

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Priority Area Landscape Schedules
Variation to the Queenstown Lakes
Proposed District Plan

Summary of Planning Evidence of Morgan Kendall Shepherd

8 November 2023

1 Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Morgan Shepherd. My qualifications, planning experience and confirmation of my adherence to the Code of Conduct is outlined in paragraphs 1.1 – 1.3 of my evidence dated 11 September 2023.
- 1.2 I attended the expert conferencing held on 3 October 2023 and signed the joint witness statement (JWS) dated 9 October 2023.
- 1.3 This summary relates to a general matter that has evolved over the course of the hearing in relation to landscape capacity rating and then submitter-specific matters relating to Mount Cardrona Station Limited (MSCL).
- 1.4 I prefer the previously agreed JWS version wording for ***Extremely limited or no landscape capacity*** for the reasons discussed at expert conferencing. The removal of the last sentence which states ‘... *there may be exceptions where occasional, unique or discrete development protects identified landscape values*’ has a similar effect of reverting back to the original ‘no capacity’ rating.
- 1.5 As I understand, the Council’s position is that the Priority Area (PA) mapping extends across zones other than the Rural Zone but only applies to land that is zoned Rural Zone. The preamble now includes a section titled ‘Application’ which clarifies that, the ‘*schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exceptions Zones (see 3.1B.5)*’. It is also acknowledged in the preamble that the schedules may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA although this would not be a requirement.
- 1.6 It is unclear as to when the schedules ‘may’ be used to inform assessments and how Council officers (that are not privy to this process) will interpret the preambles in the future, specifically when they ‘may’ refer to the schedules to inform assessments.
- 1.7 As noted in the JWS, if there is scope to remove the Exception Zones (and any zone other than the Rural Zone) from the PA mapping, I remain supportive of this as it would avoid any unnecessary plan implementation issues arising in future.
- 1.8 The Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone (MCSSZ) is an operative zone and is therefore not listed in Policy 3.1B.5 as an Exception Zone, albeit Council has indicated that it would be appropriate for the MCSSZ to become one¹. The MCSSZ is currently within the extent of the mapped Cardrona Valley ONL PA and my understanding is that (if the mapping is not amended

¹ As set out in Paragraph 6.2 of my evidence.

to remove Exception Zones and any other non-rural zones) the schedules will not apply in the same way that they do not apply to any Exception Zone.

- 1.9 To avoid unintended application of the schedules in future (in non-rural zones instances where the schedules 'may' be used to inform assessments), it may be efficient to add a sentence under the 'Landscape Capacity' heading of the preamble as follows:

“The landscape capacity ratings identified in the PA Schedules, do not apply to activities within non-rural zones.”

- 1.10 I am happy to take any questions.

M Shepherd

8 November 2023