

Before Queenstown Lakes District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And The Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan Topic
13 Queenstown Mapping – Group 1C (Queenstown Urban
(Central, West, and Arthurs Point))

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CAREY VIVIAN FOR

Gertrude's Saddlery Limited (494)

Larchmont Developments Limited (527) and (1281)

Dated 9 August 2017

Solicitor:
Rosie Hill
Anderson Lloyd
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
DX Box ZP95010 Queenstown
p + 64 3 450 0700 | f + 64 3 450 0799
rosie.hill@al.nz

Counsel:
Warwick Goldsmith
Barrister
PO Box 213, Queenstown 9365
m + 64 021 220 8824
warwickgoldsmith@gmail.com

SUMMARY EVIDENCE

- 1 My name is Carey Vivian.
- 2 My Evidence in Chief (**EIC**) dated 9 June 2017 outlines my experience and qualifications relevant to this evidence in respect of the Queenstown Mapping Hearings of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).

Boundary Adjustment Subdivision

- 3 At paragraph 2.5 of my EIC I detail a proposed boundary adjustment application designed to facilitate improved access to the site along Atley Road. I confirm that boundary adjustment was made, and a decision has been issued (RM170551) approving the boundary adjustment plan as shown in my EIC.

Council's Rebuttal Evidence

- 4 Ms. Devlin's recommended in her EIC that the proposed LDRZ sought by both the Swan and Larchmont submissions be rejected in their entirety. Ms. Devlin has now circulated rebuttal evidence where she states that many of her concerns have been addressed through the evidence provided by the Submitters. However, Ms. Devlin does not support LDRZ over the entire site, her primary concerns being adverse transport and landscape effects.
- 5 I note Ms. Devlin states that Mr. Glasner no longer opposes the requested LDRZ from an infrastructural point of view. Ms. Devlin also does not raise any issue with the suitability of the property for LDRZ from a geotechnical point of view.
- 6 As a result of this Ms. Devlin recommends LDRZ over part of the site as identified by Dr. Read and not opposed by Ms. Banks.

Landscape Issues

- 8 There is agreement between Dr. Read and Mr. Espie as to the boundary of Shotover Gorge ONF¹. I confirm the proposed LDRZ does not intrude into, or impinge upon, the agreed Shotover Gorge ONF.
- 9 There is disagreement between Dr. Read and Mr. Espie as to the landscape classification of the land between the Shotover Gorge ONF and the recommended LDRZ boundary. Mr. Espie's view that this land is physically separated and isolated from the broader ONL and the landscape character is not akin to that of the broader ONL. Mr. Espie sees this strip of land as a remnant area of RGZ (or RZ) that is separated from the broader landscape.

¹ As demarcated by the green line on Appendices 1 and 2 of Mr. Espie's EIC.

- 10 In **Attachment CV3** to my EIC I evaluate the proposed LDRZ against the relevant landscape objectives and policies contained in Chapter 3 Strategic Direction², Chapter 4 Urban Development³ and Chapter 6 Landscape⁴ of the PDP. I agree with Mr. Espie where he concludes that even if this strip of land is found to be part of a broader ONL, it must be considered to be a particularly modified part of that ONL and one that does not particularly contribute to the overall broader ONL characteristics⁵. Because of this, a finding that this small area of land is part of the wider ONL does not change my overall evaluation and conclusion in respect of the relevant landscape objectives and policies⁶. In my opinion, the requested LDRZ over the site is the most appropriate zoning outcome.

Traffic Issues

- 11 Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Carr have both considered the main off-site traffic effects of concern to Ms. Banks. These include:
- (a) The traffic effects of the one lane Edith Cavell Bridge (ECB);
 - (b) Traffic effects at the intersection of Arthurs Point Road with Atley Road;
 - (c) Traffic effects at the intersection of Atley Road with Mathias Terrace.
- 12 With respect to the ECB, Mr. Carr supports Mr. Bartlett's conclusion that the ECB is operating beyond its capacity, finding that the need for an upgrade is not dependent on, or triggered by, and development of the submitters land.
- 14 I do not consider it is 'bad planning' to zone for development ahead of such infrastructure improvements being made, especially where they are anticipated in the near future. By way of example, Kelvin Peninsula (Mee land), Jacks Point, Henley Downs and Homestead Bay were all zoned for urban expansion well ahead of any plans to replace the Kowarau Falls bridge. That zoning undoubtedly contributed to the need to construct the new Kowarau Falls Bridge ahead of what was originally planned.

² Objective 3.2.2.1; Objective 3.2.5.1, Policy 3.2.5.1.1; Objective 3.2.5.3, Policy 3.2.3.1.

³ Objective 4.2.1.

⁴ Objective 6.3.1, Policies 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.5 and 6.3.1.7 – 9, 6.3.1.1.11 and 12; Objective 6.3.2, Policy 6.3.2.2; Objective 6.3.4, Policies 6.3.4.1.1 to 4; Objective 6.3.5, Policies 6.3.5.1 to 6.

⁵ Which are described in Mr. Espie's EIC in paragraphs 5.12 and 5.14.

⁶ In particular Policy 6.3.2.2 which seeks to allow subdivision and development in locations where the District's landscape character and visual amenity would not be degraded and Policy 6.3.4.1 which seeks to avoid subdivision and development that would degrade important qualities of landscape character and amenity, particularly where there is little or no capacity to absorb change.

- 15 I also consider it is important to note in this instance there is an alternative access direction through the Wakatipu Basin to the local shopping centres and commercial activities at Frankton that does not require crossing the ECB.
- 16 With respect to traffic effects at the intersections of Atley Road and Arthurs Point Road / Mathias Terrace, neither Mr. Bartlett nor Mr. Carr has raised concerns regarding the efficient operation of those intersections as a result of the proposed rezoning. I rely on their expert opinions.
- 20 Overall, Mr. Bartlett's evidence concludes that development anticipated by the requested LDRZ can be accommodated within the local road network. Mr. Carr's peer review concurs with Mr. Bartlett's views that the proposed access road will be suitable to serve the extent of development contemplated in the submitters sites. I rely on their expert opinions.

Conclusion

- 21 For the reasons set out in this summary I do not resile from the conclusions set out in Part 9 my EIC.