

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 4 –
Subdivison and Development

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF NICHOLAS KARL GEDDES
ON BEHALF OF**

Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd (Submitter 414)

Dated 13th July 2016

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1 My name is Nicholas Karl Geddes. I hold a degree of Bachelor of Science majoring in Geography and Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science from Otago University.
- 2 I have fifteen years' experience as a resource management practitioner, with past positions as a Planner in local Government in Auckland, private practice in Queenstown and contract work in London, England. I currently hold a planning consultant position with Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Limited.
- 3 I was employed by a Queenstown consultancy in 1999 before moving to Auckland City Council in 2001 where I held a senior planning position with Auckland City Environments. Leaving Auckland in 2005 I worked in London as a planner for two and a half years before returning to Queenstown where I have been practicing as a planning consultant since.
- 4 I have been a practicing consultant involved in a wide range of developments, district plan policy development and the preparation and presentation of expert evidence before Councils.
- 5 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court consolidated Practice Note (2014). I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 6 I previously prepared evidence in relation to Chapter 21 and 22 with reference to minimum allotment sizes in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as set out in submissions: Sim (235), Gallagher (223), Hutchinson (228) Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates (414) and NTM Family Trust (565).
- 7 Amendments to the minimum allotment sizes are also contained in the following submissions I have lodged on behalf of Strain A (231), Andrew (232), Moffat (239), Middleton (336 & 338), Greenslade (348), Gutzewitz (328), Jones (850), Strain S (351), The Station at Waitiri (331) and Wakatipu Holdings (314). These submissions relate to re-zoning of land.
- 8 The scope of this evidence relates to Chapter 27 as set out in submission 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates).
- 9 In the preparation of this evidence I have reviewed the following:
 - a. Section 32 Evaluation Report Subdivision and Development;
 - b. The relevant submissions and further submissions of other submitters; and
 - c. The Council s.42A Reports prepared in relation to Chapters 27 including the associated evidence prepared by Mr Ulrich Glasner and Mr Garth Falconer.

Abbreviations:

Proposed District Plan – “PDP”

Operative District Plan – “ODP”

Subdivision Code of Practice – “Code”

SECTION 42A REPORT

- 10 The section 42A report for Chapter 27 undertakes a number of fundamental changes to the provisions as notified. I would like to commend the reporting planner for being able to present these changes in a clear and logical manner within a well-structured report.

- 11 The revised provisions of Chapter 27 largely resolve issues raised in the original submission 414 (Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates).

SUBDIVISION CODE OF PRACTICE

- 12 Rule 14.2.4.1(iv) (Parking Area and Access Design) of the ODP reads:

“All vehicular access to fee simple title lots, cross lease, unit title or leased premises shall be in accordance with the standards contained in NZS4404:2004, and

All shared vehicular access serving residential and/or visitor accommodation units in High and Low Density Residential Zones shall be in accordance with the standards set out in NZS4404:2004 except for developments identified in the table below.”

- 13 This requires a standard of access which does not align with the standards specified in the Code adopted by Council in June 2015 and attached to the evidence of Mr Glasner.
- 14 Subdivision design is directed to accord with the standards of the Code from conception despite the Code’s influence on subdivision design being administered under a condition of consent. This is considered to place limitations on the intentions of PDP policies seeking to achieve outcomes such as good urban design and efficiencies in the subdivision process if these policies do not directly accord with the Code.

CONCLUSION

- 15 Since Part 14 of the ODP is not being reviewed it is suggested that the Code makes an exception for proposals which meet NZS4404:2004 (in accordance with Rule 14.2.4.1(iv) of the ODP) but do not meet the provisions contained in the Code.

Nick Geddes

PLANNER

BSc (Geog), GradDip EnvSci

13th July 2016