BEFORE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act

1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Publicly Notified Plan

Change 50

WILL SAY STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY WILLIAMS IN ANTICIPATION OF EXPERT PLANNING CONFERENCING Dated 29 January 2014

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Timothy 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.
- 1.2 I have practised in the planning and urban design field in the Queenstown Lakes District since 2003 and am currently employed by Southern Planning Group as a resource management planning consultant/urban designer. Since 2003 I have been involved in a wide range of resource consent applications, planning policy and urban design matters both as a council officer and consultant.
- 1.3 Southern Planning Group is a preferred supplier to the Queenstown Lakes District Council for resource management and urban design expertise. In this capacity I process resource consent applications for QLDC and provide expert urban design advice to Council planners.
- 1.4 I have been asked to provide a 'will say' statement to assist other parties in understanding my positions on matters relevant to the Zaki & Holt submission.
- 1.5 I can confirm I have read the submissions of Zaki & Holt, the evidence of Mr Bruce McLeod and legal submissions presented on behalf of the submitters. I am familiar with the content of Plan Change 50.
- 1.6 I can confirm I am generally of the same opinion as to the potential effects and issues relating to the Zaki & Holt property as described in the submissions and associated information.
- 1.7 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note and agree to comply with it. In that regard I confirm that this statement is written within my area of expertise, except where otherwise stated, and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

CONTROL OVER BUILDINGS

2.1 Buildings require controlled activity consent within the Town Centre Zone (TCZ). Although buildings currently require controlled activity consent within the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) the matters of control are different. The matters provided for within the TCZ in my opinion provide less direction and ability to consider design and effects on neighbouring properties and residential amenity.

BULK AND LOCATION CONTROLS

- 3.1 The Town Centre zoning will provide fewer controls over future building form and enable greater development potential. It is considered the current controls provide little recognition of the existing amenity of the Zaki & Holt property and increase the potential for built form to impact on their views and outlook.
- 3.2 The height limit although remaining the same as currently provided for in the High Density Zone will now be a site standard, it was previously a zone standard. It is my opinion that the provision of height as a site standard would make any breach a restricted discretionary activity.
- 3.3 In my opinion providing for height as a site standard is more enabling of height breaches which further weakens the protection and potential future management of adverse effects resulting from development on the residential properties in the Beach Street Block.
- 3.4 In almost all other zones in QLDC District Plan height is a zone standard in recognition of the importance of maintaining views and the potential negative impact additional height can have on neighbouring properties (height is currently a zone standard in the Town Centre Zone).
- 3.5 Given the importance of views to the Zaki-Holt property and existing investment, the ability for additional height to be accommodated without significantly affecting the Zaki-Holt property would be limited. Therefore, a restricted discretionary or discretionary status does not in my opinion adequately reflect the importance of height and potential adverse effects additional height would have on the Zaki-Holt property.
- 3.6 A 65% building coverage applied in the HDRZ. A 80% coverage would now apply and a breach can be processed without notification under rule 10.6.4 ii. In my opinion building coverage of 80% and the potential to go to 100% without neighbours approvals does not reflect the potential effects of site coverage on the amenity and outlook from residential properties within the block.
- 3.7 It is noted a 2 m setback is proposed by Council on the north-western boundary of the properties owned by Crowne Plaza interests. I support this rule.

ZONING

4.1 I agree there is an existing commercial flavour to the activities within the Beach Street Block that front onto Beach Street. However, the block also contains residential apartments that have had significant investment and therefore are unlikely to be re-developed in the short to medium term.

- 4.2 The existing Town Centre zoning is more directed to promoting commercial activity and managing the appearance of buildings than protecting residential amenity.
- 4.3 Providing for commercial activity to establish within close proximity to residential activity has the potential to result in adverse effects on residential amenity particularly associated with hours of operation. Therefore, further consideration needs to be given to the proximity of commercial activity to the Zaki-Holt property and potential for commercial activity to impact on the residential amenity of existing residential properties.

Tim Williams

30 January 2015

Tim Wilin