
**SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE OF BEN FARRELL FOR CHAPTER 24
WAKATIPU BASIN**

**For:
M & C Burgess (669, 2591/2712)
Ashford Trust (2535/2711)
Philip Smith (2500/2770)**

TABLED AT QLDC HEARING 18 July 2018

1. In 2015 Council recommended the site be rezoned from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle with an average allotment size of 2ha. During the Stage 1 hearings: the rezoning was supported in submissions and in evidence – nobody opposed it or gave evidence why it should not be rezoned. Council is now seeking to discourage subdivision and development on the site. Despite Council's updated position, submitters' remain in support of the rezoning and there is still no opposition to the rezoning. I do not understand Council's position. I believe it does not give any weight to what local people want or accept is appropriate and is not justified in terms of the ability of the relevant land to absorb such subdivision and development.
2. I support the rezoning to enable appropriate subdivision and development because it is the most appropriate way of achieving sustainable management of the site. In this regard:
 - a. Nobody in the local community opposes the rezoning. This can be given considerable weight when determining the appropriateness of the rezoning (including when comparing this rezoning to other rezoning requests).
 - b. The s32 Analysis was deficient / inaccurate because it relied on the Wakatipu Basin Study which did not: appropriately define the landscape unit; satisfactorily recognise that new subdivision and development can be absorbed in the landscape unit; take into account the opinions of the local community; and did not give sufficient weight to the benefits of providing for new rural living opportunities in the landscape unit.
 - c. Rezoning the site to enable rural lifestyle subdivision and development will facilitate a more efficient use of land than not rezoning the land.
 - d. Rezoning the site will not result in adverse effects on outstanding natural landscape values. The Outstanding Natural Landscape values will be protected.
 - e. Rezoning the site can enhance environmental quality and amenity values.
 - f. Rezoning the site could result in nature conservation benefits.
 - g. New rural living subdivision and development can occur within the site while maintaining or enhancing the highly valued landscape attributes. Therefore any consequential changes to landscape values (including cumulative effects) will appropriately fit with the local rural character;
 - h. There is no valid effects basis to "protect" the landscape values associated with the site.
3. Sections 5, 7(b), 7(c), and 7(f) should carry substantial weight in this particular enquiry, at least until such time that the PRPS and/or the Strategic Direction (chapters 3 and 6) are settled.
4. I prefer the landscape analysis of Mr Skelton (and also, but to a lesser extent Dr Read and Mr Espie's peer review) over Ms Gilbert because it provides a closer and more refined examination of the landscape unit in particular the defensible boundary of that unit, including its ability to absorb further development and identification of the specific parts of the landscape unit where new development should be avoided.
5. Ultimately I believe the costs, benefits and overall effectiveness and efficiency of the rezoning outweigh the benefits and effectiveness and efficiency of not rezoning the land.

FOOTNOTES 8 (p8) *Typo (delete footnote)*
 [to be inserted 9 (p9) *Paragraphs 122-147*
 into evidence]: 10 (p9) *Par 6 Goldsmith Legal Submission 20 May 2016, Stream #2*
 11 (p9) *s.42A Report inclusive of s.32 Report and evidence all dated 6 April 2016*
 12 (p10) *Paragraph 5.3 Evidence dated 28 May 2018*