

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

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions and further submissions on  
Hearing Stream 12 – Upper Clutha  
Mapping Annotations and Rezoning  
Requests

---

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND  
(ECONOMICS)  
ON BEHALF OF MIKE BERESFORD (SUBMITTER 149)  
Dated: 14 June 2017**

---

---

**Prudence Steven QC**  
Canterbury Chambers  
PO Box 9344  
Christchurch 8149

Telephone: (03) 343 9834  
Email: [pru@prusteven.co.nz](mailto:pru@prusteven.co.nz)

## **SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. My full name is Michael Campbell Copeland. At the request of Mr M Beresford, I prepared evidence (dated 4 April, 2017) on the economic effects of the proposed rezoning of approximately 20 hectares of the Hawea-Wanaka Substitute Block, with the remainder of the block retained in exotic forestry and available for continued recreational use.
- 1.2. In this summary statement of evidence I list the main findings of my evidence and respond to the rebuttal evidence presented by Mr Craig Barr on behalf of the Queenstown Lakes District Council, dated 5 May, 2017.

### **2 MAIN FINDINGS OF MY EVIDENCE**

- 2.1 The economic benefits from Mr Beresford's submission are:
  - 2.1.1 Increased economic and social wellbeing for the beneficiaries;
  - 2.1.2 Economic efficiency benefits from a more productive use of the land;
  - 2.1.3 The retention of the existing mountain bike facilities on the land and the associated retention of and possible increase in expenditure by visitors to Wanaka utilising these facilities; and
  - 2.1.4 An increase in the supply of residential sections, and an increase in the level of competition in the market for the supply of land for residential development in Wanaka. These particular economic benefits are consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
- 2.2 There are no economic externality costs associated with the proposed rezoning of part of the block.
- 2.3 The proposed rezoning is consistent with:
  - 2.3.1 Enabling "*people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety*"; and

2.3.2 Having *“particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources”*.

### **3 THE REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF MR CRAIG BARR**

- 3.1 Mr Barr assumes that the economic benefits of the proposed rezoning are confined to economic benefits to the beneficial landowners of Sticky Forest.<sup>1</sup> In fact there are a number of community-wide economic benefits which Mr Barr has overlooked. These were identified in my evidence.
- 3.2 At paragraph 11.33 of his rebuttal evidence Mr Barr states that it is not the Council’s task to provide redress to the beneficial owners of the Sticky Forest land. However it is my understanding that the economic (and social) wellbeing of people and communities and the efficient development and use of resources are relevant considerations for determining the provisions to be included in the Proposed District Plan and this will include the economic and social wellbeing of the beneficial landowners and the more productive use of the rezoned land. In addition, as set out in my EIC the rezoning sought will provide economic benefits to the wider Wanaka and Queenstown Lakes District communities and therefore the relevant positive economic effects of the rezoning sought go much beyond simply providing redress to the beneficial landowners.
- 3.3 Also in paragraph 11.33 Mr Barr appears to suggest the proposed rezoning of some of the Sticky Forest land will see the potential loss of recreational opportunities for the wider community. However it is my understanding from Mr Beresford’s EIC that in fact the reverse is true. The proposed rezoning would provide economic benefits to the beneficial landowners such that they would be willing to forgo returns from forestry harvesting and replanting of the remainder of their land holding and the majority of the block could continue to provide recreational opportunities for local residents and visitors. Without the proposed rezoning recreational and economic benefits from the existing mountain biking activities on the land will be lost at least for an extended period if not in the longer term (see paragraphs 3.5-3.6 of my EIC).
- 3.4 Paragraphs 11.49 to 11.51 of Mr Barr’s rebuttal evidence are under the heading “Housing Capacity and Economic Issues”. As I have stated already

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, see paragraphs 11.7 and 11.32 of his evidence.

in my rebuttal evidence Mr Barr has not addressed the economic benefits I have set out in my EIC and this section of Mr Barr's rebuttal evidence does not in fact address the "Economic Issues" which I consider to be relevant considerations with respect to the proposed rezoning of a portion of the Sticky Forest land.

- 3.5 Further in this section of his rebuttal evidence, Mr Barr relies on the evidence of Mr Osborne (for the Council) to conclude that "there is adequate housing capacity in the Upper Clutha in the short, medium and long term". I note that Ms Hampton's evidence (on behalf of Mr Beresford) reaches different conclusions and she has addressed this part of Mr Barr's rebuttal evidence in her rebuttal evidence.
- 3.6 I note at paragraphs 11.55 and 11.56 of his rebuttal evidence Mr Barr concludes that there are no matters that might give rise to economic externality costs associated with the proposed rezoning insofar as the provision of infrastructure is concerned.

**Michael Campbell Copeland**

**Date: 14 June 2017**