

**BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL  
AT QUEENSTOWN**

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**")

**IN THE MATTER** of the Proposed Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation  
to the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan  
("**Variation**")

---

**HEARING STATEMENT OF JAMES ARTHUR BENTLEY ON BEHALF OF  
QUEENSTOWN COUNTRY CLUB VILLAGE LIMITED**

**LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL**

**12 DECEMBER 2023**

---

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 My name is James Arthur Bentley, and I am a landscape architect at Boffa Miskell. I provided Landscape Evidence in Chief ("EiC") dated 20 October 2023 as part of these proceedings.
- 1.2 Specifically, my evidence relates to the 75m Building Restriction Area ("BRA") concerning the south side of State Highway 6 (Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile) along the Queenstown Country Club ("QCC") site. My evidence recommends the reduction of the setback to 25m as context of the QCC site has changed and the proposed future urban environment for Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile does not warrant relying on the past QCC consent.
- 1.3 This Summary Statement outlines the key changes and updates that have occurred since my primary evidence was filed.

### **Expert conferencing and Landscape Joint Witness Statement ("JWS")**

- 1.4 I participated in expert landscape conferencing on 30 October 2023.
- 1.5 Broad agreement was reached by the Landscape Experts in that session, and this is recorded at Point 4 of the 2 November 2023 JWS. Specifically:

That there is room for consideration of the reduction of the 75m BRA to 25m (approximate location of existing post & rail fence), on the basis that it is replaced/ accompanied with a specific design/ policy response in regard to built form permitted.

- 1.6 Within the Rebuttal Landscape Evidence of Stephen Skelton<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Skelton states:

Since landscape conferencing I have read the JWS for planning and understand that the planning experts are agreeable to reducing the BRA on the QCC site and that Ben Farrell (who has given planning evidence on behalf of QCC) intends to draft a proposed rule to include provisions for a lower height profile (5.8 – 6m) for development located between 25 – 75m from SH6. I note my opinion recorded in the landscape JWS and shared by Ms Chartres-Moginie and Mr Milne is that density and location of buildings is also an appropriate design consideration. While there is room for consideration of a reduction of the 75m BRA, any design or policy response needs to rigorously and specifically address scale, form, density and location of

---

<sup>1</sup> Rebuttal Evidence of Stephen Skelton at [26] and [27].

buildings such that the sense of openness to the south of SH6 and views to the wider ONLs are maintained.

### Proposed Provisions

- 1.7 I have reviewed the updated proposed provisions, presented by QLDC planner, Mr. Brown, at the hearing<sup>2</sup>. I am in agreement with those that relate to the QCC site. These concern amendments to rules within in Chapter 7 (Lower Density Suburban Residential) of the PDP.
- 1.8 In particular, I broadly support those outlined in Rule 7.5, especially the following:
- Building height standard of 6m<sup>3</sup> (I comment on the potential for a further increase in building height at paragraph 1.12 below);
  - Maximum number of residential units<sup>4</sup> within 120m of the boundary of SH6 is 42 units<sup>5</sup>, with a maximum floor area of 310m<sup>2</sup>; and
  - An Information Requirement requiring applications for resource consent to contain a design statement describing how the proposed building location and appearance achieves the matters of discretion and is commensurate with existing buildings within the Queenstown Country Club and the approved development plan of SH160140. For the reasons given by Ms Rennie I agree that "and the approved development plan of SH160140" is no longer required.
- 1.9 I consider these plan provisions will enable a high-quality development outcome that will continue to protect views (the northern part of The Remarkables and broader views towards Peninsula Hill/ Cecil Peak); provide a level of spaciousness; and maintain a consistent landscape character of the SH6/ Ladies Mile corridor. In my view, concerns around density, scale, form and location of buildings that Mr. Skelton raises as a concern in his Rebuttal Evidence concerning the BRA on the QCC land, where they may affect a sense

---

<sup>2</sup> Hearings Version of Chapter 7 (and other Chapters, including Chapter 49) of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan and presented at the hearing on 27 November 2023 by Mr Brown.

<sup>3</sup> Proposed rule 7.5.1.4

<sup>4</sup> Proposed rule 7.5.X (concerning maximum number of residential units and maximum floor area). These appear reasonably consistent to what is already present on the QCC site along the 120m boundary.

<sup>5</sup> I understand this number is derived by doubling the existing 21 units that are currently built that abut the current 75m BRA (so that a further 21 may be built).

of openness and views to the wider ONL, will be addressed through amended rules in Chapter 7.

- 1.10 As stated previously in this hearing, this district is blessed with 97% of it being recognised as an ONL.<sup>6</sup> All built form in the district retains a sense of place due in part by the prominence of the surrounding mountain backdrop. Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile is the same. The proposed plan provisions will enable the maintenance of key landscape principles including the integrity of the adjacent ONLs; the roche moutonnee of Slope Hill; and the upper terrace setting contained by the lower river terraces and the Kawarau and Shotover Rivers, (including Lake Hayes to the east). Views towards the wider landscape will still be evident, although truncated in some areas.

### **Other Considerations**

- 1.11 I understand that the Urban Design experts have undertaken discussions on a further reduction of the BRA (from 25m), notably around the commercial node of SH6 / Howards Drive. I also understand that building heights of 8m be contemplated.
- 1.12 I would generally support a further reduction in the BRA (as well as contemplation of the setback to be 18m or 20m as set out by Ms Rennie) and other matters including slight height increases and a greater level of density, however, I consider this needs to be supported by an appropriate policy framework ensuring that landscape values are appropriately managed. The "reduced size" BRA, for example, will need to hold a high level of amenity, be designed through careful design and will need to celebrate a sense of place by managing views towards the broader context. Based on this, I consider that a 6m height limit set back 25m need not be the final desired outcome along this BRA if a greater level of built form be contemplated.
- 1.13 Further, from a landscape perspective, a potential building "node" around the Commercial Precinct on the Howards Drive / SH6 intersection could positively respond to the emerging urban context and deliver a high amenity outcome. However, how this is delivered has yet to be tested so I endorse a framework to enable this.
- 1.14 Mr Blakely's evidence in relation to his own submission addresses the 75m setback<sup>7</sup>. I have already commented on the reasons why I consider a reduction in the setback from 75m to 25m is appropriate in my EiC. However, I wish to

---

<sup>6</sup> Statement of Evidence of Bridget Gilbert at [27].

<sup>7</sup> Statement of Evidence of Philip Blakely at [21] - [22].

comment on Mr Blakely's reference to the Wakatipu Basin Landscape Study recommending a 75m setback for Ladies Mile if the area was zoned for urban development. I have not been involved in this study or the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Structure Plan process, however, I note that the master planning that has been applied to the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile is still evolving as part of this process.

**James Bentley**  
**12 December 2023**