

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

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed
District Plan – Wakatipu Basin

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Submission 2489

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES
ON BEHALF OF**

Ladies Mile Consortium (#2489)

Dated 13th July 2018

- 1 I would primarily like to address matters raised within the QLDC rebuttal evidence in relation to landscape and infrastructural matters.
- 2 In relation to the area of the submission between Lake Hayes and the existing rural living development of Threepwood the rebuttal evidence of QLDC Planner Mr Marcus Langman accurately reflects the position of the landscape evidence of Ms Mellsoy and supports it with the relevant parts of the PDP.
- 3 I accept that residential buildings appearing in the immediate foreground of Lake Hayes is not a desirable outcome. To ensure this does not eventuate I rely upon the consenting regime as discussed in my primary evidence to locate building platforms where they do not appear in the immediate foreground but on the terrace of Ladies Mile, behind existing residences and towards the existing 22 rural living allotments of Threepwood.
- 4 To rely upon the consenting regime appears to be the same approach QLDC have taken in zoning land Lifestyle Precinct where sites adjoin the south eastern and northern western corners of Lake Hayes.
- 5 The rebuttal evidence of QLDC Planner Ms Anita Vanstone addresses the remainder of land within the current submission.
- 6 Paragraph 5.6 of Ms Vanstone's rebuttal evidence reflects Ms Mellsoy's concerns regarding minimum allotment sizes and the setback from State Highway 6.
- 7 I refer to part 5 of my primary evidence where the allotment size recommended by the WBS equates to a density between 1087 and 1957 residential units on the subject land.
- 8 While I accept the recommended 25m setback as part of the current submission is less than that originally sought. I remain of the opinion that any adverse effects associated with the bulk, location and associated domestic land uses of some 1000 residential units as recommended by the WBS is considerably higher than what I would expect from the 150 rural living allotments sought by the current submission.
- 9 Paragraph 5.8 of Ms Vanstone's rebuttal evidence confirms the Ladies Mile Masterplan recognises there is a limit on the capacity of the Shotover Bridge and I believe this to be 1100 residential dwellings. I also understand this is a threshold agreed between QLDC and NZTA.
- 10 Paragraph 3.3 of the evidence of Mr Tony MacColl for NZTA states it is inappropriate to re-zone land on the assumption that infrastructure upgrades will occur on the basis of increased demand. This is accepted. However, I believe that the submission proposes to re-zone land on the basis that it reduces the agreed threshold by a small amount (13%) and occupies a large portion (approx 50%) of the land area in the Ladies Mile Masterplan. This leaves a generous allocation of the remaining infrastructure capacity for the land master planned by QLDC for higher density living.
- 11 In addition, I am uncertain of validity of Mr MacColl's comments that it is unacceptable for the current submission to contemplate re-zoning land in advance of infrastructural capacity yet the QLDC intentions for Ladies Mile appear well in advance of infrastructure and without the support of landowners.
- 12 I believe the lower density specified in submission 2489 is an appropriate response to the limited capacity of roading infrastructure.