

**Summary of Evidence – Scott Edgar on behalf of Henley Property Limited, Evolution Trust Limited, D & K International Properties Limited Partnership, Ardmore Trustee Nominee Limited and Edgar Planning Limited**

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. With regard to my evidence on behalf of Henley Property Limited, Evolution Trust Limited, D & K International Properties Limited Partnership and Ardmore Trustee Nominee Limited, which relates to height limits in the Business Mixed Use Zone and Wānaka Town Centre Zone, there is no disagreement with Council's position.
5. I consider that the recommended tiered height limit, which establishes the permitted height limit at 16.5m with a discretionary height limit extending up to 20m is appropriate in the Business Mixed Use Zone and the parts of the Wānaka Town Centre Zone to which the submissions relate.
6. With regard to my evidence on behalf of Edgar Planning Ltd I confirm again that I have complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses. My evidence does relate to a further submission filed on behalf of Edgar Planning Limited however I do not have anything to gain (professionally or otherwise) from the introduction of an alternative definition of ground level.
7. As a practitioner who has worked in the District for over 20 years and who works with the District Plan on a day to day basis I do not consider it improper or unethical to make recommendations in this forum as to how the District Plan could be improved to achieve greater efficiency and certainty.

8. I therefore disagree with Ms. Bowbyes where she suggests in her rebuttal that my evidence may not be admissible as it relates to my own further submission.
9. The further submission was made in opposition to submissions seeking that the definitions proposed to be amended under the Urban Intensification Variation be adopted as notified.
10. The further submission was therefore made in opposition to original submissions. It did however seek alternative relief, being the adoption of the definition of ground level from the National Planning Standards.
11. If the Commissioners feel that there is no scope or jurisdiction to adopt that alternative relief then I am happy to concede that point.
12. If however the Commissioners consider that there is scope to introduce the definition of ground level from the National Planning Standards I consider there to be merit in that. The introduction of the standardised definition will provide greater efficiency and certainty and will help simplify infill development proposals and better achieve the objective of the variation, will assist in giving effect to the NPS UD and better achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act.