

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

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed
District Plan – Wakatipu Basin

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Submission 2332, Middleton Family Trust

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES
ON BEHALF OF**

Middleton Family Trust (#2332)

Dated 09th July 2018

- 1 Note a number of corrections: The letter of endorsement from Queenstown Trails should appear as Appendix 6, not 3 while I have neglected to include the requirement to construct the walking trail as part of the recommended amendments to Chapter 27 in Appendix 3. This requirement appears in Appendix 4 as rule 27.7.10.1.
- 2 Correspondence from lwi authorities in relation to the proposed re-zoning arrived on my desk following the submission of my primary evidence so I attach to this summary confirmation in principal from both Runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.
- 3 Submission 2442 seeks to re-zone land located at the end of Tucker Beach Road creating approx. 200 residential allotments and 9 rural living allotments.
- 4 I consider the topography of the site to be particularly well suited for residential development. The two flat north facing river terraces are located in a corner of the landscape where the topography offers its own natural defensible edge.
- 5 Subject to extensions and upgrades, the proposed re-zoning can be fully serviced with reticulated water, wastewater, power, telecoms while the land affords suitable areas for the treatment and disposal of storm water.
- 6 NZTA released its intentions on the upgrading of the intersection with Tucker Beach Road and State Highway 6 earlier this year. The submitter has actively participated in NZTA workshops where NZTA have been made aware of the submitters re-zoning intentions.
- 7 Due to the current state of surfacing across the western end of Tucker Beach Road the submitter accepts this requires upgrading as a pre-requisite to any future development. This upgrade is anticipated to be designed and included as part of future subdivision consents under the structure plan.
- 8 The area of proposed residential zoning is no more than 500 metres from the Open Space Area of Tucker Beach Reserve. The proposal includes the construction of a walking / cycle trail from this reserve to the northern end of Lake Johnson also known as the Oasis in the Basin. From this point there is a potential connection via Crown Reserve and legal road to Frankton.
- 9 Turning to the rebuttal evidence of QLDC Planner Mr Marcus Langman.
- 10 Paragraph 7.3 of Mr Langman's rebuttal evidence states that the residential precinct sought was the less appropriate zoning to achieve the strategic objectives and policies of the PDP as this zoning would not promote a compact, integrated and well-designed urban form with reference in particular to Objective 4.2.1 and 4.2.1.3.
- 11 Objective 4.2.1: Urban Growth Boundaries used as a tool to manage the growth of larger urban areas within distinct and defendable urban edges. This objective has seven related policies.

- 12 Policy 4.2.1.3 seeks to avoid urban development outside the boundary. I do not believe this necessarily precludes the location of a further UGB to include further potential urban development.
- 13 Policies 4.2.1.5 – 4.2.1.7 contemplate that UGBs will be required to accommodate areas which are not adjacent to large urban areas and I believe these policies offer a level of flexibility in accommodating UGB around otherwise isolated settlements such as Arthurs Point.
- 14 The promotion of compact, integrated and well designed urban form must apply to development within the UGB to ensure the most efficient and desirable use of the existing urban area so as to avoid "looking over the fence" and extending the UGB. Based upon my primary evidence I believe that the proposed re-zoning achieves a compact and efficient urban form.
- 15 Objective 3.2.5 relates to the retention of the District's distinctive landscapes where policy 3.2.5.1 protects ONL and ONF landscapes from the adverse effects of subdivision, use or development that are more than minor. For the reasons set out in the evidence of Mr Espie coupled with the conclusions in part 5 of my primary evidence, I do not believe that the proposed re-zoning results in adverse effects that are more than minor.
- 16 Policy 3.3.29 reads: "identify the Districts ONL and ONF on the District Plans maps". Based upon Mr Langman's inclusion of Objective 3.2.5 in the same paragraph (7.3) I assume this is to refer to policy 3.3.30 which is the same wording as Objective 3.2.5.
- 17 If so, I rely upon the evidence of Mr Espie in this regard. If not, I consider that 3.3.29 is not a relevant because the ONL line has been settled as part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review.
- 18 Policy 3.3.32 asks to only allow further land use change in areas of the Rural Character Landscapes which are able to absorb that change and limit the extent of any change so that landscape character and visual amenity values are not materially degraded. For the reasons set out in the evidence of Mr Espie coupled with the conclusions in part 5 of my primary evidence, I believe the landscape is able to absorb change and I do not believe that the proposed re-zoning results in the material degradation of landscape character or visual amenity value.
- 19 Paragraph 7.12 of Mr Langman's rebuttal evidence states the proposed zoning and UGB is not the most appropriate in terms of the protection of the District's rural landscapes from sporadic and sprawling development (Objective 3.2.2.1(a)). I do not believe that the proposed re-zoning is sporadic or sprawling as there are geographical constraints and elements of the landscape which have directed the location of the proposed re-zoning and these constraints limit any future expansion.
- 20 Like Policy 4.2.1.3 already discussed, Policies 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2 seek growth adjacent main urban settlements. However, the later policies 4.2.1.5 – 4.2.1.7 under Objective 4.2.1 I believe offer a balance to growing adjacent to main urban settlements and

acknowledge that "one size does not fit all" and the UGB may need to be amended to address changing community needs.

