

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –  
Hearing Stream T15.

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE - SEAN DENT ON BEHALF OF MT CRYSTAL  
LIMITED (#2450)**

Dated: 19<sup>th</sup> September 2018

---

**SOUTHERN PLANNING GROUP**

Resource Management Consultants

PO Box 1081

QUEENSTOWN

Phone: (03) 409 0140

Fax: (03) 409 0145



- 1.1. Overall, my expert opinion presented in my primary brief of evidence regarding the application of a VASZ to the Mt Crystal Limited site at 634 Frankton Road, Queenstown remains unchanged.
- 1.2. Specifically, I remain of the opinion that the character of the surrounding environment does not contain the type of traditional suburban densities and residential character that would normally be anticipated in the Low Density Suburban Residential Zone. The surrounding environment also exhibits a strong VA character due to the existence of large scale VA operations and RVA in the immediate vicinity.
- 1.3. Accordingly, it is my opinion that providing for a VASZ over this site (subject to it retaining its Medium Density Residential Zoning) is unlikely to result in a significant loss of residential cohesion or character of the suburban environment and note that Ms Devlin and I are in agreement on this matter<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.4. In regards to the provisions for VA and RVA, similarly to the above my opinion presented in my primary evidence remains unchanged. I note that I made some minor recommendations to the provisions such that Rule 8.4.30 would enable both VA and RVA to occur within the VASZ in the Medium Density Residential Sub-Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity and that the matters of infrastructure and servicing would become a matter of Council's discretion. Both recommendations have been accepted by Ms Bowbyes<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.5. For clarification, I agree with Ms Bowbyes<sup>3</sup> that the changes I recommended would apply to VASZ's throughout the MDRZ not just the VASZ (if approved) over the Mt Crystal site.
- 1.6. I also recommended a minor change to the non-notification Rule 8.6.2.3 to enable written approval and/or potential notification for any VA and RVA activities in the MDRZ which adjoin or access the State Highway. This is in recognition of the potential impacts that VA in particular could have on the safety of the State Highway network as a result of higher traffic generation. I am still of the opinion that this amendment is appropriate with the exception that on further consideration, it is unnecessary to require notification simply because a site adjoins a State Highway. I consider it would address my concerns if it simply referred to "where the site has access onto a State Highway".

---

<sup>1</sup> Evidence of Rosalind Devlin Dated 23 July, paragraph 24.10, page 55 and Rebuttal Evidence of Rosalind Devlin Dated 22 August 2018, paragraph 4.4, page 4

<sup>2</sup> Rebuttal Evidence of Ms Bowbyes, paragraph 3.4, page 3 and paragraph 3.11, pages 4-5.

<sup>3</sup> Rebuttal Evidence of Ms Bowbyes, paragraph 3.3, page 3 and paragraph 3.11, pages 4-5.

- 1.7. As noted in the Council evidence, the submitter has lodged an appeal on the PDP Stage 1 decision that re-zoned the site to MDRZ and is seeking a HDR zoning. I am not involved in this appeal and will not be providing expert planning evidence in respect of it. Notwithstanding, I have considered the VA and RVA provisions for the HDRZ in case such zoning was afforded to the site and I support the Council evidence for such activities to occur as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Similarly to the MDRZ I recommend that written approval or notification for VA and RVA in the HDRZ where the site has access onto a State Highway.



Sean Dent

19<sup>th</sup> September 2018