

Summary of Evidence – Scott Edgar on behalf of Scott & Jocelyn O’Donnell

1. My name is Scott Edgar. I am the Director of Edgar Planning Ltd, a planning consultancy based in Wānaka.
2. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence and I confirm that I will comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.
3. In this summary statement I will set out the key points of my evidence and matters of disagreement.
4. The evidence that I will speak to today was filed on behalf of Scott & Jocelyn O’Donnell.
5. The O’Donnells submitted in opposition to the proposed High Density Residential provisions and the upzoning of their property at Panorama Terrace and the wider area from Lower Density Suburban Residential to High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential respectively.
6. The O’Donnells concerns relate to the effects of the Urban Intensification Variation on their views, access to sunlight, privacy and amenity and whether, in the context of the High Density Residential Zone, the variation will achieve it’s intended outcome.
7. While I generally support urban intensification and acknowledge Council’s obligations to give effect to the NPS UD I do have concerns that in the High Density Residential Zone the intended outcomes of the variation will not be achieved. The objective of the variation is to enable the development of a diverse range of housing typologies to provide greater housing choice and affordability.
8. My concern with regard to the High Density Residential Zone is that the amended provisions apply broadly to built development and will further enable visitor accommodation as well as residential development while providing visitor accommodation argueably an easier consenting pathway.
9. In my opinion the High Density Residential Zone is primarily a residential zone within which visitor accommodation is enabled albeit on a qualified basis.

10. I consider that the proposed amendments to the High Density Residential policy framework remove the distinction between residential and visitor accommodation and shift the zone purpose from being primarily a residential zone within which visitor accommodation is enabled on a qualified basis to one in which visitor accommodation is on an equal footing with residential development if not prioritised over residential development.
11. Under the amended provisions the matters of discretion for residential development are more extensive than those for visitor accommodation. Notably residential amenity, building dominance, sustainability, infrastructure capacity, stormwater, natural hazards and consistency with the Residential Zone Design Guideline are included as matters of discretion for residential developments but not visitor accommodation.
12. I accept Ms. Frishknecht's rebuttal point that the matters of discretion for visitor accommodation of location, nature and scale of activities and external appearance are broad and could allow for the consideration of a relatively wide range of effects however I consider that there is little in the provisions to suggest that a wide range of effects should be considered and I do not agree with Ms. Frishknecht¹ that including additional controls and matters of discretion for visitor accommodation would narrow the scope of discretion.
13. I consider that the assessment of infrastructure capacity on an ad hoc, case by case basis is impractical and the burden of modelling and infrastructure upgrades may deter the type of infill residential development that the variation seeks to encourage.
14. I consider that placing the burden of infrastructure capacity modelling and upgrades on residential development but not visitor accommodation is inequitable and is likely to allow visitor accommodation to further outcompete residential development.
15. In my opinion there is insufficient information with regard to the demand for visitor accommodation land within the High Density Residential Zone and the interaction in a competitive sense between visitor accommodation and residential development or the

¹ Rebuttal – Paragraph 7.51

effects of further enabling visitor accommodation within the High Density Residential Zone on the vibrancy and vitality of the Town Centres and Business Zones.

16. Overall I consider that the proposed High Density Residential provisions will not achieve the objective of the variation and do not give effect to the NPS UD or achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act.
17. I maintain my position with regard to the amended provisions set out in Appendix B to my evidence.