

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL
APPOINTED BY QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER THE Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of a Variation to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan
(Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile) in accordance with Part 5 of Schedule 1
to the Resource Management Act 1991

**MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL ON BEHALF OF THE ANNA HUTCHINSON FAMILY TRUST
PROVIDING FURTHER INFORMATION AND RESPONSES TO PANEL QUESTIONS**

DATED: 18 DECEMBER 2023

Counsel acting:
JAMES WINCHESTER
BARRISTER
P 06 883 0080
M 021 303 700
Joll Commons
Level 1, 17 Joll Road
PO Box 8161, Havelock North 4130
jameswinchester.co.nz

MAY IT PLEASE THE HEARING PANEL

- 1.** This memorandum seeks to provide a consolidated response to the requests for further information and questions from the Hearing Panel (**Panel**) regarding the evidence and legal submissions presented on behalf of the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (**Trust**).
- 2.** While it is noted that the Trust has advanced a substantial case with high-quality evidence that the Panel can continue to place significant reliance upon, I reiterate the offer made at the conclusion of the Trust's case for the Panel to seek any further clarification or assistance it might need from the Trust's counsel and witnesses prior to the formal closure of the hearing.
- 3.** The Trust acknowledges the difficulty of the task facing the Panel in a Streamlined Plan Process (particularly around timing considerations). Notwithstanding that, it would no doubt have assisted both the Panel and the Trust had there been clearer "run" to enable more flexibility for the Panel in dealing with witnesses, and enable it and the Trust to more fully explore and explain a range of important issues without interruption.
- 4.** It is hoped that the timetable issues have not prejudiced the Trust's ability to fully advance its relief and adequately answer any questions that the Panel might have, understanding of course that the quality and nature of the case presented for the Council has left a range of matters unresolved which it will at least have the opportunity (and, in my submission, duty) to address objectively and fairly.
- 5.** Based on counsel's records, the Panel has asked for further information and/or responses to questions from the following members of the Trust's team:

 - (a) legal counsel;
 - (b) Mr Ladbrook¹;
 - (c) Mr Bartlett and Mr McKenzie;
 - (d) Mr Church; and
 - (e) Mr Murray.

¹ Via e-mail dated 14 December 2023

6. For the purposes of this response, I have gathered the information and responses directly from the relevant experts, and have recorded them verbatim in this memorandum (including appendices).

Questions of legal counsel

7. Commissioner Munro asked questions regarding paragraph 49(e) of counsel's opening legal submissions regarding the references to and relevance of the Otago Regional Public Transport Plan (**ORPTP**). The first issue, about which there was no dispute, was whether the ORPTP was a regional land transport plan. For the sake of clarity, the ORPTP is not a regional land transport plan as defined under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (**LTMA**). They are subject to their own legal requirements, with the relevant definitions in the LTMA as follows:

regional land transport plan means a regional land transport plan prepared under Part 2, as from time to time amended or varied

regional public transport plan means a regional public transport plan adopted under section 119, as from time to time varied or renewed

8. They are however closely related documents, for the reasons set out below. This is relevant to considering the question as to whether a dedicated bus lane was a service, and whether planning for a bus lane also covered planning for the necessary vehicles.
9. It is submitted that a bus lane is not, of itself, a service. But it is clear from the language of the LTMA and the ORPTP itself that there is a strong and integrated approach between the planning for services and the associated infrastructural investments. In addition, there is a strong relationship between the ORPTP and the regional land transport plan. In short, consistent with the evidence given by transportation experts such as Mr Parlane and Mr McKenzie, investments in enhanced services and associated infrastructure investments generally go hand-in-hand.

10. The reasons for this position are clear in the statutory language of the LTMA. For example, the purpose of a regional public transport plan is set out in section 117 of the LTMA as follows²:

The purpose of a regional public transport plan is to provide—

- (a) a means for encouraging regional councils, territorial authorities, and public transport operators to work together *in developing public transport services and infrastructure*; and
 - (b) an instrument for engaging with the public in the region on the design and operation of the public transport network; and
 - (c) a statement of—
 - (i) the public transport services that are integral to the public transport network; and
 - (ii) the policies and procedures that apply to those services; and
 - (iii) the information and *infrastructure that support those services*.
(*emphasis is mine*)
11. The integration between public transport services and infrastructure is submitted to be evident from the contents of regional public transport plans set out as section 120(1) of the LTMA. In addition, the linkage between a regional public transport plan and a regional land transport plan is made clear by section 121(2) of the LTMA which provides that, while they are not one and the same:

A regional council may publish a regional public transport plan and a regional land transport plan *as a single document*.

12. It is respectfully submitted that it would be wholly inconsistent with the statutory purposes and indications of the ORPTP and the regional land transport plan, for the direction requiring integrated planning of transportation advancements such as those proposed for the SH6 corridor to be undertaken in a piecemeal manner. Therefore, the prospect of significant investment in the Ladies Mile SH6 corridor *not* be accompanied by a commensurate investment in the services that are planned to use it is submitted to be remote.
13. The other question put to counsel was whether, in the circumstances, one public transport stop on the Ladies Mile corridor was enough. This is more

² This statutory position is also clearly recorded at page 14, section 1.2 of the ORPTP, which also expressly refers to a systems approach in section 1.3 as including “*Assist[ing] in the implementation of various projects delivered by Connecting Dunedin and Way to Go partnerships, which are driving transformative changes to the transport systems in these areas.*” (*emphasis is mine*)

properly a question for a qualified expert to answer. Nevertheless, considering the direction for investment in the RLTP in conjunction with the NPS-UD requirements to achieve well-functioning urban environments, the provision of only one stop (at or adjacent to the commercial centre) would likely fail to maximise the benefits of the transportation investment and result in a significantly inferior urban environment along the corridor, when compared to the option of the addition of a western transport-oriented development node.

Mr Ladbrook - stormwater

14. A number of written questions were put to Mr Ladbrook by the Panel. The questions posed and Mr Ladbrook's answers are set out in **Appendix A** to this memorandum.

Mr Bartlett – traffic and transportation

15. A question was put to Mr Bartlett by the Panel about his assumptions for the design and construction of a dedicated active travel pathway/route through the Extension Area and linking with Lower Spence Road and the Old Shotover Bridge. It is understood that the underlying concern was the gradient (and hence feasibility/useability) of such a route given the presence of the escarpment between the upper and lower terraces on the Extension Area.
16. Mr Bartlett has identified the Council design standards that he used and relied upon in considering the viability of a proposed route through the Extension Area. His response is as follows:

I set out below the design guides for a Grade 1 trail between Lower Shotover Road and the Old Shotover Bridge. The QLDC Code of Practice Appendix³ provides the design details but here are the requirements of a grade 1 trail, they are flatter than I told the commissioners so it would be good to see how these gradients may fit within the site, and on Spence Road.



