

**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 2400

---

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

**Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited, and others (#2400)**

**Dated 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018**

---

- 1 I would primarily like to address matters raised within the Council's evidence.
- 2 On the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018 the statement of evidence of Council's Planning Consultant, Mr Langman identified there was no opposition for a precinct zone on the subject site in terms of landscape considerations on the basis that the Wakatipu Basin Landuse Study regarded the area as having a high ability to absorb development. The statement of evidence by Council's Landscape Consultant, Ms Gilbert did not address the current submission.
- 3 Mr Langman acknowledges the sites high ability to absorb development yet preferred the Amenity Zone for its ability to preserve the site for a future point in the long term when it "may potentially" be required for urban greenfield development. Mr Langman's rebuttal evidence confirms this timeframe could be between 5 – 50 years and may not occur in the lifetime of the Proposed District Plan.
- 4 Ms Gilbert's rebuttal evidence disagrees with Mr Skelton's evidence for submission 2400 in relation to one point only and this is in relation to the future ability to "up zone" the site to urban densities which may potentially be a consideration within the next 5 – 50 years.
- 5 Based upon the evidence of Council's consultants coupled with that of Mr Skelton I believe that the Lifestyle Precinct zoning sought by the current submission is acceptable in terms of the sites ability to absorb rural living.
- 6 I cannot find any evidence to undertake a meaningful analysis of the demand for urban greenfield development on the subject site within a 5 – 50 year timeframe or outside the lifetime of the Proposed District Plan. The notified plan does not seek urban densities on the site and the current submission does not either. Therefore, I find that consideration of urban densities is not feasible or within the scope of the hearing.
- 7 The current submission is unopposed by Council's traffic and infrastructure consultants.
- 8 Based upon the reasons set out in my primary evidence coupled with the evidence of Mr Skelton I believe that any adverse effects associated with the proposed re-zoning are acceptable. The proposed re-zoning is consistent with the relevant national standards, regional policies and the higher order provisions of the Proposed District Plan as well as part 2 of the Resource Management Act.