

Before the Queenstown Lakes District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a submission under clause 6, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 on Stage 3B of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan

Between **Wayfare Group Limited (#31024)**

Submitter

Summary of Evidence Robert Schofield

22 June 2021

Applicant's solicitors:

Maree Baker-Galloway |

Anderson Lloyd

Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300

PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348

p + 64 3 450 0700

maree.baker-galloway@al.nz |

**anderson
lloyd.**

May it please the Panel

- 1 I provided expert planning evidence on behalf of the Wayfare Group in relation to its proposal to rezone an area of land owned at Walter Peak to Walter Peak Tourism Zone (WPTZ) under the Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan (PDP). My evidence was framed in the nature of a peer review of the proposed changes to the planning framework for Walter Peak, drawing on the planning evidence prepared by Ben Farrell, and based upon my involvement and knowledge of planning matters associated with Walter Peak, Wayfare Group, and the history and development of this land in the past, and including through the PDP process.
- 2 My evidence in chief provided an overview of the background and history of development and zoning at Walter Peak. At para 19, I noted that it was surprising such a significant policy change through the PDP was notified without consultation with Wayfare. I wish to formally amend that statement in my evidence to note that I understand some level of consultation did occur between Council and Wayfare, but that this was at a point in time after expert input had been sought, and as such, consultation was not 'open-minded', or as meaningful as it could have been.
- 3 The Walter Peak site has a wide range of opportunities for increasing its tourism potential in a manner that would protect the landscape and ecological values through a quality built development within the site. Much of the Walter Peak site area has the capacity to absorb further development in a manner that would protect the area's scenic values.
- 4 In my opinion, the proposed planning framework under the PDP is unnecessarily restrictive, with the blanket coverage of Walter Peak as a ONL unreasonably coarse. The proposed WPTZ has been framed with an intention to capitalise on, and enhance, the current high quality visitor experience offered by enabling a development management framework that seeks complement the natural heritage and high country character of the development while recognising the environmental constraints within the site.
- 5 I generally support the reasoning for, and intention of, a bespoke zoning for Walter Peak. In my opinion, the WPTZ being sought by Wayfare would provide a more effective and efficient planning regime for the site than the RVZ, given it more specifically recognises the cultural, tourism, historic and evolved uses / development of the site, and provides a finer-grained planning framework within which to assess future development proposals.

- 6 I have reviewed Mr Farrell's section 32 reasoning as set out in his evidence from paras [33] – [54]. I agree with his conclusions in respect of the need for a more bespoke zoning that would provide a more appropriate, effects-based and certain planning regime for the site to:
- (a) Provide greater certainty (and therefore efficiency) in terms of planning outcomes for the site;
 - (b) Provide a framework that manages tourism use and development while protecting values that contribute to the ONL being outstanding and has provision for cumulative effects; and
 - (c) Provides a planning regime for recognising the functional need in support of existing and future tourism activity at Walter Peak.
- 7 In particular, I agree with the proposed policy framework for Walter Peak, including:
- (a) Amendments to the purpose statement and key objectives and policies to address protection of certain ONL values;
 - (b) Better recognition of restoration and enhancement of conservation values; and
 - (c) Protection of predominantly open spaces and natural character landscapes (where those exist).
- 8 I note that Mr Farrell considers that there may be areas for further refinement of specific standards and rules pertaining to the management of future building and development under the proposed WPTZ (paragraph 57). I agree that any such further development could be of assistance to achieving the purpose of the WPTZ to provide a more enabling planning framework while protecting the wider values of the surrounding ONL.