

15 September 2017

The Planning Policy Manager
Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag
QUEENSTOWN

Attention: Ian Bayliss

Dear Sir

SCOPE RESOURCES LIMITED - THE OASIS - RM070294 (Our Ref: 291599-14)

BACKGROUND

1. By decision dated 3 December 2008, the council granted the above-mentioned subdivision and land use consents to construct 20 residential units within the Stoney Creek Quarry, State Highway 6, Queenstown.
2. The site was, and still is, owned by Scope Resources Limited ("Scope").
3. The land use consent was granted for a duration of 10 years,¹ and will lapse on or before 2 December 2018, unless given effect, or an application is made under s125 to extend the duration of the consent.
4. The subdivision consent was granted for the standard period specified in the Act, that is, five years. No s223 certificate has been issued in respect of the subdivision consent therefore, this consent has lapsed.

ZONING - CONEBURN INDUSTRIAL

5. As you are aware, Scope, together with some adjoining owners has sought to rezone its land at Storey Creek Quarry and adjoining lands for industrial purposes in a submission to the District Plan review.
6. Hearings have now been completed, and during Panel directed caucusing, the Council's consultant planner, Mr Buxton has sought some "comfort" regarding the land use consent RM070294 not being exercised in consideration of the submission being accepted by the Council, and thereafter being confirmed (in the event of any appeal).
7. On behalf of Scope, the writer is authorised to offer the following undertaking:

¹ Condition 21.

Scope shall not take steps to implement the land use consent granted under RM070294 pending the decision of the Queenstown Lakes District Council on submission #361 and the resolution of any appeals arising therefrom. For the avoidance of doubt, Scope shall not be in breach of this undertaking in the event it seeks to extend the duration of the land-use consent pursuant to s125 of the Resource Management Act 1991, pending the resolution of any appeals. Scope shall surrender the land-use consent (in the event it has not expired) upon the Council issuing its decision confirming the Coneburn Industrial Zone, or in the event of an appeal(s), the zoning being confirmed on appeal.

Scope will take such measures as are required to bind any successor in title to the undertaking set out above in the event it enters into an agreement to sell the land.

8. We trust this undertaking provides the level of comfort sought by Mr Buxton.

Yours faithfully

MACALISTER TODD PHILLIPS


J E Macdonald
Partner

E-Mail: jmacdonald@mactodd.co.nz
Mobile: 027 473 0874
Direct Dial: 03 441 0127

cc: The Hearings Panel
Hearing Stream 13
Queenstown Mapping

cc: Robert Buxton
Consultation Planner
robert@buxtonwalker.co.nz

15 September 2017

The Planning Policy Manager
Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072
Queenstown, 9348

Attention: Ian Bayliss

Dear Sir,

Proposed Coneburn Industrial Zone, Kingston Road (SH6)

Proposed Planning Provisions

The purpose of this letter is to provide a traffic engineering review of the proposed planning provisions following expert conferencing. In particular to identify any potential effects on the traffic modelling previously undertaken.

1 Background

I have been provided with a revised set of planning provisions for the Coneburn Industrial Zone dated 15 September 2017 following expert conferencing.

2 Planning Provisions

2.1 Section 18 - Coneburn Industrial Zone

There have been a number of changes to these provisions although these changes do not change the types of on-site development expected. It is my opinion that these changes do not change the anticipated traffic generation or likely traffic distribution from the site.

2.2 Section 27 – Subdivision and Development

The fundamental changes in the subdivision section are that there is now a minimum lot size of 1000m² in Activity Area 2a (previously no minimum). Lot size is linked to vehicle type, the larger the lot sizes the larger the vehicle types with the on-site activity. However, the revision is unlikely to change the overall vehicle composition anticipated for the overall zone. It is my opinion that this change will not have a noticeable effect on the vehicle composition anticipated and will not affect the modelling undertaken for the overall zone.

The provisions relating to access from SH6 have been revised. This revision now identifies a possible staging with the northern access initially and second (southern) access being provided at the time 25% of the land area is developed. In my opinion this change will not affect the overall anticipated traffic generation, distribution or modelling and still provides a trigger at 25% of development.

3 Summary

I have reviewed the proposed planning provisions for the Coneburn Industrial Zone following expert conferencing. In my opinion the changes will not affect the traffic assumptions regarding traffic generation or distribution. It is possible that the proposed minimum lot size could affect vehicle composition, however I do not expect that these changes will be noticeable given the overall zone size.

It is my opinion that the revisions, to Sections 18 & 27 of the Proposed District Plan, will not affect the modelling undertaken or the outcomes of that modelling described in my traffic evidence of the 12th September 2017.

Should you require any further information please contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Jason Bartlett

CEng MICE, G.IPENZ
Traffic Engineer