and landscaping are unlikely to adversely affect important views, and that extensive areas of car parking will be relieved with soft landscaping to avoid the potential for adverse visual and amenity effects.
- 3.3.5 On Component [7], the report concludes (paragraphs 35) that the provision for more than one stopping point on the Kawarau River will have implications for the natural character of the river and its margins, however the question of adverse effects on the natural character will be an issue to be addressed at the time proposals are developed .
- 3.3.6 Such assessment<sup>1</sup> would take place at the time of resource consent for a ferry stopping point; there are sufficient rules and assessment matters in place to ensure that actual effects can be properly avoided or mitigated.
- 3.3.7 On Component [12], the report concludes (paragraphs 36 – 37) that the maximum height of buildings of 18 metres in AA8 is acceptable, and will be commensurate with the height of buildings elsewhere within the wider Frankton Flats, and will not compromise views to the outstanding natural landscapes and features of the Wakatipu Basin, nor compromise the status of nearby outstanding natural landscape and features.

### **3.4 Any effect on ecosystems, including effects on plants or animals and any physical and any physical disturbance of habitats in the vicinity**

- 3.4.1 The vast majority of the RPZ is currently either developed for residential purposes (AA1) or for commercial / retail purposes (AA5), or is in long established farmland and is zoned for urban purposes (Activity Areas 3 – 8). Within AA1 and AA3 – AA8 there are no remaining areas of ecological significance. The balance of the RPZ – AA2a, b and c – is to be maintained as open space or overlies the steep escarpment adjacent to the Kawarau River.

---

<sup>1</sup> The relevant assessment would likely take into account the assessment matters for controlled activity buildings (in AA2a of the RPZ) and discretionary activity jetties and structures on the surface of the river (Rural General Zone).

- 3.4.2 The objectives and policies relating to AA2 (particularly Objective 3 and related policies) promote nature conservation values, and these are given effect to by the rules and assessment matters. PC34 does not affect the provisions relating to natural conservation values. Development affecting AA2 will need to achieve these provisions, and this would be assessed at the time of development proposals.

### **3.5 Any effect on natural and physical resources having aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual or cultural, or other special value for present or future generations**

#### ***Aesthetic values***

- 3.5.1 The landscape and visual effects have been addressed in part 3.3 above. The conclusion is that none of the components of PC34 have any additional effects in respect of landscape and visual amenities.
- 3.5.2 The modifications promoted in Component [11], focus on the RPZ provisions relating to site and building design in the RPZ. The modifications are expected to provide for clearer, more objective assessment of the effects of building and site design within the Zone, while still enabling adequate artistic licence on the part of the designer. The provisions are therefore more efficient. Further, all proposed buildings within the RPZ would be potentially subject to review by the Remarkables Park Design Review Board, and not just buildings above the specified height. This has advantages in that there can be a consistent management of the review of applications for buildings.
- 3.5.3 The changes proposed by Component [11] will therefore result in positive effects on the aesthetics of the built environment of the RPZ.

#### ***Recreational values***

- 3.5.4 PC34 does not change the ability of the RPZ to provide for recreational or commercial recreational activities. RM090321 requires preparation and approval of the *Remarkables Park Amenities Strategy*, which includes (among other things) establishing the location and nature of works required to provide reserve land, open space, parks, community facilities, pedestrian trails and other connections, landscaping, exotic vegetation removal, re-vegetation, and a maintenance regime, as development proceeds generally through the activity areas of the RPZ<sup>2</sup>. PC34 does not affect the purpose of or implementation of this Strategy.
- 3.5.5 AA8 of the RPZ comprises a large area of land adjacent to the airport, and provides for commercial recreational facilities as a controlled activity. PC34 does not affect AA8 and does not change the ability for AA8 to deliver commercial recreational and recreational activities, open space and reserves, as may be required as development through the RPZ proceeds.
- 3.5.6 With the minor change in alignment of the EAR, and the consequential small increase in the size of AA6, PC34 results in a small reduction of the area of AA8 from approximately 55.9 hectares to approximately 51.9 hectares. The permitted and controlled activities in AA8 remain unchanged by PC34. Indoor and outdoor recreation activities, including recreation and commercial recreation, are expected in AA8.

---

<sup>2</sup> Condition 10(a) of RM090321

- 3.5.7 The QLDC development contributions policy<sup>3</sup> establishes open space requirements for all new development. The policy requires 27.5 m<sup>2</sup> of open space per each dwelling unit, made up of 15 m<sup>2</sup> of neighbourhood reserve and 12.5 m<sup>2</sup> of local reserve. The overall projected open space requirements for the RPZ, based on anticipated commercial floor areas, community and educational buildings, visitor accommodation and residential development is approximately **11 hectares**. This total is largely a product of the 3500 – 4000 residential or visitor accommodation units planned for the RPZ.
- 3.5.8 Accordingly, the RPZ (by way of AA8 and other activity areas) has no shortage of land available to meet the QLDC requirements for reserves.

