

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ROB GREENAWAY FOR QUEENSTOWN PARK LTD

- 1 My evidence considers the role the Rural Zone in the Queenstown Lakes plays in supporting tourism, and why the Proposed District Plan (PDP) should recognise and provide for tourism and recreation activities in the rural zone to a greater extent than is currently proposed. Specific recommendations for amendments to the PDP are made in the submission of Queenstown Park Ltd (QPL). My evidence provides background to this submission.
- 2 In my evidence I describe tourism activities which have very low impacts on landscape and other values in rural settings, and which should be supported by the provisions of the PDP.
- 3 I agree with the review of Mr Philip Osborne as provided in his evidence that the landscape of the District underpins its value as a tourism destination, especially considering that a large proportion of the District's most significant and valuable tourism activities occur in the proposed Rural Zone, providing access to (for example):
 - 3.1 Most of the Shotover River (offering, for example, jet boating, driving tours, bungy jumping).
 - 3.2 The land providing access to the District's many significant angling settings (such as upper Clutha River (22,000+ angler days in 2007/08), Lake Hawea (22,000+) and Lake Wanaka (39,000+)).
 - 3.3 Mount Aspiring National Park and all the walking, climbing and tramping options within and nearby, including the start of the Routeburn Track.
 - 3.4 Almost all the land occupied by the 120km Queenstown Trail, with almost 700,000 walkers and cyclists using the component tracks between opening and the end of 2015, and 214,000 for the 2015 year; and other public walking tracks.
 - 3.5 Golf courses such as Frankton, Arrowtown, Jacks Point and Wanaka (albeit with some designations and special zones).

4 Capitalising on activities such as these may require additional infrastructure that can be sympathetically developed in a rural setting. For example, this might include:

4.1 Conversion of or additions to existing farm buildings to provide accommodation for, for example, bike trail users, and associated food and bike rental services and parking.

4.2 New trails and tracks for recreation access, and associated facilities such as bridges, toilets and shelter, which may have commercial elements.

4.3 Facilities and services to support, for example, game hunting, equestrian trails and farm visits on private land.

5 In my experience with such development proposals as Parkins Bay Preserve and Hill End, for example, the consenting process enabled clear consideration of their costs and benefits. My approach to the PDP and its expectation of maintaining the qualities of rural settings for (amongst other things) their contribution to tourism value is therefore in line with Mr Osborne's. However, there is dubious logic in elevating farming above all other uses if those other uses can achieve the same outcome in terms of, most importantly, landscape effects. A cycle trail and a farm road have no important differences. A small farm building (if less than 100m² and 4m in height) in an ONL is permitted, and I do not see why similar options for tourism should be significantly fettered by a non-complying status. In that regard, I also have some sympathy for the views of Professor Hazledine that farming activity per se does not make a significant contribution to Queenstown's tourism appeal, but that the value is based on the ability to do activities in a quality social, commercial and landscape setting.

6 I consider that the QPL gondola proposal represents a strategic asset for tourism in the District and is appropriately located, for the following reasons (amongst others stated in my evidence):

6.1 It provides an efficient means of accessing and capitalising on existing tourism infrastructure (the Remarkables Ski Area).

- 6.2 It is located in an area (very proximate to the airport) where high levels of service for tourism are expected and where international comparisons with standards of service will be made.
- 6.3 It enhances high-value short-stay tourism by increasing the ease by which domestic and Australian visitors can access a ski weekend and responds to emerging Asian markets which are less likely to seek independent road transport to the ski area.
- 6.4 Based on my review for Queenstown Park Ltd, it has very limited potential for adverse effects on existing tourism assets, such as the Queenstown Trails and users of the Kawarau and Shotover Rivers, and will have no adverse effect on participant numbers in other tourism activities.
- 6.5 It is, in one sense, merely a modern means of transport through a rural area, and of far less physical and visual impact than a road would be in the same setting,
- 6.6 It occupies a relatively small footprint and allows rural activities to continue, sustaining rural landscape values.