

Under

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

In the matter of

Plan Change 29 to the Mackenzie District Plan

In relation to

The submission of Tekapo Springs Ltd

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MARK WILLIAM GEDDES

27 May 2025

perspective
PLANNING | DEVELOPMENT | ENVIRONMENT

Contact details:

Perspective Consulting Ltd

mark@perspective.net.nz

027 948 6575

INTRODUCTION

1. Kia koutou.
2. My name is Mark Geddes, and I am a planner from Perspective Consulting Ltd and I am here today to address my evidence in relation the Tekapo Springs submission on Plan Change 29 to the MDP.
3. Accompanying me today is Ms. Naomi Crawford, who is a landscape architect from Glasson Huxtable.

SCOPE OF COMMENTS

4. My intention today is comment on the remaining matters in contention. However, firstly I will just briefly introduce the submitter and the submission.

THE SUBMITTER

4. Tekapo Springs is located on Lakeside Drive, Lake Tekapo. It is an internationally renowned, multi-attraction business offering relaxation and outdoor adventure. It features hot pools, a day spa, sauna facilities, an ice-skating rink and snow tubing etc.

SUBMISSION

5. The submission sought changes to PC29 to enable the ongoing operation, development and expansion of these activities. As such it sought the expansion of the SARZ into the land adjoining the site to the east and west, and a specific control area over this land specific to Tekapo Springs.

REMAINING MATTERS IN CONTENTION

6. The main matter still in contention is the extent of the SARZ to the east of the site. The officers have recommended only part of this land (indicated in Figure B in the second last page of the officers' addendum report), is rezoned SARZ, and the eastern remaindering part of this area is left as OSZ.

Land to the east

7. The concern from the reporting officers is that the eastern most part of this land is visually sensitive and that the design controls in the SARZ and the Tekapo Precinct are insufficient to mitigate the potential adverse effects of built form. Accordingly, they recommend this land is zoned Open Space Zone, as that zone has a low building coverage standard, which will mitigate potential landscape effects of new development.
8. However, with a building coverage standard of 5% or 100m² (whichever is lesser) the Open Space Zone anticipates limited facilities and structures. While resource consent could be sought to contravene the building coverage standard, would be difficult to consent.
9. To address the officers concerns, the submitter has advised me that they would be happy to accept some more onerous standards requiring:
 - a. A maximum building height of 5.5m (down from 7.5m) (15% of the height of the pine trees)
 - b. A building coverage of 30%.
 - c. A landscaping plan that would require 20% of the site to be landscaped.
10. These new standards will combine with the standards of the Tekapo Precinct that provide restrictive standards in relation to:
 - a. Building wall length
 - b. Roof design
 - c. Materials
 - d. Colours and light reflectivity
11. Ms Crawford's evidence is that these collective standards will maintain the landscape character and visual amenity values of this area. I agree and my evidence is that these collective standards are appropriate considering that:
 - a. This land is not classified as an ONL and is largely outside the 25m natural character setback.
 - b. In reality, the steep topography and nature narrow of this land will significantly limit its development potential and subsequently its adverse effects.

12. My evidence confirms that the extension of the SARZ zone into this area is supported by the Strategic objectives of the MDP and chapter 5 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement both of which prioritise consolidation and growth attached to existing urban areas. Allowing Tekapo Springs to expand would also have economic benefits.
13. As such, I recommend the SARZ is extended over all this land to the east. I also recommend the revised standards offered by the submitter are adopted as site specific standards.
14. Out of an abundance of caution, and only if the Hearings Panel are not minded to grant the relief sought, the submitter offers a restricted discretionary activity status for new buildings in this area, so long as it is zoned SARZ. This will allow a merits-based assessment of any specific buildings proposed.

Land to the West

15. I acknowledge the reporting planner has recommended the rezoning of the land to the west of the site indicated as 'A' in the submission. However, our client has indicated that the boundaries of this land as identified in the submission were somewhat arbitrary. Accordingly, we can submit a revised plan based on a topographical map that more accurately identifies the area to be rezoned.

CLOSING

15. I am happy to answer any questions.

Appendix 1 – Boundary of the SARZ the West of the site indicated with a red dotted line

