

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

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Stage 3 and 3b of the
Proposed District Plan

**SECOND REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF RICHARD ROBERT POWELL
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Settlement Zone / Rural Visitor Zone

19 June 2020



Simpson Grierson
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / R Mortiaux
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH8140

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SCOPE.....	1
3. LUC WAITE & PETER FORREST FOR UNIVERSAL DEVELOPMENTS HAWEA LIMITED (3248).....	1
4. MICHAEL BOTTING FOR CORBRIDGE ESTATE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (31021).....	3

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Richard Robert Powell. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence in chief dated 18 March 2020.

1.2 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

2. SCOPE

2.1 My second rebuttal evidence is provided in response to the following evidence filed on behalf of various submitters:

- (a) Luc Waite and Peter Forrest for Universal Developments Hāwea Limited (**3248**);
- (b) Michael Botting for Corbridge Estate Limited Partnership (**31021**).

2.2 My evidence has the following attachments:

- (a) **Appendix A:** Universal Developments Hāwea Limited Zoning/Structure Plan.

3. LUC WAITE & PETER FORREST FOR UNIVERSAL DEVELOPMENTS HAWEA LIMITED (3248)

3.1 While there was little certainty in the Universal Submission as to the types of urban zones sought, their size and location/layout in the context of the overall submission, more detail on the proposed zones and therefore likely yield has been provided through the submitter's evidence. In summary, the proposed zoning, as set out at paragraph 9 of Mr Williams' evidence and at Appendix B, now consists of:

9 In summary the rezoning proposal includes.

- Relocating the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to Domain Road and the southern and eastern boundaries of the Universal/LAC land.
- Utilising a Building Restriction Area in the form of a green buffer to reinforce the UGB.
- Provisions for a Water Race Reserve and associated walking/cycle trails providing connectivity through and around the Site.
- Re-zoning of land within the Site providing for:
 - 9.2ha of General Industrial Zoning – Yielding a potential of 72 (1000m²) sections.
 - 3.5ha of Local Shopping Centre Zone – Yielding a potential of 16,800m² GFA.
 - 3.5ha for a future school
 - 5.2ha of Medium Density Residential Zone – Yielding a potential of 145 sections.
 - 110.3ha of Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (including 29.1ha approved as an SHA) – Yielding a potential of between 881 & 1137 sections plus the 465 sections approved via the SHA.

3.2 Appendix B of Mr Williams' evidence which shows the proposed zoning for the land, is reproduced in **Appendix A** of this evidence for convenience.

3.3 Mr Luc Waite and Mr Peter Forrest have filed evidence in relation to infrastructure. This evidence relates to the issues raised within my evidence in chief and seeks to justify the zoning now advanced by the submitter.

3.4 With regard to wastewater, Mr Waite's evidence concludes that although the existing Lake Hāwea Township Wastewater Treatment Plant operates above capacity there is a planned connection to the Project Pure treatment facility that will remove capacity issues. This is partly true, the size of this planned connection is to remove capacity issues for the current growth forecasts within Hāwea, not to deal with any additional rezoning submissions including a rezoning of this

nature. Any pipe upsize / upgrade or additional pipes that need to be installed to accommodate the increased demand created by the Universal rezoning are not included in the planned connection nor has the Project Pure treatment facility been planned with the Universal Proposal as a contributor of wastewater. No funds are allocated within the LTP.

3.5 With regard to water supply, Mr Waite's evidence concludes that the existing water supply network can be extended into new developments in accordance with the requirements of the Subdivision Code of Practice. This evidence states that any supply limitations can be managed with additional bores and/or reservoir capacity. While I accept this conclusion as a matter of fact, the required upgrades to bore fields and/or increased storage facilities to allow for the yield sought through the Universal Proposal are not included, nor are funds allocated within the LTP.

3.6 With regard to stormwater disposal, Mr Waite's and Mr Forrest's evidence concludes that Geotechnical assessments in the area have indicated the underlying geology is conducive to stormwater disposal to ground. I accept this conclusion.

3.7 In summary, from an infrastructure perspective I continue to oppose the rezoning. Although I acknowledge there are feasible solutions for servicing the site, the solutions, at a scale suitable to service the proposed rezoning, are not included in QLDC's planned works nor have funding allocated to provide these services.

4. MICHAEL BOTTING FOR CORBRIDGE ESTATE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (31021)

4.1 Mr Michael Botting has filed evidence in relation to infrastructure servicing the proposed rezone from Rural Zone to RVZ. A Structure Plan approach is proposed by Corbridge Estate, which is explained in the evidence of Mr Edgar and Mr Curley (in particular at paragraph 61). As I understand it, the proposed RVZ would provide for a golf course and a mix of visitor accommodation options, residential activity and workers accommodation. I understand this would be 'instead of'

the development currently enabled by RM 100152 and RM 120572, as are described in Mr Curley's evidence at paragraphs 25 – 34.

4.2 The evidence does not set out a simple list of the development provided for across the various activity areas (i.e. a total number of residential units) and Mr Botting's evidence does not set out the amount of development he has assessed. My understanding mainly derives from Mr Curley's evidence at paragraph 64 as follows:

- (a) Activity Area 1: up to 150 visitor accommodation units, 400m², GFA, potential end density of 1 unit per 1,913m² of Activity Area;
- (b) Activity Area 2: up to 100 visitor accommodation units, 300 GFA, potential end density of a unit per 2,400m² of Activity Area;
- (c) Activity Area 3: no cap on number of units, no GFA, restricting built form by imposing a building coverage limit at 50% of the Activity Area, 12m height;
- (d) Activity Area 4: spa and pool facilities, conference rooms, restaurants, club houses associated with a hotel, and the golf course, no GFA, restricting built form by imposing a building coverage limit at 70% of the Activity Area, 12-16m height
- (e) Activity Area 5: 100 worker accommodation units, 45% building coverage, 160m² maximum size.

4.3 This level of development on the site is such that Council would require connection to council services and that an on-site private water supply or wastewater scheme would not be appropriate, therefore I have discounted this option from my following evidence.

4.4 With regard to wastewater, Mr Botting's evidence concludes that a physical connection to Council's network is possible with further modelling required at the time of subdivision to confirm capacity requirements. While a physical connection may be possible, this ignores the need for the upgrades required to the Project Pure treatment plant in order to accept the flows generated from the

proposed rezoning. Such upgrades are not included in QLDC's planned works, nor are there funds allocated within the LTP.

4.5 With regard to water supply, Mr Botting's evidence concludes that a connection to Council's network is possible and has been approved under a previous consent. The evidence also concludes that firefighting supply can be achieved by strategically positioned firefighting tanks. While I accept that a connection can physically be made, however, the potential demand of the rezoned land is significantly higher than what has previously been consented. The existing bore and supply network will be decommissioned when the Wanaka Airport water supply is upgraded and extended to this area. The current planned works do not account for the increased demand from the proposed rezoning nor is there funding allocated within the LTP for any required upgrades resulting from the proposed rezoning.

4.6 In summary, from an infrastructure perspective, I oppose the rezoning. Although I acknowledge there are feasible solutions for servicing the site, the upgrades required to service the proposed rezoning are not included in QLDC's planned works, nor have funding allocated to provide these upgrades within the LTP.



Richard Robert Powell

19 June 2020

Appendix A
Universal Developments Hāwea Limited Zoning/Structure Plan