1. Grade 1 – Easiest; gentle grades up to 2 degrees (28:1) with short sections <100m up to 4 degrees, wide (2.5m+) and smooth trail ideal for all user groups. No fall hazards. These are ideal for connecting communities and where families and novice cyclists are likely to be present. All areas of fall hazard within 1.5m of track (exposure) shall be protected with barriers that meet the building code

³ <https://www.qldc.govt.nz/media/3yqf110p/cycle-trail-and-track-design-standards-specifications-2018.pdf>

The minimum specifications for each trail grade can be expanded as follows:



Grade 1

1. A minimum width of 2.5m allowing for side by side riding and walking. This makes passing and overtaking easy, and provides sufficient width for novice riders to feel secure. The minimum width may be reduced to protect historic features, or for environmental or visual amenity reasons. Width also caters for 4wd vehicle access for maintenance purposes.
2. Maximum prolonged gradient of 2 degrees (28:1). Maximum gradient of 4 degrees (14:1)
3. Maximum out-slope cross fall of 3% for straight sections of track.
4. Corners shall have a minimum inner radius of 6.0m and in-slope gradient or cross-fall of 6- 8% except hair pins which must not exceed Typical Detail Sheet R4030_E3_3 of 2.5m
5. Minimum structure width of 2.0m clear. Clear means between the closest parts of the barriers.
6. A clearly sign posted, well defined trail from beginning to end so visitors can easily find their way in both directions and during inclement weather
7. A compacted, well bound smooth riding surface with suitable camber to provide a pleasurable and easy riding experience. Riders should never feel they are going to slide off the trail. Minimum compacted aggregate depth of 75mm, with 10mm compacted crusher dust top layer
8. All water courses to be culverted or bridged
9. All areas of fall hazard within 1.5m of track (exposure) shall be protected with barriers that meet the building code.
10. No stiles are to be used. All fences are to be crossed using cattle stops/bollards
11. Sight lines – a minimum of 15m clear sight distance is to be achieved around all corners



Image 1 – Frankton Trail from Queenstown to Frankton Beach

In addition, the trail would need to be sealed and lit so that it is appropriate for all users including micro mobility (scooters etc).

- 17.** When considering those factors and applying them to the Extension Area, Mr Bartlett's advice is:

The existing Spence Road has a prolonged gradient of approximately 1 in 25 (4%, 2.3 degrees) for the majority (approx 500m) of its length.

A Grade 1 trail has gradient maximum prolonged gradient requirement of 1 in 28.6 (3.5%, 2 degrees) although this does allow for a maximum gradient of 1 in 14 (7.1%, 4 degree) for lengths no greater than 100m. Arguably the Spence Road alignment does not meet the maximum prolonged gradient requirements of a Grade 1 trail, although in terms of gradient this requirements is only just breached. I would expect that the trails within the Variation Area would be expected to be Grade 1 as this area is generally flat. I note that the A2 trail on the opposite side of the Old Shotover Bridge is expected to be a Grade 2 trail as this raises up from the Shotover River via Jims Way to a SH6 crossing to Hardware Lane.

I suggest that any trail provided through the Extension Area is to meet the Grade 1 requirement in that the general gradient is less than 1 in 28.6 (3.5%, 2 degrees) with an allowance for a slightly steeper portion on the terrace of no greater than 1 in 14 (7.1%, 4 degrees) for maximum length of 100m. I do not expect that short length of this route, being steeper through the Extension Area will affect the viability, bearing in mind we are either providing an alternative route, or upgrading the current route on Spence Road. Either will complete the connection between the Ladies Mile Communities and the Old Shotover Bridge with a family-orientated active travel route.

- 18.** The updated Structure Plan for the Extension Area shows an indicative location of an active travel route which meets these assumptions, showing that it is feasible for the Extension Area to accommodate and provide an enhanced linkage servicing the entire Variation Area, irrespective of the future management of Spence Road.

Mr Church – urban design

- 19.** The question put to Mr Church and his response is set out below:

During my questioning on 13 December 2023, the Panel requested an indication of the remaining developable land in Te Tapuae / Southern Corridor.

In response to the Panel, based on the early stages of the Structure Planning process, I estimate there is approximately 240 Ha gross greenfield land that may be appropriate for development that has not yet been developed or consented. This gross available land would need to accommodate all land use activities, infrastructure and Green Blue Network requirements. It is also subject to more detailed Geotech and natural hazard investigations.

Furthermore, I provided an indicative percentage of the overall Corridor during my questioning. However, on reflection I do not consider it is appropriate to provide a percentage, given there is a considerable amount of land within the Corridor that is either under QEII National Trust covenant / rural land, a recreation area (e.g. Jacks Point Golf Course) or Large Lot / Rural Residential Zoning (or an equivalent Special Zone) that would not be comparable to TPLM Variation Area.

Mr Murray - planning

- 20.** There were a range of matters for Mr Murray to address, either in response to questions from the Panel, as “homework” requirements that he did not have sufficient time or opportunity to cover before the Panel, or as amendments which are desirable as a consequence of the Trust’s case presented to the Panel.

21. Mr Murray's commentary for the package of relief he has now recommended is as follows:

During my questioning on 13 December 2023 the Panel indicated that it wanted to see updated provisions and plans that more accurately reflect the evidence that has been presented through the TPLM SPP process including the Joint Witness Statements and further evidence that has been presented by AHFT and Glenpanel throughout the hearing process.

I have set out the changes below and categorised them to cover the main issues that have been traversed. As I see it, there are 4 key areas where changes are required to be made to the provisions in general; and then changes that relate specifically to the AHFT Extension Area to address the "missing tooth" between Ladies Mile and Frankton; and Glenpanel Homestead Precinct.

1. **SH6 and Amenity Access Area:** I understand that members of the community are sentimental about the wide access corridor along Ladies Mile. I consider however that, in balancing between amenity and the need to efficiently use land given that TPLM is considered as part of the Queenstown-Lakes Urban Environment (Indicative Future Expansion Area (PDP chapter 4.1.2)), more weight can be applied to the efficient use of land. To that end I recommend adopting a cross section that allows for a narrower Amenity Access Area (modelled on the cross section presented in the Urban Design JWS). An Amenity Access Area that is 12m wide with between 2-5m setbacks for buildings along SH6, and no setback for buildings within 50m of an intersection, would be appropriate. This treatment is the most appropriate for the urbanisation of the SH6 corridor and especially bearing in mind traffic safety concerns that have been raised. There will still need to be a cross section that the provisions can refer to.
2. **Density:** I have attached a spreadsheet that shows how I have approached the density requirements. The traffic evidence showed that 40du/ha across the TPLM area was needed in order for meaningful modal shift to occur. For medium density I believe that a density range of 35-45 dwellings would be pushing to the "next level of density" in the Queenstown Lakes District. In order to ensure that the overall density meets 40du/ha across the TPLM, I have recommended that the average density in the MDR should be 42du/ha. For HDR it appears that the evidence has suggested 40-72 du/ha, and the provisions currently have HDR at an average density of 55du/ha. While 55 du/ha is appropriate for HDR, from looking at the spreadsheet attached 46 du/ha average would still achieve the 40du/ha average, so average density for HDR could be dropped from 55 du/ha to 46 du/ha.

