

**BEFORE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 9 - Resort  
Zone

---

**STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY WILLIAMS**

**Dated 17 February 2017**

---

## INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Timothy Williams. I hold the Qualifications of Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University and Masters of Urban Design and Development with Distinction from The University of New South Wales. I reside in Queenstown.
- 1.2 I have practised in the planning and urban design field in the Queenstown Lakes District since 2003 and am currently employed by Remarkables Park Ltd as their Project Design and Planning Manager. Since 2003 I have been involved in a wide range of resource management matters including landuse, plan changes, subdivision and comprehensive development applications relating to the Resort Zones and including within Jacks Point.
- 1.3 My wife and I are residents of Jacks Point, 96 Jacks Point Rise having recently completed building our family home that we reside in with our two children. We lodged a submission (No 601) and further submission (NoFS1252) relating to the resort zones and in particular the Jacks Point Resort Zone.
- 1.4 I note although I have been involved in numerous relevant matters as an expert witness. My statement today is provided on behalf of our family, as residents of Jacks Point.

## ZONE STRUCTURE

- 2.1 In deciding to purchase a section and build our home in Jacks Point the unique qualities of the development were integral to this decision. As the Commissioners will appreciate from their site visit Jacks Point is not a 'typical' subdivision with much higher levels of planned open space, landscaping and a particular subdivision layout (residential pods set within landscape buffers) that is not replicated in other residential areas.
- 2.2 In my professional capacity having worked within the various zones of the District I am aware that because Jacks Point is located within a resort zone and has its own specific structure plan and development controls it is not by accident that the specific outcomes have resulted. The zoning and structure plan are integral components of why the environment we see today is what it is.
- 2.3 I consider that the provisions of District Plan therefore should recognise the unique identity, qualities and attributes of Jacks Point.
- 2.4 In my view there is a risk with the evolving character of Hanley Downs and due to changing objectives of land interest within the zone that the qualities and controls that make Jacks Point what it is could be lost or undermined. Therefore, in my opinion whatever the final form the zoning takes it needs to recognise the unique qualities of

Jacks Point and avoid this being watered down and/or mixed up in attempts to streamline the plan and have a 'one zone fits all' type approach, taking into account what is likely to be a very different character within Hanley Downs.

- 2.5 In particular I am mindful that a number of the proposed provisions have the potential to erode and/or open the door for development within the open space areas of the zone. In my opinion the open space areas are a critical component of Jacks Point that make it unique and therefore the provisions should recognise and provide for these areas of open space and their role and significance to the zone.

## **OSCR**

- 3.1 We oppose the rezoning of this land to provide for further development.
- 3.2 As noted above and articulated in the various documents (Operative District Plan, Coneburn Study, Stake Holder Deed etc) high levels of open space providing a setting for residential pods is integral to the identity and integrated nature of Jacks Point, this land plays an important role in this.
- 3.3 It appears the current landowner does not recognise the role this land plays within the master planned nature of Jacks Point. I note comments such as the area of land is 'large and underutilised' as being illustrative of taking a very narrow view of the importance and role the various areas of open space play in the integrated nature and qualities that make Jacks Point what it is.
- 3.4 When purchasing this land the owners would have been aware any potential development opportunities were very limited and that this land provides buffer open space and for recreational trails as part of the structure plan nature of the zone.
- 3.5 I acknowledge that within the evidence presented on behalf of the owners of this land changes to what could potentially be developed on the land have been promoted in their evidence. However, in my opinion this appears to continue a premise that the land should be developed because it is not of any 'value' to the landowner. In my view this is not representative of an objective planning analysis of the cost and benefits.
- 3.6 The values and importance of this land for residents, their outlook, amenity and the identity of the settlement do not appear to have been considered. I am also not clear from the evidence provided why the suggested landuse is the most appropriate when assessed against a range of alternatives.

## FP1/FP2

- 4.1 I would like to acknowledge the proposed amendments promoted in the memorandum provided by Anderson Lloyd dated 15 December 2016. In my opinion the concept of identifying home sites, adopting a similar approach to the existing Preserve area is a far better approach that provides greater certainty of what would be developed. If these discrete home sites can be located such that existing vegetation and topography can screen them from view in a similar manner as has been adopted in the preserve I do not consider this approach is contrary to the general principles of Jacks Point.
- 4.2 I understand the intention is to provide for additional trails to support the existing trail network within Jacks Point as part of this development. I consider additional trails through this land would be beneficial to residents.
- 4.3 In my opinion it will be important that the provisions ensure the trails are formed prior to any development occurring. These provisions will need to be replicated in both Chapter 41 and Chapter 27 (subdivision). A mechanism should be included allowing Council to have input into the alignment of the trails to ensure they are provided for in logical locations.

## CONCLUSION

- 5.1 I have assisted in preparing an amended set of provisions that look to further refine those presented as part of the s42A Report. These amendments in my opinion better reflect the values and issues I have discussed above and I would be happy to talk the Commissioners through the rationale and reasons for the suggested changes.
- 5.2 Since these provisions were compiled and having reviewed the document I consider further refinement of the provisions relating to the control over buildings in the OSL/OSA area is justified. In my opinion, the provisions should enable the management of the scale of farm and recreation buildings particularly recreation buildings. Any other buildings should be non-complying in recognition of the importance of these areas to the overall integrity of the zone.
- 5.3 I note these changes don't provide for FP1 & FP2 however as discussed above I believe there is merit in considering this concept on the basis of the Preserve type model.

Tim Williams

17 February 2017