

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS COMMISSIONERS
APPOINTED BY THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of submissions on a Variation to a Proposed District Plan under schedule 1 of the Act

BY **WILLOWRIDGE DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

AND **UNIVERSAL DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

AND **METLIFECARE LIMITED**

Submitters

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TIM WILLIAMS

Dated: 6 March 2024

Solicitor acting
R Hill / B B Gresson
PO Box 124 Queenstown 9348
P: 03 441 2743
graeme@toddandwalker.com
ben@toddandwalker.com

Counsel instructed
B J Matheson
Richmond Chambers
33 Shortland Street
Auckland 1140
matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

Introduction

- [1] My name is Timothy Turley Williams. My qualifications and experience are set out in my evidence in chief, dated 21 December 2023.

Code of conduct for expert witnesses

- [2] I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Summary of Evidence

- [3] My evidence concludes that, as proposed, the IHV is not an appropriate method to address the issue of housing and housing affordability in the context of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (**NPS-UD**) and when considered under s32 of the Act.
- [4] In terms of s32 the proposed IHV is not effective or efficient in addressing the Resource Management Issue identified by Council given it will discourage supply, reduce competitiveness and increase prices.
- [5] The NPS-UD is the relevant higher order policy statement 'on the issue' The proposed IHV will not align with or give effect to the NPS-UD given that it has the risk of causing the opposite outcome, reducing supply and the competitiveness of the housing market.
- [6] My evidence identifies a third 'Option 3' that is considered more efficient and effective at addressing the Resource Management Issue and aligns with the NPS-UD. This option includes implementing the UIV, accelerating funding and focus on infrastructure, a streamlined consent process and amending activity status rules.

IHV Provisions

[7] I have reviewed the rebuttal evidence of Ms Bowbyes and Mr Mead and note Mr Mead has suggested several further adjustments to the proposed plan provisions. However, I remain of the view the clauses relating to exemptions should not include an assessment against the objectives and policies and therefore continue to consider the following amendments are appropriate:

Policies

40.2.1.4 Recognise that the following forms of residential development either provide affordable housing or do not generate pressure on housing resources and should not be subject to the affordable housing contribution:

d) A residential lot or unit located in a Zone that already contains affordable housing provisions in the district plan, or is subject to where previous agreements providing for the delivery of affordable housing. and affordable housing delivery with Council have satisfied objective ~~3.2.1.10 and 40.2.1~~ and their associated policies

40.6.1 3. Exemptions:

(d) a residential lot or residential unit located in a Zone that already contains affordable housing provisions in the district plan or is subject to where previous agreements providing for the delivery of affordable housing. and affordable housing delivery with Council have satisfied objective ~~3.2.1.10 and 40.2.1~~ and their associated policies

Timothy Turley Williams

6 March 2024