Alternatively, to simplify the density requirements in the TPLM zone an average density of 40 du/ha could be adopted for the entire zone, with the density ranges mentioned above relating to MDR and HDR.

3. **Height:** I also recommend changes to the height plan as attached. The reason for this is that there was discussion in the hearing about enabling density via height. The idea behind this is to incentivise

density around the transport nodes, and achieve an appropriate urban form around key intersections and nodes.

4. **Walkable Neighbourhoods:** It became clear from the evidence that TPLM is also about creating walkable neighbourhoods that focus around transport “nodes” rather than only having one centre that serves the entire community located within the eastern corridor. I have suggested that the western extension have a node that could be described as a Local Shopping Centre Precinct, which could also apply to the Doolittle Land. The reason for this is that while I understand the logic around one Commercial Precinct and then creating mode shift to buses, there was urban design and economic evidence that suggested that 2000m² commercial area around the western bus stop would be feasible without detracting from the TPLM centre in the long term.

My view is that creating walkable neighbourhoods at the outset in the plan change outweighs the risk of the TPLM Commercial precinct being undermined especially as the economic evidence suggests that a Local Shopping Centre Precinct and including MDR in the Extension Area would benefit the TPLM area as more households overall in the Extension Area would support spend in the Commercial Precinct in the short-medium term.

5. **Extension Area:** I have also added the mitigation for the Extension Area land into the land use but mainly the subdivision requirements under Rules 49.5.6.5 and 27.7.27.1. This is done by:
 - a. adding a requirement for a landscape management plan that will have a number of matters that needs to be addressed these include:
 - i. Location of future buildings and the appropriateness of lot sizes along the escarpment edge along with a requirement at 49.5.6.5 for a 20 metre setback from the escarpment edge. (note that this was 30 metres but due to changes to the location of the buffer planting has been reduced to 20 metres);
 - ii. The heritage setting of the Ferry Hotel, and the Old Shotover Bridge and how these Sub-Area K will be framed;
 - iii. Location of the landscape buffer;
 - iv. The location, spacing and type of planting to be located within sub-area K2 to achieve screening and softening of the development when viewed from State Highway 6 looking east;
 - v. The staged removal of wilding species and the replacement with suitable non-wilding vegetation that has similar characteristics;
 - vi. Active travel link between; Lower Shotover Road, the Bus Stops on State Highway 6, Sub-areas K1 & K2 and the Old Shotover Bridge; and
 - vii. Access intersections from both Lower Shotover Road and Spence Road, these access intersections are to be linked through Sub-area K2 to enable a loop road.

The expectation is that this will be put in place prior to development – when the first subdivision is done.

6. **Glenpanel:** For Glenpanel I have recommended that:

- a. the UGB be shrunk to only accommodate the tanks,
- b. no urban zone change into the current location of the ONF is proposed,
- c. an access Local Type E leading to Glenpanel homestead with the flexibility to be able to move the precise location at subdivision stage (80m). This will allow for a mid-block (between Howards Drive and Stalker Road) signalised crossing.
- d. heights in the Glenpanel Precinct between 8-17 metres provided there is a setback of 40 metres from the homestead. This will be via a discretionary consenting pathway to allow for heritage matters to be considered.

The Recommended Provisions include various modifications from the notified version, and a s32AA evaluation and subsequent evidence presented through the hearing process. In the event the Panel accepts them, along with any other modifications the Panel may accept, an evaluation will need to be undertaken after the hearing in the s42A Reply Report or at such time as the Panel may direct.

22. Mr Murray's recommended provisions are attached as **Appendix B**, along with an assessment of the provisions. Examples of density of developments in Queenstown are attached as **Appendix C** to assist the Panel with the suggested approach to density.
23. Also attached in separate documents are an updated structure plan (western end only), zoning plan and height plan, and the density spreadsheets referred to in Mr Murray's commentary.

DATED this 18th day of December 2023



James Winchester
Counsel for the Trust

APPENDIX A - RESPONSE BY WARREN LADBROOK ON BEHALF OF THE TRUST

1. On 13 December 2023, the Panel raised some additional questions relating to stormwater on the Extension Area land addressed in the submission by the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (AHFT).
2. This response is in addition to my evidence in chief dated 20 October 2023, and my summary of evidence dated 11 December 2023.

Q1a: The AHFT land (proposed extension area) has a different morphology to the TPLM variation area - How do you consider stormwater generated in this area would be managed?

3. I am not a geologist, so cannot provide expert opinion about the morphology. However, there is every reason to believe that stormwater can infiltrate into the soils at the Extension Area – and no reason to suggest otherwise – albeit the specific infiltration rate is unknown.
4. If soils testing results in infiltration rates which are conducive to stormwater disposal to land, then this is clearly the preferred solution.
5. If soils testing results show slow infiltration rates which are problematic for stormwater disposal to land, then the most practical option is for controlled discharge of stormwater:
 - a. in the same location(s) as at present,
 - b. in a consistent form to existing flows,
 - c. at less than pre-development flows for a range of rainfall events up to 1% AEP, and
 - d. at a higher quality than at present.
6. Testing for infiltration rates should be conducted at a reasonable number of likely sites on the Extension Area, and at a reasonable depth – specifically to avoid dense surface soils.
7. Stormwater quality is best addressed during collection, prior to entering the primary attenuation and/or disposal device.

Q1b: How you consider that the extension area stormwater management fits in the TPLM area integrated stormwater approach?

8. As previously advised, it is specifically noted that an integrated stormwater approach should not be construed to be another name for a centralised, single stormwater solution.
9. An integrated stormwater approach can be achieved by working towards stormwater solutions which are consistent with those utilised on the wider TPLM area. This specifically includes disposal to land, where possible, and reduced discharge off-site when land disposal rates are exceeded.
10. It is reasonable to set a target requirement to dispose of all stormwater to land, up to the 1% AEP, or 5% AEP in alignment with the stormwater from Slope Hill – pending QLDC review of site-specific infiltration testing results.
11. It is important to minimise the number of stormwater disposal devices within the TPLM area, with an expectation that one device is appropriate for each site, including the Extension Area – albeit the size, shape, and other design elements will be determined during Detailed Design.

12. It is likely that the stormwater attenuation and/or disposal device will likely take the form of a pond, swale, or underground chamber – as with other properties within the TPLM. The optimal solution may vary slightly for each site, based on topography, geology (soils), site layout, land cost, and the cost of these stormwater options.
13. Depending on the sequencing of development, it is expected that QLDC and land developers will progressively move toward consistent stormwater solutions within the TPLM area, with variations that are appropriate for unique site constraints – and which may specifically include the Extension Area.

