

Before the Queenstown Lakes District Council Hearing Panel

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the renotification of two submissions on Stage 1 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan concerning the zoning of land at Arthurs Point by Gertrude's Saddlery Limited and Larchmont Enterprises Limited

---

**Summary of statement of evidence of Derek Foy**

01 February 2023

---

**Submitters' solicitors:**

Maree Baker-Galloway | Rosie Hill  
Anderson Lloyd  
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300  
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348

p + 64 3 450 0700  
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz

**anderson  
lloyd.**

## **OVERVIEW**

- 1 My evidence identified and assessed four categories of potential economic effects that might result from the proposed rezoning:<sup>1</sup>
  - (a) Residential land supply;
  - (b) Loss of rural productive land;
  - (c) Effects on tourism, public access and natural character;
  - (d) Expenditure on development of the Site.

## **RESIDENTIAL LAND SUPPLY**

- 2 The 41 residential lots would equate to around two years of supply at the current rate of uptake, or one year excluding the parts of the Site that are already zoned for urban use.
- 3 There is likely to be demand for 220 new dwellings in Arthurs Point in the next decade. There is likely to be a shortage of dwelling supply in Arthurs Point in the next decade, even if the Site is developed.
- 4 The proposal would accommodate a small but desirable share of projected residential growth in the area. Development of the Site would not undermine the viability of other residential developments.

## **LOSS OF RURAL LAND**

- 5 The rural part of the Site is not viable as an operating farm due to its small size, its severance from other rural farm land, low quality soils, access and topography constraints, and reverse sensitivity issues.
- 6 At most, my assessment indicates that the rural part of the Site would produce \$11,000 per annum of agricultural gross revenue, and support less than 0.1 FTE job. Once costs, including rates, are accounted for, the likely result would be a net loss for an agricultural enterprise on the Site.
- 7 There are very few alternative uses for the Site. Ecological evidence suggests it would revert to pest plant species again if not rezoned.

## **TOURISM, PUBLIC ACCESS AND NATURAL CHARACTER**

- 8 The development will enable new public access points from Arthurs Point to the Shotover Gorge and DoC reserve. I understand access is already gained by people trespassing the Site, and that the landowners are working with Queenstown Trails Trust ('QTT') and DoC to formalise these links.

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting that approximately 14 lots would be created within existing LDR Zoned land, and approximately 27 lots are proposed to be added under this rezoning proposal as a mixture of LDR and LLR B zoning.

- 9 Mr Giddens suggests there is no certainty the links will occur. I agree that future links are uncertain. However, I understand the links cannot occur if the Site is not rezoned, and providing public access within the Site to the reserve boundaries is a necessary step towards creating these additional links. In particular, the entire proposed Right of Way through the Site is required through subdivision provisions to be made available for public walking and cycling access.
- 10 Pre-pandemic usage data recorded over 35,000 trail users per annum. Trail expansion and the addition of the new access points are likely increase those numbers. New links through the Site are likely increase visitors to Arthurs Point and patronage of its businesses. My high level assessment indicates the potential economic benefits of this could be in the order of \$100,000 per annum or around one additional FTE job.
- 11 DoC supports the removal of wilding pines, revegetation, and trail improvements because those changes will allow better access to public land, and will result in the removal of exotic wilding trees and the restoration of native vegetation, which is consistent with Dr Lloyd's opinion.
- 12 Mr Espie and Ms Pfluger conclude the development will protect landscape values. In reliance on those expert assessments, I do not consider the rezoning of the land would have adverse economic effects in terms of loss of important landscapes in the District or landscape-related tourism.

## **ECONOMIC EFFECTS ARISING FROM DEVELOPMENT**

- 13 Any future development of the Site for residential activities would yield economic benefits. Preliminary costings indicate that such expenditure would be in the order of \$7 million for the Site.
- 14 Not all of the economic contribution of the project will be net additional, however the development will positively contribute to the economy.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 15 The proposal is for a small scale of development adjacent to an existing residential area, on land that is uneconomic for farming productively, and where there is existing infrastructure available.
- 16 There is likely to be a shortage of residential land supply within Arthurs Point within the coming decade. The rezoning would provide additional dwelling supply and increased choice of housing options, without adversely effecting distribution of growth or urban development.
- 17 Overall there would be no adverse economic effects of the requested rezoning and net positive effects.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a long, sweeping stroke that curves upwards and ends in a circular flourish.

**Derek Richard Foy**

**1 February 2023**