

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –Chapter 22 –  
Rural Residential and Lifestyle

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TIMOTHY TURLEY WILLIAMS  
ON BEHALF THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTER:**

**595 – Matakauri Lodge Limited**

17th May 2016

## Introduction

1. My name is Timothy Turley Williams. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University and Masters of Urban Design and Development with Distinction from The University of New South Wales. I reside in Queenstown.
2. I have practiced in the planning and urban design field since 2003 and I am currently employed by Southern Planning Group as a resource management planning consultant/urban designer.
3. Whilst I acknowledge that this is a Council hearing I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Consolidated Practice Note 2014 and have complied with it in preparing this evidence.
4. I confirm that the matters addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.
5. Southern Planning Group assisted Matakauri Lodge Limited ("Matakauri") in the preparation of their submission on the Chapter 22 (Submission No. 595). Matakauri also prepared further submissions relating to Chapter 22. Southern Planning Group assisted the Queenstown Lakes District Council in the preparation of the Matakauri Lodge s32. Southern Planning Group has for a number of years assisted Matakauri in the planning and development of their site
6. It is my understanding this hearing stream is considering the provision of Chapter 22 rather than the individual merits of whether or not for example the Matakauri Lodge site should be zoned Rural Lifestyle with a visitor accommodation overlay. I understand the consideration of individual sites and there zoning will be considered in a later hearing. Therefore this brief does not address the relative merits of the Matakauri Lodge site. However, should the Commission have any questions relating to this particular site I would be happy to answer them.
7. Matakauri Lodge Limited operates a high end visitor accommodation facility providing accommodation for up to 32 guests with associated visitor accommodation facilities. The total combined footprint of buildings on site is 1924m<sup>2</sup>. Visitor accommodation activity has been associated with the site since the 1990's. The site is 3.9 ha in area and accessed from Farrycroft ROW 10 minutes' drive from Queenstown on the Glenorchy Road.

8. The Proposed District Plan ("PDP") zones the subject site Rural Lifestyle with a Visitor Accommodation overlay.
9. I have read the s32 and supporting documentation and the Section 42A reports prepared by the Council officers with respect to the Rural Residential and Lifestyle chapter of the PDP. I have considered the facts, opinions and analysis in this documentation when forming my opinions which are expressed in this evidence.

#### **Visitor Accommodation Subzone**

10. I support the provision of visitor accommodation sub-zones as a method within the rural living zones to provide for visitor accommodation activity. In my opinion the diversity in tourism and visitor accommodation offering in the district requires recognition that in a similar manner as people chooses to live in a rural setting some visitors prefer to stay in accommodation facilities that offer the amenity, outlook and privacy that can only be provided in the rural environment. Therefore in my view it is appropriate to plan for future growth and demand in this particular sector of the visitor accommodation market.
11. The rural living zones have been identified to accommodate and provide for rural living opportunities representing those areas of the rural environs that the Queenstown Lakes District Council has identified to absorb greater change. In my opinion it is therefore logical that where visitor accommodation also seeks a rural setting the rural living zones are an appropriate zone for this type of activity.
12. The use of Visitor Accommodation sub-zoning is considered to provide certainty to both visitor accommodation providers and neighbours by proactively identifying where visitor accommodation activity within the rural environs is considered appropriate. In my opinion this is a more efficient and effective method than a case by case assessment through a discretionary regime and is an appropriate response in planning for growth in this particular part of the visitor accommodation market.
13. In my opinion the Controlled Activity regime for visitor accommodation and buildings within the sub-zone is appropriate given the proposed controls over the bulk and location of buildings. In this respect the same setback and height controls apply irrespective of whether development is located within a sub-zone this includes a restriction on the size of individual buildings of 500m<sup>2</sup> and setbacks from neighbouring properties. In my view these restrictions will maintain an appropriate level of amenity, privacy and outlook to residents adjacent to or nearby a visitor accommodation sub-zone whilst enabling visitor accommodation activity.
14. A cap on building area is specified in the PDP for visitor accommodation buildings this has been set at 10% or 2,500m<sup>2</sup> whichever is less. In my view the individual characteristics of

each visitor accommodation sub-zone will contribute to the appropriateness of this provision. However, given the process to identify individual sub-zones provides the opportunity for a more detail analysis of these potential effects greater certainty can be provided from the outset. This in my view is a more efficient and effective approach, directing visitor accommodation activity to those areas with greater ability to absorb change whilst enabling a scale of development appropriate to encourage a more intensive visitor accommodation facility. For example Matakauri lodge has 1924m<sup>2</sup> of building area and sits comfortably within its bush setting.

15. I also note that the proposed provisions as they relate to the Rural Lifestyle zone do not appear to place a limit on the total building area within a residential building platform or the size of the platform. Therefore a varying degree of building form is anticipated within a rural lifestyle lot irrespective of whether it is located within a visitor accommodation subzone. In my view this puts the proposed 10% or 2,500m<sup>2</sup> cap in perspective, which when taking into account the nature of the sub-zoning as a method to enable visitor accommodation activity provides an appropriate balance.

#### **Summary**

16. Overall I support the use of visitor accommodation sub-zones as a method to recognise and provide for visitor accommodation growth that prefers a rural setting. The proposed provisions will manage potential adverse effects to neighbours through both the process to identify the location of visitor accommodation sub-zones and then the bulk and location controls that would apply within the sub-zone.