Q2a: Given the geomorphology of the site i.e. river terraces, and depending on the answers above, can you please comment on: Whether you consider there are /or may be geotechnical constraints or risks for stormwater management in a MDR development in the Extension Area.?

14. The glacial deposits on the Extension Area may be slightly different to those across the wider TPLM area, and should be further tested.
15. It is recognised that infiltration rates will vary across the TPLM and the Extension Area , but this does not necessarily preclude the disposal of stormwater to land.
16. Stormwater can be infiltrated into a wide range of soils, albeit some are much more suitable than others. If the glacial deposits on the Extension Area are in the form of gravels, then it is expected that infiltration will be possible.
17. There is always a risk that there are unknown conditions below the ground, however, I understand that geomorphic indications are positive.

Q2b: Whether you consider the 1% AEP discharge to ground is achievable?

18. Glacial deposits are commonly understood to consist of gravels, and gravels commonly are associated with good infiltration rates.
19. As in the TPLM area, it is expected that the gravels are intermixed with sand and other particles, where the collective composition and density will impact the infiltration rates at each location.
20. Without infiltration testing it is difficult to know how suitable the soils are for stormwater disposal to land at any specific location.
21. It is reasonable to expect that the 1% AEP could be discharged to land on the Extension Area, albeit this is conditional upon the confirmation of infiltration rates.
22. It is recognised that higher infiltration rates will result in smaller disposal areas and attenuation volumes, and lower infiltration rates will result in larger disposal devices.
23. My expert opinion does not extend to matters such as when the size of the stormwater device will adversely impact the development of housing due to size or cost.

Q2c: How stormwater could be managed/directed when the rainfall event exceeds the 1%AEP.

24. Extreme rainfall events are not constrained to individual sites and will result in significant stormwater rates within the receiving catchments, commonly seen as flooding.
25. It is expected that any stormwater generated from a rainfall event greater than the 1% AEP would not be disposed to land. However, any land disposal devices would likely remove the

majority of the stormwater in accordance with the physical properties of the device – expecting that it is a volume or rate somewhat larger than designed.

26. If the normal stormwater solution includes post-development discharge of stormwater off-site, then it is required that post-development discharge is less than the pre-development flow for up to the 1% AEP. However, during Detailed Design, it would be prudent to also consider the measures required to accommodate up to the 0.4% AEP (ie. 250 year event). While not required, it would be beneficial to encourage developers to accommodate these additional measures where practicable.
27. As with the TPLM, secondary flowpaths must be provided for stormwater generated from rainfall events greater than 1% AEP, and must direct flows to an appropriate discharge location.

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDED AMENDED PROVISIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF PROVISIONS

Black = Provisions as recommended at the hearing week commencing 4 December

Red = Updated provisions

49.1 Zone Purpose

....To achieve the Zone purpose, the Zone provides for a range of residential densities and land use activities across six Precincts identified on the Planning Maps. The purpose of each Precinct is:

- The Low Density Residential Precinct, on the south side of State Highway 6 **and to the west of Lower Shotover Road**, supports integration with the adjoining lower density residential communities of Shotover Country, Lake Hayes Estate and the Queenstown Country Club, while acknowledging the transport limitations;
- **To incentivise increased density in certain areas, in order to assist in achieving the overall average density sought across the zone, additional height is enabled at key nodes within the zone, being the Commercial Centre Precinct, Glenpanel Precinct, and Local Shopping Centre Precinct.**
- The Medium Density Residential Precinct provides for a range of housing typologies including terrace, semi-detached, duplex, and townhouses on the north side of State Highway 6, to a density of at least ~~40~~ **42** units per hectare, within easy walking distance to facilities;
- The High Density Residential Precinct provides for multi-unit accommodation, to a density of at least ~~50~~ **46** units per hectare, in locations close to areas of public open space, future transportation links, and facilities;
- The Commercial Precinct is centrally located within the Zone and provides a focal point for commercial activities and amenities to serve the day-to-day needs of the Eastern Corridor communities resident community while not undermining the role of the commercial areas at Frankton or the Queenstown Town Centre;
- **The Local Shopping Centre Precinct is used predominantly for small-scale commercial and community activities that service the needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood around it.**
- The Glenpanel Precinct provides for commercial activities and community activities where these are compatible with the heritage values of the Glenpanel Homestead and supports open space and a sense of community; and
- The Open Space Precinct covers the Council-owned land on the south side of State Highway 6 and provides for community activities centred around a sports hub.
- The above statements do not limit proposals for community, education or recreation activities in any precinct.
- **In order to ensure that development, which will be advanced over time and in no particular sequence, proceeds to deliver the anticipated outcome identified above,**

extensive land use and subdivision information requirements are linked and intended to enable integrated management of development across the zone, over time.

49.2 Objectives and policies

49.2.4 Objective - The Glenpanel Precinct, and the Local Shopping Centre Precinct provides for non-residential activities that complement the role of the Commercial Precinct with development which responds to the character of the area.

the Medium and High Density Residential Precincts, Neighbourhood Precinct and the Commercial Precinct, require that development responds to its context, with a particular emphasis on the following essential built form outcomes:

- a. achieving high levels of visual interest and avoiding blank or unarticulated walls or facades;
- b. achieving well-overlooked, activated streets and public open spaces, including by not dominating street edges with garaging, parking or access ways;
- c. achieving a variation and modulation in building mass, facades, materials and roof forms;
- d. using well-designed landscaped areas to add to the visual amenity values of the development for residents or visitors, neighbours, and the wider public.
- e. Within the Local Shopping Centre Precinct, avoid individual retail activities exceeding 300m² gross floor area and individual office activities exceeding 200m² gross floor area that would adversely affect the:
 - i. retention and establishment of a mix of activities within the local Shopping Centre Precinct;
 - ii. role and function of town centres and commercial zones that provide for large scale retailing; and
 - iii. safe and efficient operation of the transport network.

Policy 49.2.4.2

- a) Require development within the Glenpanel Precinct to protect the historic heritage values of the Glenpanel Homestead and its setting (including the established homestead grounds) and manage adverse effects of development on the historic heritage values of Glenpanel Homestead and its setting.
- b) Enabling additional building height provided such intensification is undertaken in accordance with best practice urban design principles and adverse effects on heritage and character attributes of the Glenpanel homestead and gardens are avoided or satisfactorily mitigated.

49.2.7.9 Require high quality building and site design that promotes and supports neighbourhood amenity values, reflects the highly visible location close to the state highway, and that is appropriate in the setting adjacent to the outstanding natural feature of Slope Hill.

