

### **SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE BY BEN FARRELL**

#### **Recommended amendments**

1. I support the relief being sought as set out in the Legal submission by Mr Gardner-Hopkins tabled today (5<sup>th</sup> August 2020).

#### **New information / updated relief sought by MIL**

2. Since preparing my evidence in June I have had the opportunity to review the additional material provided by the submitter on this matter, including the Legal submission by Mr Gardner-Hopkins (27 July 2020); Lay evidence by Mr Brett Giddens; Natural Hazard Assessment by Mr Grant Meldrum; and the Transportation Assessment by Mr Jason Bartlett.
3. I have also had the opportunity to liaise with Mr Gardner-Hopkins and Mr Giddens since they presented to you last Thursday. MIL has since amended the relief it is seeking, which is now reflected in the documented tabled by Mr Gardner-Hopkins today.

#### **Natural Hazards**

4. The natural hazard evidence is now conclusive that "*there are no natural hazard concerns provided that issues of runoff and earthworks are given consideration at the time of that development*". I note "run off and earthworks" are managed under Chapter 25 (Earthworks), so there is no reason for natural hazards to be specified as a matter of control or discretion.

#### **Access/Transport**

5. Based on my experience living in Queenstown and working as a planner on various commercial activities, coupled with my familiarity with the remote location of Skippers, I consider it is entirely realistic to anticipate that most visitors to the Skippers RVZ would rely primarily on commercial / chartered transport options, including air travel.

#### **Residential activity**

6. While I maintain my opinion (set out in my June evidence) that it is appropriate for residential activity to be permitted throughout RVZs, MIL has amended its relief to pursue a stringent permitted residential activity standard within a visitor accommodation unit (up to 180 days). I am not aware of any direction in any higher order policy document that seeks to avoid residential activity in rural (including rural visitor) zones. I have assumed that Policy 46.2.1.7 is subject to challenge and can be deleted or amended in response to submissions or evidence on this matter.
7. If Policy 46.2.1.7 is to be retained, then I consider it would be appropriate to amend Policy 46.2.1.7 to list/prescribe the circumstances where residential activity is provided for, including the amendment now sought by MIL.

Ben Farrell  
5 August 2020