

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

IN THE MATTER

of Queenstown Lakes Proposed District
Plan (Stage 1) Chapter 7: Low Density
Residential

Evidence of Matthew John Suddaby, Surveying Consultant, on behalf of Submitters:

33 Dan Fountain
448 Matt Suddaby, C. Hughes & Associates Ltd

**C. Hughes and Associates Limited
Surveying and Resource Management
Central Otago**

Tel: 03 443 5052
E-mail: wanaka@chasurveyors.co.nz
PO Box 599
Wanaka

Introduction

1. My name is Matthew Suddaby and I am a Surveying Consultant, based in Wanaka. I have over 20 years of experience in surveying and resource management since graduating from the University of Otago with a Bachelor of Surveying Degree.
2. I am a Director of C. Hughes & Associates Ltd. In addition to subdivision developments in the Queenstown Lakes District, I have been involved with resource management applications in the Central Otago, Westland and Mackenzie Districts.
3. I am a Registered Professional Surveyor, and am a member of the Consultants Division of the New Zealand Institute of Surveyors.
4. I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note and agree to comply with it. This evidence is within my area of expertise and I confirm I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed herein.

Scope of Evidence

5. I represent submissions made by my client, Mr Dan Fountain, and by myself in relation to the Low Density Residential (LDR) Chapter 7 of the Proposed District Plan (PDP).
6. We also have submissions relating to specific parcels of land, however understand that these will be heard after the submissions on the plan text are complete.
7. I have read Council's Section 42A report in relation to this current hearing.

Proposed LDR Rules - Density

8. I support the concept of 450m² density, (which appears very similar to the current District Plan provisions).
9. I also support Council's 'gentle density' approach. To me it makes sense that thoughtful, sympathetic development should be encouraged at a higher density than development which is not as rigorously assessed through the consent process. I appreciate the concept of allowing development at a 300m² density as a restricted Discretionary process. This gives a signal that appropriate residential development is likely to be acceptable providing the matters for discretion are managed.
10. I understand that it is appropriate for Council to have the ability to decline inappropriate 300m² applications, and so the Restricted Discretionary status

is fitting, however I would be very concerned if the majority of such cases became bogged down in long and complicated consent applications. It is vital that the matters for discretion are clear and do not create unnecessary uncertainty, which may dissuade developers from using these provisions.

Proposed LDR Rules - Building Height

11. I consider Rule 7.5.3 (restricting building height to 5.5m where density is less than 450m²) to be an excellent compromise, and an efficient method of maintaining the low density nature of the zoning. My concern is that it is likely to be very restrictive for building multiple units on sloping sites. With this in mind, I support the status change from Non Complying to Discretionary, and consider that this signals to applicants that additional height may be appropriate in some situations.

Zoning of LDR Land

12. I support the extensions of the LDR zone as proposed and consider that it is efficient use of the land identified within the Urban Growth Boundary.
13. In particular, the Meadowstone & Old Station Ave area has been progressively developed in line with current LDR standards via non-complying subdivision applications due to the Rural Lifestyle zoning.
14. Past subdivision applications have included land use consents to erect residential dwellings on each property. These have typically been long protracted applications with approval eventually obtained. This is an inefficient method of development, wasting valuable time and resources for Council and the landowners involved. It is vital that sufficient areas of land be zoned to reduce the likelihood of this reoccurring.
15. With growing demand from both tourists and the local population requiring accommodation in close proximity to both the lake and central Wanaka, opportunities to deliver a volume of housing solutions are very limited.
16. It is critical that land and infrastructure are used in an efficient and sustainable manner. Areas close to the urban centres and where urban quality water, wastewater and roading infrastructure are available should be prioritised for residential living.
17. We would welcome the opportunity to support our submissions relating to specific parcels of land once submissions on the plan text are complete.

Conclusion

18. I support the proposed rezoning of Low Density Residential land and consider that it is efficient use of land as identified within the Urban Growth Boundary.

19. I support the written provisions of the proposed LDR zone and consider they will provide effective and efficient density of built form. The density is appropriately balanced to provide for a high level of residential amenity.

M Suddaby
Dated: 13 October 2016