49.2.7.10 In the Medium and High Density Residential Precincts, **Local Shopping Centre Precinct**, and the Commercial Precinct, require that development responds to its context, with a particular emphasis on the following essential built form outcomes:

- a. achieving high levels of visual interest and avoiding blank or unarticulated walls or facades;
- b. achieving well-overlooked, activated streets and public open spaces, including by not dominating street edges with garaging, parking or access ways;
- c. achieving a variation and modulation in building mass, facades, materials and roof forms;
- d. using well-designed landscaped areas to add to the visual amenity values of the development for residents or visitors, neighbours, and the wider public.

49.4 Rules - Activities

	Activities located in the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone	Activity Status
49.4.4(j)	j) The information requirements for stormwater management specified by Rule 27.7.28.1. <u>The information requirements for the subdivision of land within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone specified by Rule 27.7.28.1</u>	RD
49.4.6A	Any application under Rule 49.5.16.2(b) for a residential density of less than 40 residential units per hectare.	RD-NC
49.4.11	Retail activity in the Commercial Precinct, Local Shopping Centre Precinct and Glenpanel Precinct, except where provided for elsewhere in this table	P
49.5.6	<p>Minimum Building Setbacks</p> <p>49.5.6.1 Minimum setback from road boundary: 4.5m</p> <p>49.5.6.2 Setback from waterbodies: 7m</p> <p>49.5.6.3 All other boundaries: 2m</p> <p>49.5.6.4 In Sub-Area H1: Minimum setback from boundary with Sub- Area H2: 6m</p> <p><u>49.5.6.5 In Sub Area K1 and K2: Minimum setback from the escarpment edge: 20 metres</u></p> <p><u>49.5.6.6 Setback from Amenity Access Area</u></p>	D

	<p>a. <u>No setback within 50 metres of an intersection</u></p> <p>b. <u>Setback of between 2 and 5 metres</u></p>											
49.5.10	<p>Staging development to integrate with transport infrastructure Development (except for utilities, the specified transport infrastructural works and other physical infrastructure) within the Sub-Areas shown on the Structure Plan shall not occur prior to all the corresponding transport infrastructural works for the Sub-Area listed below being completed.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rule, “completed” means when the works are physically completed and are able to be used for the intended purpose. For the purposes of this rule, “development” means a building for which a Code Compliance Certificate has been issued by the Council. Any application under Rules 49.4.4, 49.4.18, and any other application involving a building shall include a condition requiring that a Code Compliance Certificate under s92 of the Building Act 2004 shall not be applied for in respect of that building before the corresponding transport infrastructural works for the Sub-Area are completed.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>H1 & H2</td> <td>Active Travel link to State Highway 6 bus stops</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>K1</u></td> <td><u>Active travel link to State Highway 6 Bus Stops.</u> <u>Access intersection from either Lower Shotover Road or Spence Road.</u></td> </tr> </table>	H1 & H2	Active Travel link to State Highway 6 bus stops	<u>K1</u>	<u>Active travel link to State Highway 6 Bus Stops.</u> <u>Access intersection from either Lower Shotover Road or Spence Road.</u>	NC						
H1 & H2	Active Travel link to State Highway 6 bus stops											
<u>K1</u>	<u>Active travel link to State Highway 6 Bus Stops.</u> <u>Access intersection from either Lower Shotover Road or Spence Road.</u>											
49.5.11	<p>Maximum number of Residential Units</p> <p>The total number of residential units shall not exceed the maximums in the table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sub Area (as shown on the Structure Plan)</th> <th>Maximum number of residential units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sub-Area H1</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub-Area H2</td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub-Area I</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Sub-Area K1</u></td> <td><u>80</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sub Area (as shown on the Structure Plan)	Maximum number of residential units	Sub-Area H1	38	Sub-Area H2	108	Sub-Area I	30	<u>Sub-Area K1</u>	<u>80</u>	NC
Sub Area (as shown on the Structure Plan)	Maximum number of residential units											
Sub-Area H1	38											
Sub-Area H2	108											
Sub-Area I	30											
<u>Sub-Area K1</u>	<u>80</u>											

Table 2	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Precinct and the High Density Residential Precinct	Non-compliance status
49.5.15	<p>Development shall be consistent with the Structure Plan at 49.8, except that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The location where Collector Road Types A and B intersect with State Highway 6 or Lower Shotover Road may be varied by up to 10m where required to achieve integration with these intersections. b. The location of Collector Road Type C may be varied by up to 20m to integrate with the intersection with State Highway 6. c. The location of the Key Crossing shown on the Structure Plan may be varied by up to 30m. d. <u>The location where Local Types E intersect with State Highway 6 may be varied by up to 80m where required to achieve integration with the SH6 intersection and to maintain view shafts.</u> <p>The location of items identified with a * on the Structure Plan shall be generally consistent with the Structure Plan. <u>[This is to include the location of the Collector Type A as indicative only]</u></p>	NC
49.5.16	<p>Residential Density</p> <p>49.5.16.1 In the Medium Density Residential Precinct, residential development shall achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a density of 40—48 35-45 residential units per hectare across the gross developable area of the site. b) <u>An average density of at least 42 residential units per hectare across the gross developable area of the land in the HDR Precinct in the same ownership or control of the applicant</u> <p>49.5.16.2 In the High Density Residential Precinct, residential development shall achieve:</p>	<p>NC</p> <p><u>RD- Discretion is restricted to the manner by which the average residential density will be achieved by future stages of development on land in the HDR Precinct in the same ownership or control of the applicant.</u></p>

	<p>a) a density of 50-40 – 72 residential units per hectare across the gross developable area of the site.;or</p> <p>b) An average density of at least 55 46 residential units per hectare across the gross developable area of the land in the HDR Precinct in the same ownership or control of the applicant.</p>	<p>For the purpose of this rule, gross developable area of a site means the land within the site shown on the Structure Plan, excluding the following:</p> <p>a. Building Restriction areas as shown on the Structure Plan and planning maps;</p> <p>b. Roads, Open Space, Amenity Access Areas and Landscape Buffer as shown on the Structure Plan;</p> <p>c. Stormwater management areas; But including any vested or private roads, reserves, accesses and walkways not shown on the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Information requirements for applications under Rule 49.5.16.1(b), and 49.5.16.2(b):</p> <p>The applicant shall provide a statement (along with any plans and supporting information) demonstrating how future stages of residential development on the site of the application, or on other land in the HDR Precinct in the same ownership or control of the applicant, will attain the average residential density required by Rule 49.5.16.2(b); including the methods to ensure that land allocated for the future stage(s) will be protected for development so that the average residential density is attained across the current and future stages.</p> <p>Advice note: For the purposes of Rule 49.5.16.2(b), an example of an acceptable method to ensure that land allocated for the future stage(s) will be protected for development so that the average residential density is attained across the current and future stages is a covenant, to which the Council is a party, registered on the title that includes the land to be protected.</p>	<p>NC</p> <p>RD - Discretion is restricted to the manner by which the average residential density will be achieved by future stages of development on land in the HDR Precinct in the same ownership or control of the applicant.</p>
49.5.33	A, B, K ,	Bus stops on State Highway 6, west of the Stalker Road intersection (one on each side of the State	NC

