

**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 Stage 3b of the
Proposed District Plan

**REPLY EVIDENCE OF ROBERT BOND
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING — REZONINGS

RURAL VISITOR ZONE AND ARTHURS POINT

4 September 2020

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / R Mortiaux
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. ROBERT STEWART (31038) REZONING	1
3. MALAGHANS INVESTMENTS LTD (31022) – 1352 AND 1354 SKIPPERS ROAD REZONING	2
4. GIBBSTON VALLEY STATION (31037) REZONING	3

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Robert Bond. I have prepared three statements of evidence in chief¹ and a statement of rebuttal², filed in Hearing Streams 17 and 18. My qualifications and experience are set out in my First Statement of Evidence in Chief.

1.2 I attended the hearing on the 2 and 3 July 2020 and have been provided with reports of what has taken place at the hearing where relevant to my evidence.

1.3 This reply evidence covers the following issues:

- (a) Robert Stewart (**31038**) rezoning;
- (b) Malaghans Investments Ltd (**31022**) – 1352 and 1354 Skippers Road rezoning;
- (c) Gibbston Valley Station (**31037**) rezoning.

2. ROBERT STEWART (31038) REZONING

2.1 Since my appearance at the Hearing, I have been provided with further information relevant to the submitter's rezoning request. In particular, I have been provided with two resource consents, granting development on sites within close proximity to the submitter's site. Those consents contain limited information pertaining to natural hazard risk assessments relative to those sites. At the hearing, the submitter suggested that the granting of these consents by council represents an indication of the acceptability of the hazard risk at the submitter's site.

2.2 Having reviewed the information submitted with these consents (when applied for) in relation to the assessment of landslide risks, I am of the opinion that the level of risk assessment applied to landslide risk for these neighbouring sites is not of a standard or level of detail that I would expect to be applied for a rezoning decision.

1 Dated 18 March 2020.
2 Dated 12 June 2020.

2.3 As explained in my rebuttal evidence³, based on the AGS 2007 methodology⁴ a qualitative assessment of landslide risk posed to this site suggests that the likelihood of an event occurring, that could result in property damage, is at worst, C – Possible. The assessment of consequence to property in this instance is considered to be 3: Medium or 2: Major (Appendix C – Qualitative Terminology for use in assessing risk to property, AGS 2007). The resultant Risk Level of a possible event is therefore M-H or Moderate to High.

2.4 I also note the information presented in the provided consents for that require detailed investigations and specific engineering design and makes reference to localised groundwater conditions that would require specific investigation and design. I therefore maintain my position (as expressed in my rebuttal) that detailed site investigations would be required, prior to any rezoning, in order to determine the stability of the submitter’s site and its suitability for future development, as well as to confirm the preliminary assessment of risk.

3. MALAGHANS INVESTMENTS LTD (31022) – 1352 AND 1354 SKIPPERS ROAD REZONING

3.1 An additional report was filed by consultants GDM Ltd (on behalf of Malaghans Investments Ltd) on 24 July 2020 (post my appearance at the hearing). The report provides an assessment of landslide hazards at 1352 and 1354 Skippers Road.

3.2 I have reviewed the report and consider it to be a current and reasonable assessment of landslide risk at the subject site. The report includes a site walkover and description of the extents of landslide hazards present on and in close proximity to the site. GDM assesses the landslides as being historic. The report concludes that the lower terrace levels of the site are at low risk from landslides.

3.3 On the basis of the submitted report I have reviewed my position in terms of landslide risk and now consider the risk posed to the site to be low. I now do not oppose the requested rezoning of the site.

³ Paragraph 4.5.

⁴ Australian Geomechanics Society Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management.

4. GIBBSTON VALLEY STATION (31037) REZONING

4.1 The submitter has provided further information, post hearing, in relation to developable areas at the site. In particular, the submitter has provided landscape architecture plans which depict the location of proposed developable areas at the site.

4.2 Based on this information, I confirm that the developable areas, labelled 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Figure 2 of Ms Grace's second statement of rebuttal⁵ are sited within the low risk areas identified within my second statement of evidence in chief.



Robert Bond

4 September 2020

⁵ Dated 19 June 2020.