

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL FOR THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

IN THE MATTER OF THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN – PLAN CHANGE

19

EVIDENCE OF MATTHEW CURRAN FOR KEYROUZ HOLDINGS LIMITED

Summary Statement

1. Keyrouz Holdings Limited (KHL) sought in their submission on the Plan Change 19 that land to the southeast of the corner of Barry Avenue and State Highway 8B should be zoned 'Business Resource Area' in recognition of the commercial land use that has developed on the land over the life of the Operative Central Otago District Plan (Operative CODP) and its proximity to the existing Cromwell commercial hub.
2. Council's Section 42A officer Ms White appears to largely agree with matters raised in the KHL submission, recommending that the land in question is rezoned Business Resource Area as per the relief sought by KHL.
3. One minor matter of disagreement relates to effect of the designation on the land that adjoins KHL land, where I have given more weight to the importance of correctly zoning the designated land than Ms White.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERTISE

1. My full name is Matthew Peter Curran. I am employed as a Planner (Technical Lead – Energy, Infrastructure and Minerals) at Landpro Limited (Landpro), a firm of consulting planners and surveyors.
2. I hold the qualifications of a Bachelor of Science (Geography) and a Master of Planning, both of which I obtained from the University of Otago. I am an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI). I have 11 years' professional experience in planning and resource management.
3. I authored the Keyrouz Holdings Limited (KHL) submission on Plan Change 19 and have been engaged by KHL to provide independent planning services including the preparation of evidence on Plan Change 19.

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EXPERT WITNESSES

4. Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses within the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014 and I agree to comply with that Code. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. To the best of my knowledge I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

5. The scope of my evidence is limited to the application of Plan Chane 19 to land on the southeast corner of Barry Avenue and State Highway 8B (refer Figure 1 below), specifically my evidence covers:
- A summary of matters raised by KHL in their submission; and
 - An assessment of relevant matters in the Section 42A Report.



Figure 1: Parcels referred to in KHL submission and evidence.

Summary of Keyrouz Holdings Limited submission

1. The operative Central Otago District Plan (Operative CODP) zoning and Plan Change 19 proposed zoning of parcels 1, 2 and 3 identified in Figure 1, owned by KHL, is inappropriate.
2. The Plan Change 19 proposed zoning of parcel 4 identified in Figure 1, owned by the Central Otago District Council, is inappropriate.
3. Land identified in Figure 1, in particular land owned by KHL, has developed a commercial character over the life of the Operative CODP.
4. Retaining residential zoning on parcels 1, 2 and 3, and rezoning parcel 4 residential, would apply an inappropriate objective, policy and rule framework to future activities associated with the maintenance and development of existing assets.

Section 42A report

5. Council's Section 42A officer, Ms White, appears to largely agree with matters raised in the KHL submission, recommending that land identified in Figure 1 is rezoned 'Business Resource Area'.
6. My comments on the Section 42A report are limited to confirming agreement and addressing minor discrepancies in opinion between Ms White and I.
7. Ms White recommends that parcels 1, 2, 3 and 4 are rezoned for a number of reasons, primarily due to the sites existing commercial uses and proximity to Cromwell's established commercial hub. I agree with Ms White's justification for rezoning parcels 1, 2, 3, and 4.
8. The only matter on which I disagree with Ms white is where she suggests that given parcel 4 is designated, the underlying zoning is not particularly relevant.

The underlying zoning would apply to an activity proposed by CODC outside the designation purpose and all activities not proposed by CODC. Furthermore, the underlying zoning would apply to all activities on this land if the designation was surrendered. It is therefore my opinion that appropriately zoning parcel 4 is important.

Conclusion

9. I agree with Ms White's recommendation to maintain the existing zoning of Parcel 4 as 'Business Resource Area', and rezone parcels 1, 2 and 3 'Business Resource Area'.