		<p>Highway 6) Safe pedestrian cycle crossing of State Highway 6 west of Stalker Road intersection</p> <p>Upgrades to the existing SH6 / Stalker Road intersection. Appropriately upgraded Intersection on Lower Shotover Road at Spence Road</p>	
	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, K	Dedicated westbound bus lane on State Highway 6	
	<u>Sub-Area K2</u>	<p><u>Active travel link between; Lower Shotover Road, the Bus Stops on State Highway 6, Sub-areas K1 & K2 and the Old Shotover Bridge.</u></p> <p><u>Access intersections from both Lower Shotover Road and Spence Road, these access intersections are to be linked through Sub-area K2 to enable a loop road.</u></p>	
49.5.XX	<p>Landscape buffer <u>requirements</u></p> <p>a. The Landscape Buffer shown on the Structure Plan within Sub Area A, and K shall be no less than 6 meters wide along its full length and include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. a diverse range of 70% native species with a minimum plant spacing of 1.5m to enhance biodiversity values. ii. no less than 30% of planting which will reach a mature height of over 10 meters. iii. no less than 30% of planting which shall reach a mature height of over 4 meters. iv. the balance of the species can be shrubs and small trees which contribute to biodiversity and amenity values. <p>b. Existing Trees to be Retained</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing wilding species to be replaced with native revegetation on Council land (Section 159 Block III Shotover SD), with agreement from QLDC. ii. Existing wilding species located on the western side of K2 to be replaced with native revegetation. Native vegetation is 	RD	

	to achieve outcomes sought under 27.7.28.1.	
Table 3	Standards for activities located in the Commercial Precinct, <u>Local Shopping Centre Precinct</u>, and the Glenpanel Precinct	Non-compliance status
49.5.38	<p>Retail activity</p> <p>49.5.38.1 The maximum retail floor area of a single retail tenancy shall be 300m², except as provided for by 49.5.38.2 below.</p> <p>49.5.38.2 The maximum retail floor area of the single Large Format Retail tenancy retailing grocery products provided for in Rule 49.4.14 shall be 4000m² (<u>this does not apply to the Local Shopping Centre Precinct</u>)</p> <p>49.5.38.3 The single retail tenancy retailing grocery products provided for in Rule 49.4.14 shall not front the State Highway.</p> <p><u>49.5.38.4 The maximum combined commercial and retail space within a Local Shopping Centre Precinct shall be no more than 2,000m².</u></p>	NC
49.5.41	<p><u>Building Height</u></p> <p>49.5.41.1 Buildings shall not exceed the maximum number of storeys shown on the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Structure Plan – Building Heights Plan.</p> <p>49.5.41.2 In the Glenpanel Precinct, building height shall not exceed 8m.</p> <p>49.5.41.3 In the Commercial Precinct, buildings shall achieve the minimum number of storeys where specified on the shown on the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Structure Plan – Building Heights Plan.</p> <p>49.5.41.4 Building height shall not exceed the maximum heights shown on the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile – Building Heights Plan.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any sunlight, shading or privacy effects; External appearance, location and visual dominance of the building; Provision of sustainable design responses. How the proposal aligns with the overall structure plan height strategy for the TPLM Zone
49.5.42	<p>Setbacks in the Glenpanel Precinct</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings shall be setback at least 3m from a boundary with a residential precinct or a public open space. 	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the visual effects of the height, scale, location and appearance of the building, in terms of

	<p>b. <u>Buildings shall be setback at least 40 metres from the Glenpanel Homestead where buildings higher than 8 but up to 17 metres are proposed.</u></p>	<p>i. dominance;</p> <p>ii. loss of privacy on adjoining sites; and</p> <p>iii. any resultant shading effects.</p> <p><u>D</u></p>
49.5.43	In the Commercial Precinct, and <u>Neighbourhood Precinct</u> , all residential activities shall be restricted to first floor level and above, with the exception of foyer and stairway spaces at ground level to facilitate access to upper levels.	
49.5.50	<p>Staging development to integrate with transport infrastructure Development (except for utilities, the specified transport infrastructural works and other physical infrastructure) within the Sub-Areas shown on the Structure Plan shall not occur prior to all the corresponding transport infrastructural works for the Sub-Area listed below being completed.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rule, “completed” means when the works are physically completed and are able to be used for the intended purpose. For the purposes of this rule, “development” means a building for which a Code Compliance Certificate has been issued by the Council. Any application under Rules 49.4.4, 49.4.18, and any other application involving a building shall include a condition requiring that a Code Compliance Certificate under s92 of the Building Act 2004 shall not be applied for in respect of that building before the corresponding transport infrastructural works for the Sub-Area are completed</p>	

Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development		
27.7.28.1	Subdivision of land within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone	

	<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the matters contained in Rule 27.5.7; b. the spatial layout of the subdivision, and its relationships to and integration with other sites and development, taking into account the location of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Roads, walkways and cycleways throughout the Sub-Area including Indicative Roads as shown on the Structure Plan and where these will connect to adjoining sites and (where relevant) neighbouring Sub-Areas and (where relevant) State Highway 6, including intersection layout and design; ii. Open spaces and blue-green or ecological corridors, and their intended function(s), including those open spaces and blue-green corridors required by the Structure Plan, Indicative Parks as shown on the Structure Plan, and any additional open spaces necessary to serve the future needs of the site and the wider Sub- Area; iii. Three waters infrastructure, including the retention and treatment of stormwater, and integration with the stormwater network within the Zone; iv. Heritage and archaeological values, specifically with regard to how the subdivision design integrates with and enhances the character of the Glenpanel Precinct and wider setting. c. how the subdivision design will enable the achievement of the minimum residential density requirements set out in the relevant Zone provisions; x. how the subdivision design will enable buildings and development that achieves the development standards for the relevant Precinct. d. the methods proposed for ensuring that building typologies provide for a diversity of housing choice (taking into account the zoning of the land). 	
--	--	--

	<p>e. within Sub-Areas B and C, the impact of development on existing established trees identified on the Structure Plan;</p> <p>f. within Sub-Area A, <u>and Sub-Area K</u>, the establishment of the “Landscape Buffer Area” shown on the Structure Plan, and the methods to ensure it is maintained in perpetuity;</p> <p>g. within Sub-Area H1, the impact on Sub-Area H2 of landscaping within the 6m setback from the boundary with Sub-Area H2 and methods to ensure that shading effects from landscaping are minimised;</p> <p>h. Transport infrastructural works to be established to support alternatives to private vehicle use, including the imposition of conditions requiring that the relevant transport infrastructural works as identified in Rules 49.5.10, 49.5.33, 49.5.50 and 49.5.56 be completed prior to certification under section 224(c).</p> <p>i. the integration of the subdivision layout and potential future development with the Key Crossing.</p> <p>x) <u>within sub-area K1, and K2 a landscape management plan that ensures that future dwellings will integrate with the nearby zones⁴.</u></p> <p><u>i. Location of future buildings and the appropriateness of lot sizes along the escarpment edge</u></p> <p><u>ii. The heritage setting of the Ferry Hotel, and the Old Shotover Bridge and how these sub-areas will be framed</u></p> <p><u>iii. Location of the landscape buffer referred to in (f) above</u></p> <p><u>iv. The location, spacing and type of planting to be located within sub-area K2 to achieve screening and softening of the development when viewed from State Highway 6 looking east.</u></p>	
--	--	--