#### ***Scientific values***

- 3.5.9 The RPZ does not contain any resources of any known scientific value. PC34 will not change this, and no effects arise.

#### ***Historical / Spiritual / Cultural values***

- 3.5.10 KTKO Ltd prepared a cultural values report (**ANNEXURE K**) for PC19 (and not specifically for the subject matter of PC34). Nevertheless, as the report addresses the likely issues and implications on cultural values that could arise from a plan change in the Frankton Flats area (defined as “close to the confluence of the Kawarau and Shotover Rivers”) the report is relevant to, and is adopted for, PC34.
- 3.5.11 There are no known archaeological sites located within the RPZ. If koiwi (human skeletal remains), waahi taoka (resource or object of importance) waahi tapu (place or feature of special significance) or other artefact materials are discovered during any construction work, work would stop to allow for a site inspection by the appropriate Runaka and their advisors, and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. This will determine if the discovery is likely to be extensive and whether a thorough site investigation will be required. Materials discovered should be handled and removed by takata whenua who possess knowledge of tikanga (protocol) appropriate to their removal or preservation.
- 3.5.12 Typically, the measures expressed above are imposed as conditions of resource consents for subdivision and/or land use, and this methodology is unaffected by PC34. A condition to give effect to these matters is imposed on RM090321.
- 3.5.13 Accordingly, PC34 will have no actual or potential effects on cultural and archaeological values.

### **3.6 Any discharge of contaminants into the environment, including any unreasonable emission of noise and options for the treatment and disposal of contaminants**

#### ***Infrastructure – capacity effects***

- 3.6.1 PC34 enables changes to land uses within the RPZ. It expands AA5 and enables commercial / retail activities in that expanded area. The expanded AA5 land would otherwise have been used for AA6 / AA4 activities, which would likely have had a more residential focus, and potentially greater impact on infrastructural capacity for water supply and sewerage disposal, and no significant change to the need for stormwater runoff and disposal capacity.

---

<sup>3</sup> Policy 2009 – 2010

- 3.6.2 In any case, however, all future development will be connected with trunk reticulated services. Airey Consultants Limited has undertaken an assessment of the existing services in terms of water supply and wastewater (**ANNEXURE I**) and is confident that future development on the site can be adequately serviced.
- 3.6.3 Component [1] of PC34 enables more large format retail and associated parking which will result in stormwater runoff, however, it is difficult to determine whether this runoff may be more or less than activities currently expected in AA4 and AA6. In any case the run-off will be appropriately managed on site through a variety of treatment processes, and adverse effects will be adequately avoided or mitigated. For stormwater treatment and disposal, all development within the RPZ will be managed as with the current RPZ to ensure stormwater is contained on the site prior to being appropriately discharged to the Kawarau River, under authorisation of existing and future regional consents.
- 3.6.4 Such management is inherent in the engineering conditions imposed on resource consents (subdivision and land use), and PC34 will not generate any adverse effects from stormwater discharge.

#### **Noise effects**

- 3.6.5 Effects in relation to airport noise are addressed in part 3.2 above.
- 3.6.6 The minor change to the zone standard (12.11.5.2(iii)) to include Activity Areas 6 and 8 (Component [9] of PC34) in the exemption from more restrictive noise requirements rectifies an anomaly in the existing RPZ provisions. Activity Area 6 enables predominantly the same activities as Activity Area 4 (yet is omitted from the standard) and Activity Area 8 permits only non-residential activities.
- 3.6.7 Accordingly, there are no adverse noise effects anticipated from enabling the inclusion of these two Activity Areas within the zone standard exemption.

### **3.7 Any risk to the neighbourhood, the wider community, or the environment through natural hazards or the use of hazardous substances or hazardous installations**

- 3.7.1 All of activity areas 1, 2b, 2c, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, the vast majority of AA2a, and the land within the Rural General zone northeast of the RPZ, are not prone to flood hazard.
- 3.7.2 Small parts of AA2a may be adjacent to or within the riparian margins of the Kawarau River and may therefore be susceptible to flooding. The potential for risk is inconsequential, however, due to the very limited range of activities that may be undertaken within AA2a. The key activity in AA2a is infrastructure for passenger ferry operations (jetty structures and access) which can be constructed in a manner that minimises flood risk.
- 3.7.3 No components of PC34 have any potential to generate any additional seismic hazard of the land, or instability or slippage, or to have any effects on any other land. Effects relating to land stability have been addressed in detail in the application and engineering construction details for the subdivision consent RM090321.
- 3.7.4 PC34 does not introduce any new activities that could have adverse effects in respect of hazardous substances. Hazardous substances are addressed in Part 16 of the Plan. PC34 does not affect Part 16.

## **4 SUMMARY – EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

- 4.1 All actual and potential effects on the environment have been identified in this assessment and/or in the relevant consultant expert reports, which must be read alongside this AEE document.
- 4.2 The assessment has determined that the changes proposed in PC34 will result in no adverse effects on the environment. Any potential adverse effects are capable of being avoided, remedied or mitigated.