

**Ruth Evans for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 1 February 2023**  
**Stage 1 PDP submissions – Gertrude’s Saddlery Ltd and Larchmont Developments Ltd, Arthurs Point**

1. My evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) is on planning matters associated with the rezoning requests by Gertrude’s Saddlery Ltd and Larchmont Developments Ltd (**the submitters**) at Arthurs Point, Queenstown, lodged as part of Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan (**the PDP**).
2. The submitters are seeking the rezoning of land at 111 and 163 Atley Road from Rural to a mix of Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (**LDSR**) and Large Lot Residential B Zone (**LLRB**). A structure plan and a number of bespoke provisions are proposed for the part of the site proposed as LLRB, with the structure plan providing for 17 building platforms. A conceptual masterplan that is not proposed to form part of the PDP also shows 10 lots<sup>1</sup> on the LDSR land, with a total of 27 lots across the submission site.
3. Further submissions in both support and opposition have been received on the rezoning request. Reasons for supporting the rezoning include that it is a natural extension of an existing residential area and it will contribute to housing supply. Reasons for opposing the rezoning include adverse effects on the Outstanding Natural Landscape (**ONL**) and the Outstanding Natural Feature (**ONF**) at Arthurs Point, natural hazards, cultural effects, effects on residential amenity of the surrounding area, infrastructure capacity and traffic and transport effects.
4. Based on the findings of the experts (Dr Hill and Mr Lynn) on the Land Use Capability (**LUC**) classification of the site not being LUC 1, 2 or 3, I consider that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 does not apply to the submitters’ proposal.
5. In my view the key resource management issues for this rezoning proposal are infrastructure and servicing, transport, geotechnical and natural hazards, wāhi tūpuna/cultural effects, and landscape effects. As the other witnesses for the Council explain, the proposed rezoning is considered acceptable with respect to infrastructure and servicing, geotechnical and natural hazards effects.
6. In terms of transport effects, I rely on the evidence of Mr Smith for the Council, who concludes that the rezoning is acceptable from a transport perspective. I rely on Mr Smith’s position that he is comfortable that the traffic associated with the

---

1 While 10 lots are shown on the masterplan it is noted that this a lower density than the minimum lot size – the LDSR enables more than 10 lots.

rezoning can be accommodated in the surrounding road network, and his view that the revised road design<sup>2</sup> is suitable for the number of lots proposed and can be constructed as designed.

7. With regard to wāhi tūpuna and cultural effects, the wāhi tūpuna overlay applies to the subject site along its western edge and the provisions of Chapter 39 will ensure any activities associated with any residential development of the site are appropriately managed.
8. For landscape effects, I rely on the evidence Ms Mellsop for the Council and her evidence as to the appropriate ONL boundary. I support the extension of the LDSR proposed by the submitters, along with the inclusion of a landscape buffer as recommended by Ms Mellsop, noting Ms Mellsop's conclusion that the proposed LDSR boundary is preferable to the existing zone boundary with respect to topography and landscape elements, and that the landscape values of the wider Arthurs Point ONL and the Kimiākau Shotover River ONF will be protected.
9. With respect to the balance of the proposal, being the LLRB zoning, structure plan and bespoke provisions, Ms Mellsop is of the view that the proposed LLRB will have a moderate to high adverse effect on the values of the adjacent ONF and a moderate adverse effect on the values of the wider ONL (noting she considers most of the land sought to be rezoned LLRB to form part of the wider ONL). I therefore do not support the proposed LLRB zoning of the site due to landscape effects.
10. Setting aside that I do not support the LLRB zoning of the site due to landscape effects, should the Hearings Panel reach a different view and find that the LLRB part of the site is not part of the ONL, and on the basis that the rezoning is adjacent to an ONF (albeit with two small parts of the site being ONF – shown as BRA on the submitters' proposed Structure Plan), I would recommend a number of amendments to the bespoke provisions proposed by the submitters. My suggested edits are focused on including the changes recommended by Ms Mellsop, and tightening up the provisions, should the Hearings Panel decide that the site is not ONL and that the LLRB is appropriate, rather than undertaking a comprehensive redraft.
11. My recommended amendments to the proposed Chapter 11 provisions include:
  - (a) Inclusion of a site specific objective and policies;
  - (b) A site specific maximum building height standard;
  - (c) Retention of the road and internal boundary setbacks;
  - (d) Retention of the 4000m<sup>2</sup> net site area.

---

2 As attached to Mr Smith's summary statement.

12. My recommended amendments to the proposed Chapter 27 provisions include:
- (a) An additional site specific policy focused on mitigating visual effects;
  - (b) Retention of the 4000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot area;
  - (c) Restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision in accordance with the structure plan;
  - (d) Amendments to planting requirements for the structure planting areas plan.

**1 February 2023**

**R Evans**