⁴ This is in accordance with 49.1 of the Zone Purpose

	<p><u>v. The staged removal of wilding species and the replacement with suitable non-wilding vegetation that has similar characteristics.</u></p> <p><u>x) Active travel link between; Lower Shotover Road, the Bus Stops on State Highway 6, Sub-areas K1 & K2 and the Old Shotover Bridge.</u></p> <p><u>y) Access intersections from both Lower Shotover Road and Spence Road, these access intersections are to be linked through Sub-area K2 to enable a loop road.</u></p> <p>x. How the stormwater management proposed for the subdivision will be managed as part of an integrated stormwater management system for the TPLM Zone north of SH6 to achieve soakage to ground for the 1% AEP event, including management of overland flow paths and levels of ground surfaces to facilitate the system integration and any legal mechanisms required to achieve integration;</p> <p>x. How a fully integrated stormwater management solution for Slope Hill is to be coordinated via swales for conveyance and soakage to capture and dispose of stormwater on the Slope Hill side of the collector road for the 1% AEP event, or as close as possible to the 1% AEP event, including coordinated overland flow paths to ensure no adverse effects on downstream properties and any legal mechanisms required to achieve integration.</p> <p>Information requirements:</p> <p>a. A statement demonstrating how the subdivision layout will enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the densities expected in the relevant Precinct; and ii. diversity of future building typologies on the sites created by the subdivision, to offer maximum choice for residential or business owners or tenants, and any methods (including by way of consent notices on the titles to be created, or other instrument) to ensure such diversity; and 	
--	---	--

	<p>iii. buildings and development that will achieve the development standards for the relevant Precinct.</p> <p>b. A statement, supporting plans, specifications (and modelling when required) with a level of detail as necessary to demonstrate how the stormwater management proposed will be managed as part of an integrated stormwater management system for the TPLM Zone north of SH6, including:</p> <p>Catchment modelling and technical information</p> <p>i. A pre-development catchment-wide (encompassing Slope Hill and the full TPLM Zone) hydraulic model for all critical design storms up to and including the 1% AEP event. The hydraulic model is to be produced in accordance with the QLDC Code of Practice Section 4.3.5 Design Criteria and the QLDC Stormwater Modelling Specification. Surface infiltration tests are necessary across the TPLM Zone north of SH6 to calibrate the model for pre-development infiltration rates.</p> <p>ii. Predicted post-development hydraulic model update demonstrating how the stormwater management system(s) proposed in the application will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achieve or contribute to a fully integrated stormwater management system for the Zone; and - achieve soakage to ground of runoff generated for the 1% AEP event (or for the contributing Slope Hill catchment soakage to ground for the 1% AEP event or as close to possible to the 1% AEP, and no less than the 5% AEP event); <p>iii. how the stormwater management system(s) have been designed considering climate change adjusted rainfall</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(RCP 6.0 8.5 for the period 2081-2100);</p> <p>iii. how the stormwater management system(s) have been designed considering climate change adjusted rainfall (RCP 6.0 8.5 for the period 2081-2100);</p> <p><u>Integration</u></p> <p>iv. the manner by which the system within the land subject to the application will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contribute to a fully integrated stormwater management solution for the TPLM Zone north of SH6 (including Slope Hill); - be coordinated across development blocks with reference to the Guiding Principles for Stormwater Management; - minimise the number of stormwater facilities (detention basins, and/or soakage devices and/or including underground chambers) across the TPLM Zone north of SH6; - integrate with the system on adjoining or nearby land within the same catchment or sub-catchment, and where stormwater management devices can be shared for development across multiple properties; <p>v. the manner by which land owned by the Applicant along the toe of Slope Hill will be made available for stormwater management;</p> <p>vi. the easements to be easements to be provided as required for new stormwater</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>trunks and swales crossing private property;</p> <p>vii. demonstration of meaningful consultation with affected landowners (being those upstream and downstream to the extent that the stormwater runoff from their land would influence or be influenced by the stormwater system being proposed) about stormwater management and the effects on those parties;</p> <p>viii. How co-ordinated overland flow paths through the developments will be provided to ensure no adverse effects on upstream or downstream properties; and</p> <p><u>Treatment</u></p> <p>ix. how pre-treatment of Slope Hill Runoff and treatment of first flush from roads, carparks etc will be provided to ensure longevity of soakage devices.</p> <p>x.</p>	
<p>27.7.28.2</p>	<p>Subdivision that is inconsistent with Structure Plan in 27.13.XX, except as set out in Rule 27.7.28.3 and for the following:</p> <p>a) The location where Collector Road Types are indicative. Where they intersect with State Highway 6 or Lower Shotover Road may be varied by up to 10m where required to achieve integration with these intersections, or maintain important views.</p> <p>b) b. The location where Collector Road Type C intersects with State Highway 6 may be varied by up to 20m to integrate with this intersection</p> <p>c) the location of the Key Crossing shown on the Structure Plan may be varied by up to 40m.</p>	<p>NC</p>

Assessment of proposed changes

Proposed	Proposed Amendment	Reason
Amenity Access Area and SH6		
	<p>It is proposed to keep rule 27.7.28.3 that states: Within the Amenity Access Area, development shall be consistent with the “State Highway 6 Typical Road Section” in the Structure Plan in 27.13.XX. However, the setbacks will be reduced to 2-5 metres from the Amenity Setback Area and the Amenity Setback Area will be 12m wide. Where land is within 50m of an intersection this setback can be reduced to no setback.</p>	<p>The Urban Design and traffic evidence suggests that a better outcome in relation to speed environment and urban design elements would be achieved with a reduced setback and a reduced Amenity Access Area.</p>
	<p>Reduce setback from Amenity Setback Area at intersections</p>	<p>In order to create a safer speed environment, stepping built form in and out from the road corridor is considered a better safety outcome.</p>
<p>High density = range of 50-72 du/ha and average of 55du/ha of land in control of applicant; and</p> <p>Medium density = 40-48 du/ha</p>	<p>A density of MRD</p> <p>a density of 42 units per hectare across the gross developable area</p> <p>HDR</p> <p>a density of 46 units per hectare across the gross developable area</p> <p>Commercial</p> <p>A height incentive is proposed rather than an upper density limit.</p>	<p>Our preference to fit into what could be called the next level of “ZQN Density” would be for density a density range from 35 du/ha and higher densities would then be incentivised by additional height requirements.</p> <p>The concept promoted via this framework is to achieve an average density over the Zone of 42du/ha and then incentivising higher densities (with no cap) with height allowances. It could be that there is an activity status that is NC for developments below 35du/ha in Medium and High Density zones. Please see the attached memo for an explanation of the rationale.</p>

