

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Scott Freeman. I am a resource management planning consultant with Southern Planning Group. I am here today to present planning evidence on behalf of Matakauri Lodge Limited ("MLL") in relation to MLL's submission (31033) on Stage 3 of the Proposed District Plan ("PDP"). Matakauri Lodge can presently accommodate up to 32 guests via six buildings established on the site.
2. MLL has requested that the PDP Rural Visitor Zone ("RVZ") be imposed on the site. In my opinion, the RVZ is an appropriate zoning framework for the site, bearing in the mind the long term established visitor accommodation activity (twenty years plus), its size/location, and finally, the inherent issues with expanding the current accommodation under the PDP Rural Lifestyle Zone.

RURAL VISITOR PROVISIONS

3. In my Statement of Evidence, I proposed a number of recommended changes to the RVZ provisions that were included in the Section 42A Report.
4. With the exception of total ground floor area restriction of 2000m², I agree with Ms Grace in relation to her comments concerning my changes to standard 46.5.2.2 (I assume that Ms Grace is comfortable with adding 'traffic generation' as a matter of discretion if standard 46.5.2 is breached). In relation to traffic considerations, Ms Grace agrees with my recommended changes which adds the Transport Chapter to provision 46.3.1 and the amended matters of control for traffic related considerations in terms of Rule 46.4.6(f).
5. On the advice of Ms Lucas, I recommended a new standard (46.5.X.X) that requires buildings to be separated by at least 10m on the site. Ms Grace has recommended a second limb to standard 46.5.X.X that requires a native planting plan. I am comfortable with this addition as proposed by Ms Grace.
6. I will address two outstanding issues in relation to the request to impose the RVZ on the site.

STANDARD 46.5.2 – TOTAL MAXIMUM GROUND FLOOR AREA

7. Mr Jones has considered the Statement of Evidence compiled by Ms Lucas and considers that the evidence provides sound reasons and justification for rezoning the site to RVZ (Ms Grace accepts the views of Mr Jones on this matter) from a landscape perspective.
8. The remaining point of contention from a landscape perspective is the recommendation by Mr Jones that the total maximum ground floor area of 2000m² for the site, as opposed to the limit of 2500m² as proposed in my recommended changes to the RVZ (and as supported by Ms Lucas). The

2500m² would enable another 866m² of ground floor area built form on the site.

9. The figure of 2500m² has been based on a detailed assessment of the capacity of the site to accommodate further built form from functional and guest privacy/amenity perspectives, while at the same protecting the landscape values of the setting. Mr Jones states that a limit of 2500m² is inappropriate for the site, however there is no explanation as to why he has formed this stance. In my opinion, the limit should remain at 2500m², based on the careful consideration of the sites capacity to absorb further built form.

TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

10. Mr Bartlett has addressed the various issues raised by Mr Smith in relation to traffic considerations. In Mr Bartlett's opinion, Mr Smith has applied the incorrect assessment criteria for the 'sightlines' associated with the access from the site onto the Glenorchy – Queenstown Road, plus Mr Smith has not addressed the additional matters of control/discretion in the RVZ provisions that deal with transportation matters.
11. Ms Grace forms the view that if the access to the site is already causing traffic safety issues, and the access upgrades are not practical, then the assessment of traffic matters at consent stage is not appropriate within a controlled activity application.
12. As detailed in my Statement of Evidence, Rules 29.5.14 (Access and Road Design) and 29.5.16 (Design of Vehicle Crossings) within the PDP Transport Chapter will apply to any future consent application to expand. If these rules are breached, then a Restricted Discretionary consent is required – and this planning status provides the Council with 'teeth' to require an access upgrade or potentially decline an application.
13. In my experience, a hilly mountainous area like Queenstown often presents transportation issues, which are very commonly worked through in consent applications. There is nothing unusual about the current access arrangement to the site – it is adequate and manageable.
14. Mr Bartlett considers there is an access upgrade that is physically possible without extensive earthworks. This upgrade of course relies on permission from the Department of Conservation ("DOC"), however, MLL has had a long standing beneficial working relationship with DOC in terms of the removal of wilding trees on nearby DOC land, the use of DOC land for ancillary storage purposes, and finally a previous access upgrade on DOC land.
15. In my opinion, I consider access issues can be resolved, and that the rezoning of the site will not lead to conflict with Policy 46.2.2.6(d).