- 21 Strategic policies 3.3.12 – 3.3.15 listed in paragraph 7.12 of Mr Langman's evidence include policy 3.3.12 which relates to climate change. I assume that Mr Langman refers to the three policies listed under the heading Urban Development. These policies are sufficiently similar to Objective 4.2.1 and the policies already discussed so I refer to my earlier comments and parts of my primary submission to confirm the proposed re-zoning satisfies each.
- 22 For the reasons set out in part 5 of my primary evidence and supported by the evidence of Mr Copeland, I believe that the proposed re-zoning makes steps towards ensuring further availability of competitive land supply for urban purposes. This aligns the proposed rezoning with policy 4.2.1.4 (a) and (b).
- 23 QLDC summary evidence raises concerns in relation to landscape, infrastructure capacity and settlement patterns. I rely upon the evidence of Mr Espie and Mr Hansen in relation to the first two concerns.
- 24 In terms of the third, I am mindful in the difficulties of applying any traditional settlement plan or pattern to a Basin which is dissected by multiple topographical constraints as set out in the Stage 1 QLDC memorandum dated 19th April 2017 which referred to Queenstown as an "anomaly" in this respect. These topographical constraints place a premium on flat, serviceable land on the western side of the Shotover River and 10 minutes from Frankton.
- 25 For the reasons set out in my primary evidence I believe that any adverse effects associated with the proposed re-zoning are acceptable. The proposed re-zoning is consistent with relevant national standards, regional policies and the higher order provisions of the PDP as well as part 2 of the Resource Management Act.

Nick Geddes

09th July 2018

Nick Geddes

From: Stevie-Rae Blair <stevie@tami.maori.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 5 July 2018 2:49 PM
To: Nick Geddes
Subject: RE: Middleton Family Trust - Tucker Beach Residential Precinct - Stage 2 Queenstown Lakes District Plan Review

Tēnā koe Nick,

I have consulted with both Rūnanga and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu regarding this re-zoning of areas.

As you are aware from Deans previous email, the issue was around the Nohoanga site that is situated at Tuckers Beach. From discussion with whānau and TRoNT, we have no major concerns at this early point in the process and we look forward to receiving more detailed plans as part of the resource consent applications as they become available.

Hopefully this is sufficient, should you need any more information please don't hesitate to contact me.

Nāhaku noa nā,

Stevie-Rae Blair

Māori Environmental Advisor

Te Ao Marama Inc.
408 Tramway Road,
Invercargill, 9812.

From: Nick Geddes [mailto:ngeddes@cfma.co.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2018 12:16 p.m.
To: Dean Whaanga; Stevie-Rae Blair
Subject: Middleton Family Trust - Tucker Beach Residential Precinct - Stage 2 Queenstown Lakes District Plan Review

Kia ora (again) Dean / Stevie,

I am working for the Middleton Family Trust whom own a farm at Tucker Beach, Queenstown. I have included a location plan in the first attachment to help out.

The Middletons have been farming this land for two generations and slowly their farm is becoming obsolete by Queenstown's need for more housing especially when their land adjoins Frankton and Queenstown township. I have prepared a submission on the Queenstown Lakes District Plan Review which seeks to re-zone two areas from farm land to residential and these areas are depicted on the plan in the second attachment.

The proposed residential area will:

- Be fully serviced by extensions to the existing Council reticulation so no need for onsite wastewater disposal etc;
- Increase the number of residential houses using Tucker Beach Road which enables New Zealand Transport Agency to approve the upgrading of the dangerous intersection between Tucker Beach Road and State Highway 6 near the existing Shotover River bridge;
- Require all buildings to be located and constructed in materials which are sympathetic to the landscape;
- Facilitate a walking / cycling trail connection between Tucker Beach Reserve and Lake Johnson;

I have attached a copy of our submission (third attach) however, like most things that go to Council it is word heavy so was hoping to set things out in this email.

As with any of these large projects, I think it is helpful if we can demonstrate that Iwi authorities have no major concerns or if they do we can acknowledge what these are moving forward.

It would be great if I could get some thoughts on this project from you to place in the file.

Ngā mihi,

Nick

Nick Geddes | Planning Consultant | BSc Geog, Grad Dip Env Sci

Ph: 03 441 6071 0210 527 311

Scanned by **MailMarshal** - M86 Security's comprehensive email content security solution.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

CAUTION: This email and any attachment(s) contains information that is both confidential and possibly legally privileged.

No reader may make any use of its content unless that use is approved by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and its subsidiary companies separately in writing.

Any opinion, advice or information contained in this email and any attachment(s) is to be treated as interim and provisional only and for the strictly limited purpose of the recipient as communicated to us.

Neither the recipient nor any other person should act upon it without our separate written authorization of reliance. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy this message.