

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of the review of parts of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's District Plan under the First Schedule of the Act

AND

IN THE MATTER of submissions and further submissions by **REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED,**

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID FREDERICK SERJEANT ON BEHALF OF
REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

PLANNING

CHAPTER 17 – AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE

30 November 2016

**BROOKFIELDS
LAWYERS**

J D Young
Telephone No. 09 379 9350
Fax No. 09 379 3224
P O Box 240
DX CP24134
AUCKLAND

SUMMARY

1. This is a summary of my statement of evidence prepared for this topic on 18 November 2016.
2. The proposed Airport Mixed Use Zone (**AMUZ**) seeks to introduce a new zoning for the QAC land to enable airport and airport related activities. The proposed AMUZ broadens the list of permitted activities and extends the AMUZ over the entire airport land.
3. In particular, the proposed AMUZ seeks to reverse the approach taken in the existing AMUZ, and neighbouring zones, of prohibiting Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (**ASANs**), in particular visitor accommodation, within the Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**).
4. The Otago Proposed RPS includes a policy that urban development is integrated with adjoining urban and rural environments. This policy is consistent with best planning practice. The proposed AMUZ has not had regard to this policy, and contains provisions that are specific to the airport land for many activities that are already provided for on neighbouring land, with operative provisions. For example, freight facilities, land transport activities, industry and service activities, ancillary retail and offices can all take place within Activity Area D (**AAD**) of the Frankton Flats Special Zone (B) (**FFSZ(B)**).
5. The proposed AMUZ contains a policy supposedly seeking self-sufficiency within the airport for its supporting and complementary activities. Such a policy fails to acknowledge the already wide-spread nature of the visitor economy within Frankton and wider Queenstown.
6. While the proposed AMUZ will extend the zone over an additional 100 ha of land, much of this is taken up by airport runway and terminal apron areas. The nature, extent and location of potential development, and the manner in which it will integrate with the wider environment is unclear.
7. The Council's section 32 evaluation compares the status quo with an extended AMUZ. It is agreed that the status quo (Rural zone) is inadequate. However, it does provide certainty as to airport activity, with airport related activity to be provided within the existing, more limited AMUZ. The Council should have considered existing neighbouring zones within FFSZ(B) and Remarkables Park Zone, in terms of both the activities provided for therein, and the development controls pertaining to these zones.

8. In relation to urban design, while acknowledging the non-regulatory proposal for an urban design guide for the airport, there are no objectives for what is to be achieved for the wider environment, and the development controls are minimalist. In keeping with the neighbouring zones, I consider all new buildings should require a consent.
9. In relation to traffic, the proposed AMUZ has a number of disparate interfaces with the wider transport network around the airport. In keeping with the neighbouring zones, I consider all new development (beyond the terminal environs) should have parking requirements and more significant trip generators should require a consent.
10. In relation to the nature, extent and location of potential development, I consider that in addition to visitor accommodation noted above, the location of retail and commercial activities beyond the immediate environs of the airport terminal is inappropriate.
11. In relation to the potential to make visitor accommodation more appropriate within the AMUZ, through either a maximum length of stay or elimination of outdoor enjoyment areas, as suggested by Mr Kyle, I consider that such restrictions are either impracticable in resource management terms or fail to deliver on appropriate standards of amenity for visitors. I also note the inconsistency between Mr Kyle, Mr Day and Ms Tregidga as to the maximum stay in this regard. In any event, even a very short stay maximum is not justifiable in resource management terms.
12. I consider that a more rigorous approach to development control will achieve the objective of a "memorable and attractive gateway to the District".

QPL
SECRET