

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL**

**FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Stages 3 of the Proposed District Plan

**EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF SCOTT SNEDDON EDGAR**

**ON BEHALF OF THE FOLLOWING SUBMITTER:**

**UPPER CLUTHA TRANSPORT LIMITED (SUBMITTER #3256 AND #3270)**

**11<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2020**



- 1 The submission of Upper Clutha Transport seeks the partial rezoning of a site at Church Road, Luggate from Rural to General Industrial Zone (GIZ). The relief sought would see approximately 8ha of the 14ha site rezoned GIZ with a Building Restriction Area covering the northern portion of the site and 20m setbacks along the Church Road and Clutha River boundaries. The remaining land within the proposed GIZ that could accommodate built development (i.e. outside of the BRA or setbacks) measures approximately 5ha.
- 2 The relief sought also includes amendments to the GIZ rules to provide for workers accommodation on the submission site and to limit built development to 25,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA in order that traffic effects can be appropriately managed.
- 3 There is some disagreement between Mr. Place and I regarding the appropriateness of the GIZ, the proposed staff accommodation and the 25,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA limit. However, while Mr. Place does not support the proposed GIZ he does, as I understand it, support in principle the application of the Rural Industrial Sub Zone to the site as an alternative zoning subject to the appropriate management of landscape and traffic effects.
- 4 I have been in discussions with Mr. Place regarding the amended provisions set out in my EIC. In addition, as directed by the panel, Mr. Place and Mr. Jones have revisited the site to consider visibility from the public walking and cycling track to the east. Following on from that site visit Mr. Espie and I have been in further discussions with Mr. Place and Mr. Jones. The matters discussed include the following:
  - Landscape treatment along the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the site and how/when the implementation of that landscape treatment will be triggered (e.g. approval and implementation of a landscape management plan prior to the construction of buildings);
  - Whether the setbacks from the Church Road and Clutha River would be more appropriate as BRAs;
  - Whether an increased setback/BRA is required along the Clutha River boundary of the site;
  - Whether the BRA over the landfill area is necessary (i.e. would this/should this restrict the parking of vehicles in this area);

- Whether a Structure Plan would be an appropriate means of managing the use and development of the site and associated landscape treatment and how would that fit into the PDP (i.e. Chapter 18, Chapter 21 or Chapter 27).
- 5 Given the limited time available between Mr. Place and Mr. Jones' site visit and this hearing we have not yet been able to resolve these matters and prepare an amended set of provisions however there appears to be general agreement that with further work provisions could be arrived at that would allow for the development and use of the site for industrial purposes while appropriately managing landscape effects.
- 6 In this regard I consider that the preparation of a relatively simple structure plan would be an appropriate means of addressing landscape matters and providing greater certainty and clarity as to how the zone is to be used and developed. Such a structure plan could include:
- The currently proposed setbacks as BRAs (including the provision of a setback BRA along the northern boundary of the site and, if necessary, an increased setback BRA along the eastern boundary); and
  - The use of Activity Areas to direct the use and development of the zone (e.g. AA1 covering the northern portion of the zone and limiting use to vehicle parking and AA2 covering the remainder of the zone and providing for built development).
- 7 I consider that such a structure plan, along with corresponding rules/rule amendments, would assist in providing greater certainty that the landscape effects of development within the zone will be appropriately managed and would assist in the drafting of rules relating specifically to the submission site (i.e. the structure plan rather than legal descriptions could be referenced).
- 8 Regarding the proposed use of the zone a point I wish to clarify relates to the intended use of the northern portion of the site that is covered by the currently proposed Building Restriction Area. It is envisaged by the submitter that the landfill area in this part of the site will be capped and will provide for truck parking. This is an important element of Upper Clutha Transport's operations as adequate flat ground is required to manoeuvre and park their fleet of up to 30 truck and trailer units (each unit being 23m long, 2.5m wide and 4.3m high).
- 9 I consider that the use of the site in this manner could be provided for through the structure plan and that amended provisions relating to the extent and timing of landscape treatment

within the setback BRAs can ensure that landscape effects of this use can be appropriately managed.

- 10 With regard to the provision for workers accommodation I consider that the matters of discretion set out in my proposed rules (18A.4.15a and 21.13.5 for the GIZ and RISZ respectively) provide Council with the ability to assess and control workers accommodation to ensure it has a genuine link to the activities being undertaken within the zone. If a limit on the extent of workers accommodation is deemed necessary the submitter has advised that accommodation for 8 to 10 staff would meet their needs however I consider that the inclusion of such a limit may unnecessarily complicate the provisions.
- 11 The proposed 25,000m<sup>2</sup> building coverage limit is intended to set a land use trigger beyond which the effects on the wider roading network resulting from development within the zone are assessed and managed. I consider this limit appropriate and not dissimilar to building coverage limits used elsewhere in the PDP albeit that it is expressed in m<sup>2</sup> rather than a percentage. I do not consider that the proposed limit is unreasonably restrictive or that it has the potential to compromise the viability or appropriateness of the zone.
- 12 Overall I consider that, subject to some further refinement of the provisions, the GIZ is an appropriate zone for the site. That being said I consider that similar outcomes could be achieved through the application of the RISZ as suggested by Mr. Place.



Scott Sneddon Edgar

11<sup>th</sup> August 2020