

Before the Queenstown Lakes District
Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And The Queenstown Lakes District proposed District Plan Topic
14 Wakatipu Basin

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON FOR

Darby Planning LP (#2376)
Lake Hayes Ltd (#2377)
Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd (#2378)
Glencoe Station Ltd (#2379)
The Crown Investment Trust (#2307)

Dated 23 July 2018

Solicitors
Anderson Lloyd
M A Baker-Galloway | R E Hill
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
DX Box ZP95010 Queenstown
p + 64 3 450 0700 | f + 64 3 450 0799
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

SUMMARY EVIDENCE

- 1 Following preparation of my Evidence in Chief, I have reviewed the statements of rebuttal evidence prepared by Craig Barr, Marcus Langman and Bridget Gilbert.
- 2 At paragraph 63 of my Evidence in Chief I proposed the addition of three new policies within Chapter 6 relating to the management of landscape values within the Wakatipu Basin. I considered this important because of the way in which the Wakatipu Basin is being managed separately to the remainder s7 landscapes of the District. In error, I listed the new policies as being 3.3.34, 3.3.35 and 3.3.36, where they should have been referenced as Policies 6.3.34, 6.3.35 and 6.3.36, as alluded to within the preceding paragraph. Mr Barr takes a view such new policies are unnecessary and inappropriate because they are address through Chapter 24. I consider such policy additions as crucial to understand the overall framework for the management of landscapes and as a foundation to underpin the structure of Chapter 24.
- 3 The Councils position on the provisions relating to the retention of existing vegetation has not changed and no new evidence has been produced that advances matters. As a result, the opinions set out in my evidence and chief are unchanged.
- 4 Mr Barr accepts my suggestion for an additional policy recognising established residential building platforms and he suggests a new policy enabling residential activity within building platforms created prior to 23 November 2017. I do not understand why Mr Barr is suggesting that the policy is benchmarked to this date, given the regime proposed through the s42A report seeks to enable building within building platforms approved through resource consent and as registered on the relevant computer freehold register as a permitted activity. I prefer the wording of the policy suggested in my evidence in chief.
- 5 The rebuttal evidence for the Council reiterates its support for the rules within the Wakatipu Basin zone in relation to height and setbacks from roads. There are no new matters within this evidence to advance my understanding further and I remain of the view that a maximum building height of 8m and road boundary setbacks of 20m in the Lifestyle Precinct are more appropriate.
- 6 The rebuttal evidence for the Council by Mr Langman and Ms Gilbert remains opposed to the creation of a new sub-zone for Amisfield. Their concerns relate to the creation of a micro-level zoning for a specific activity and compatibility with amenity at the interface with rural activities. Ms Gilbert is also concerned that the effect of the 25% building coverage through a controlled activity rule, potentially enabling a large-scale increase to building mass, together with the potential for adverse landscape and amenity effects. Reflecting on the rebuttal evidence for the Council I agree that the rules could, without care, create a scale of building inappropriate for this area. Ms Gilbert considers it necessary to consider such activity through at least restricted discretionary activity status with a range of landscape focussed criteria drawing from the Stage 2 PDP provisions. Accordingly, I support amending my suggested Rule 24.4.30 to elevate status from controlled to restricted discretionary and add in two new matters of discretionary for effects on landscape values and compatibility with amenity at the interface with rural activities.
- 7 The evidence for the Council continues to support the Lifestyle Precinct over the land at 64 Fitzpatrick Road. There is no other evidence to respond to over this part of the zone.