

PROPOSED TE PŪTAHI LADIES MILE PLAN VARIATION

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF BRUCE CHARLES WEIR ON BEHALF OF GLENPANEL DEVELOPMENT LIMITED

1. As directed by paragraph 12.2 of Hearing Minute 1, I set out below a summary of the key points of my evidence. I have prepared a statement of evidence in chief dated 20 October 2023.
2. I have been involved in Expert Conferencing on urban design agreed (Joint Witness Statement issued 1 November 2023), urban design and transport (Joint Witness Statement issued 24 November 2023) and heritage (Joint Witness Statement issued 6 December 2023).

Succinct summary of key points of my evidence

3. The proposed TPLM Variation is seeking to implement urban character area with sufficient residential density to support high-frequency (Rapid Transit / RT) bus services along SH6. The substantive component of the contributing catchment is on the northern side with only limited direct contribution of benefit being provided to the existing urban area (Shotover Country and Lakes Hayes Estate to the south).
4. The Glenpanel site (Flints Park) plays a particularly significant role in the development of the Masterplan area for a number of reasons:
 - (a) It is located midway between the two now-agreed future signalised intersections and the RT hubs/stops;
 - (b) It has an NZTA-approved entry intersection, at the point generally identified (at the expert urban design/transport conferencing) for a mid-block intersection; and
 - (c) Contains the only heritage asset (the Glenpanel Homestead) in the masterplan area.
5. The Glenpanel Homestead is particularly important from an urban design perspective as it underpins character and identity for the Glenpanel Precinct, and plays a critical role along the Collector Road route in terms of 'stitching' together the other heritage

elements between the Shotover River and Lake Hayes (specifically the Old Shotover Bridge, Ferry Hotel and Threepwood Homestead).

6. Together with associated development, the enhancement of the Glenpanel Homestead in this way bolsters legibility of the node and supports wayfinding – all the foundations for quality placemaking.

Consequential Considerations from Expert Conferencing Recommendations

7. There has been complete alignment between myself and Robin Miller at our expert conferencing that:
 - i) Supporting the adaptive reuse of the homestead is one of the only credible methods to protect (and enhance) the Glenpanel Homestead and its landscape setting – and enable public access/utilisation of this asset; and
 - ii) Encouraging development with greater density away (west and east) from the homestead is preferable to allowing low rise, low-intensity development closer to the homestead – which would essentially undermine the 'setting' as sought under Chapter 26 (specifically section 26.5.9) of the PDP; and
 - iii) Building heights should graduate towards the surrounding development.
8. Consequently, while the Glenpanel rules promote (proposed standard 49.5.42) setbacks from a boundary by 3m, my view is that setting any new buildings of up to 17m in height (as sought) back by 40m from the Homestead itself would be more than sufficient to preserve the integrity of the setting while also providing for greater resident density to support the development of the node, and attain the urban design attributes that contribute to 'a well-functioning urban environment'.
9. The issue of building heights around the Homestead, views of Slope Hill (from highway vantage points) and potential visual impacts on the ONF are also correlated with what happens along the highway corridor.
10. Expert urban design and transport conferencing has now clearly articulated that the northern side of State Highway corridor will feature a more-intensive urban frontage to interface with the Active Travel Network and RT route/hubs. The recommendations include a narrower 'Amenity Access Area' to accommodate the Active Travel paths and reduced building setbacks (3–5m generally but none at intersections) and

greater buildings height around the signalised intersections (safe pedestrian crossings). These interventions will serve to further constrain views to those at right angles along the state highway – to the major entry roads and the mid-block pedestrian pathway point. Tree planting of any scale along these routes will all but obscure the upper areas of Slope Hill..

11. Consequently, while I acknowledge the opinion of Mr Miller that (from a pure heritage perspective) the mid-block pedestrian crossing and route/vista through to the Collector Road, would ideally be the existing driveway and shelter belt tree planting along the eastern boundary, this viewshaft would terminate on new residential development along the toe of Slope Hill – whereas consolidating pedestrian activity to the approved Glenpanel entry road provides far better urban design outcomes.

Other Matters

12. There has been a lot of focus on the impact of proposed development along the toe of Slope Hill and the perceived impacts on the ONF. All I can contribute to this debate is to say that geomorphology, landscape and heritage (but not limited to these) are a range of attributes which need consideration and balancing to achieve the best urban design outcomes.
13. It is clear that any views to the base of Slope Hill will be all but obscured from almost any vantage point by the anticipated built form either along the highway or in the Glenpanel Precinct. It is also clear that the ONF delineation is far from being definitive and the attribute that defines it and its subsequent placement varies markedly. It is therefore hard justify it as a 'hard' edge and more of a 'transition zone' which could accommodate sensitively designed buildings – so long as they are visually-subservient to those in front of them.
14. Notwithstanding my ONF delineation concerns, and depending on what the Panel finds, I recommend a review of plan accuracy generally as I have noticed a number of inconsistencies in other elements of the Structure Plan plans.

Dated: 11th December 2023