

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –
Queenstown Mapping Changes – Hearing
Stream T13.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE - SEAN DENT ON BEHALF OF MOUNT CRYSTAL
LIMITED (#150)**

Dated: 22nd August 2017

SOUTHERN PLANNING GROUP

Resource Management Consultants

PO Box 1081

QUEENSTOWN

Phone: (03) 409 0140

Fax: (03) 409 0145



INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Sean Dent. I am a resource management planning consultant and Director of Southern Planning Group and I am here today presenting expert planning evidence on behalf of Mount Crystal Limited ("MCL").
- 1.2. My brief of evidence dated 9th June 2017 supported the re-zoning of the subject site from LDRZ to HDRZ and was supported by infrastructure and servicing evidence provided by Mr McCartney.
- 1.3. Since MCL's expert evidence was submitted the submitter has considered the Council's position as outlined in the briefs of evidence in chief and rebuttal evidence filed by Ms Devlin, Ms Banks, Mr Glasner and Mr Watts. The ultimate position of MCL following this consideration is that they accept the recommendations of the Council's experts¹²³⁴ to re-zone the entire site to MDRZ.
- 1.4. While I originally provided evidence that supported re-zoning of the site to HDRZ I am of the opinion that a re-zoning outcome that results in the entire site becoming part of the MDRZ is an efficient and effective planning solution.
- 1.5. Specifically, I have relied on the expert evidence of Mr Glasner and Mr McCartney which confirms there are no insurmountable issues with respect to infrastructure servicing of the subject site if developed at a MDRZ density.
- 1.6. Similarly, I have relied on the evidence of Ms Banks that the transportation effects of developing the site to MDRZ density are "insignificant" (and note that NZTA will also become involved in any change in use, or increase in scale, nature and intensity of the existing vehicle crossing). Further, this will remain a matter of Council's discretion pursuant to MDRZ Rule 8.4.11.2 for the establishment of four or more Residential Units on the subject site.
- 1.7. In addition, the geotechnical experts for the Council (Mr Watts) and MCL (Georgia Scott) agree that the site is suitable for development at a MDRZ density subject to more detailed geotechnical assessment. This too remains a matter of Council's discretion pursuant to

¹ *Rebuttal Evidence of Ms Devlin dated 7th July 2017, paragraph 4.11 page 7*

² *Evidence of Ms Banks dated 25th May 2017, paragraph 8.15, page 62*

³ *Rebuttal Evidence of Mr Glasner dated 7th July 2017, paragraph 5.14, page 11*

⁴ *Rebuttal Evidence of Mr Watts dated 11 July 2017, paragraph 4.4, page 4*

MDRZ Rule 8.4.11.2 for the establishment of four or more residential units on the subject site.

- 1.8. Ms Devlin for the Council has considered all of the evidence from the abovementioned experts and concluded that applying the MDRZ to the subject site would be an appropriate outcome.
- 1.9. The opinions I provided in paragraphs 55 to 64 of my EIC regarding the PDP's approach to maintaining a LDRZ characteristic on a site surrounded by existing medium and high density unit development remain valid. Rezoning the site to MDRZ will therefore not be inconsistent with the development characteristics of the wider area despite the moderate potential increase in residential density.
- 1.10. My opinion is that accepting and applying the MDRZ to the subject site as opposed to HDRZ still accords with the Strategic Direction of the PDP to facilitate higher density living near public transport routes⁵⁶, efficient and sustainable use of infrastructure servicing⁷⁸ and providing for mixed densities of housing in existing and new urban communities⁹. The MDRZ will also maintain a high quality built environment in accordance with Goal 3.2.3 and Objective 3.2.3.1 by requiring thorough assessment of the urban design of multi-unit developments through MDRZ Rule 8.4.11.2 and the guiding Objectives and Policies of the MDRZ¹⁰.
- 1.11. In regards to the opposition of any 'up-zoning' of the site by QAC (Submitter 433 and FS 1340) I maintain the opinions outlined in paragraphs 101 to 109 of my EIC and agree with the Council's legal submissions presented by Ms Scott at paragraphs 12.3 to 12.5.
- 1.12. In regards to the assertion by Ms Wolt for QAC that the QAC submission is not disenabling because the land has never been available for development at the density sought by the submitter¹¹, I note that the site is capable of being developed as a Comprehensive Residential Development under the ODP (as a Discretionary Activity) with density allowable down to 1 unit per 200m² of net area. No similar Rule is afforded in the PDP's LDRZ and

⁵ Chapter 3 Strategic Directions, Policy 3.2.2.1.4 and Chapter 8 Medium Density Residential Objective 8.2.1 and Policy 8.2.1.1

⁶ Chapter 4 Urban Development, Objective 4.2.1 and Policy 4.2.1.3

⁷ Chapter 3 Strategic Directions, Goal 3.2.2, Objective 3.2.2.1 and Policy 3.2.2.1.3

⁸ Chapter 4 Urban Development, Objective 4.2.3 and Policy 4.2.3.1

⁹ Chapter 3 Strategic Directions, Objective 3.2.6.2 and 3.2.6.2.1

¹⁰ Chapter 8 Medium Residential Zone, Objective 8.2.2 and associated Policies and Objective 8.2.4 and Policies 8.2.4.1 and 8.2.4.2

¹¹ Legal Submissions of Ms Wolt on behalf of QAC dated 14th August 2017, paragraph 37, page 5

therefore a MDRZ maintains a similar development potential which exists under the ODP. As such, the QAC submission against the subject site is in my opinion, disenabling. I also note that other CRD's I have been involved in within the vicinity of the subject¹² site have not required QAC written approval due to 'more intensive urban development'.

- 1.13. In summary, re-zoning of the site to MDRZ is not inconsistent with the existing residential character and amenity of the land either side of the MCL site. The site can be appropriately serviced and the matters of transportation and natural hazards are acceptable and Council will retain discretion over such factors in future development of the subject site.
- 1.14. The MDRZ will accord with the higher order provisions of the PDP's Strategic Directions and Urban Development chapters, higher order statutory documents and the purpose and principles of the RMA.



Sean Dent

22nd August 2017

¹² Resource Consent RM160394 – Antrim Developments Limited, 12 Residential Unit CRD at St Georges Ave, St Andrews Park, Queenstown.