Low Density to the West of Lower Shotover Road	Currently there is no low density West of Shotover Road	Low density provides for a transition from the land to the north into TPLM
	Sub-Area K1 is proposed to be 1 unit per 300m ²	Should the AHFT area K1 (Low Density Residential) be accepted than the maximum density would be 80 dwellings
Height		
	New height plan and new setbacks from the Amenity Area as stated above.	The urban design and traffic evidence shows that the change that has come about due to the SH6 speed reduction better suits development that fronts on to SH6. This has also meant that the height and set back to SH6 should responsible be changed.
Walkable Neighbourhoods – Local Shopping Centre Precinct		
-	Local Shopping Centre Precinct	<p>Local Shopping Centre Precincts provide a supporting role, as part of a well-rounded centre strategy and establishment of highly accessible and strong place-based neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Adding Local Shopping Centre Precincts that can contribute to a more nuanced hierarchy, as part of a broader centre strategy for the Te Pūtahi / Eastern Corridor, incrementally builds a sense of place and community rather than relying on one 'heart' to service and support the whole community of circa 10,000 people.</p> <p>That a Local Shopping Centre Precinct/Zone be added. This is in accordance with the QLDC PDP Local Shopping Centre Zone.</p> <p>The provisions of the Commercial Precinct are very similar to those of the Local Shopping Centre Zone, in the PDP.</p>
	49.4.5 – Has Residential Visitor Accommodation no change is proposed	No RVA is proposed in the Local Shopping Centre Precinct

Retail and commercial of up to 2000m ² in a Local Shopping Centre Precinct		<p>Since the plan change has been notified SH6 has undergone some changes, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the slowing of traffic to 60Kmh an hour - signalised crossings and - the final conclusion that the bus stops for a rapid service would be along SH6 <p>It has now become clear that in order for a rapid bus service to be integrated with the land use along TPLM two distinct nodes would be required. From the evidence it is also clear that creating a walkable neighbourhood is as desirable as creating mode shift in terms of keeping cars off of SH6 but also to create a well-functioning urban environment. This is the reason why Local Shopping Centre Precincts have been recommended in the evidence from the Economic experts, Urban Design Experts, and traffic experts. The updated structure plan shows the location of potential Local Shopping Centre Precincts should the Commissioners prefer this option over a single centre option.</p>
Residential Activities are restricted on the ground floor of the Local Shopping Centre Precinct		Economists have agreed that if a node at the western end is to be added then 2000m ² commercial would be appropriate.
49.5.38.3 The single retail tenancy retailing grocery products provided for in Rule 49.4.14 shall not front the State Highway.	49.5.38.3 The single retail tenancy retailing grocery products provided for in Rule 49.4.14 shall not front the State Highway.	With the change in speed limit on SH6 this is no longer a requirement.
Extension Area Mitigation (AHFT)		
Setback from Escarpment of 20 metres along with planting of the Landscape Buffer	-	With planting and setback considerations (note that an edge lane will likely run along the escarpment, 20 metres is considered appropriate to also allow for efficient land use and landscape sensitivities.
Install an active travel link between Spence	-	Enabling active travel between TPLM and the old bridge into Five Mile (Metropolitan

Road and Lower Shotover Road		Centre). The AHFT Urban design evidence is clear that a plan change in the Wakatipu Basin needs to consider the existing urban areas not just the proposed TPLM Commercial centre and surrounding facilities. Creating these links integrates TPLM with the existing Frankton Centre rather than leaving out the extension area like a “missing tooth”.
Location of the Collector Road is to be indicative only	The location of the collector road is fixed	It appears that it has been agreed that the location of the Collector road does not need to be fixed. Given the difficulties around the existence of paper roads the unknown nature of what design of each landowner’s lot might look like. It is considered that the exact location of the collector road is not fixed but indicative only. This allows flexibility to located the collector road where it is most appropriate.
Insert an additional Collector Road Type B to terminate at the Glenpanel Homestead	-	An 18-20m Local Access Road in this location will mean that the viewshaft along this road would terminate at the Homestead. Terminating the road at the homestead, is good for wayfinding, adding amenity to the TPLM, and highlights this heritage component.
Add Sub Area K to Rule 49.5.33	-	Should the panel decide to adopt the transport infrastructural Works Rule 49.5.33 then Sub-Area K would need to be included with the Sub-Areas located on the western side of TPLM
Remove Wilding Species on Council land Section 159 Block III Shotover SD. Replace with Native revegetation	-	The purpose of including this provisions is to ensure that TPLM can integrate land use between the Shotover River and Lake Hayes in helping to give effect to 49.2.7
Remove Wilding Species on K2	-	This will increase biodiversity but also is intended to provide softening to development within Sub-Area K by replacing the existing vegetation with native vegetation of a similar character. This rule (49.5.XX(b)) applies to land use consents, and Sub-division Consents. The way the rules are

		written a landscape plan that achieves the objectives set by Rule 4.5.XX(b) will be prepared and approved as part of the subdivision. This will be an information requirement for subdivision consent and then this will be come a requirement to be in place by the time residential buildings are built.
Glenpanel		
	Shrink UGB to only encompass the water reservoir	
	Glenpanel Access included in Structure Plan at Midblock. It is intended that this will be a signalised traffic light.	
	No urban zoning within the ONF this has been withdrawn.	
	Increase heights in accordance with height plan, setback to Homestead of 40m	The idea is here is that height in the Glenpanel precinct will be 8 metres as the current provisions allow but if development is setback 40 metres then there will be a height provisions of between 8-17m as a discretionary activity.
Zoning extends over roads	-	The attached Plans provide for zoning that extends over roads. This is consistent with other newly zoned land in the district.

APPENDIX C – EXAMPLES OF DENSITY IN QUEENSTOWN

RC Number	Number of Units	Area	Density developable area	Zone	Picture
Bullendale – SH160143	88	4.1759ha (2.34ha effective area)	22 du/ha (gross) 37du/ha (gross effective)	ODP - Rural (ONL), Low Density Residential PDP – Medium Density	

<p>Classic Builders – Jacks Point RM190336</p>	<p>72</p>	<p>2.28ha</p>	<p>32 du/ha (gross)</p>	<p>Jacks Point Resort Zone</p>	
<p>Bridesdale Farm SH150001</p>	<p>146</p>	<p>32.23ha (7.46ha effective area)</p>	<p>4.5du/ha (19du/ha gross effective excluding park and commercial)</p>	<p>PDP - Medium Density</p>	