

PROPOSED TE PŪTAHI LADIES MILE PLAN VARIATION
SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF WERNER MURRAY ON BEHALF OF GLENPANEL DEVELOPMENT LIMITED

Introduction

1. My full name is Werner Murray. I am a Principal Planner at The Property Group, based in Queenstown. I have been engaged by Glenpanel Development Limited (**GDL**) to provide evidence in support of its primary and further submissions on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan: Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation. I hold the qualifications set out in paragraphs [2]-[8] of my Evidence in Chief (**EIC**). I reconfirm that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.

Relief Sought

2. I confirm that GDL seeks the following relief:
 - (a) An extension of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) - providing a consenting pathway for the development of critical infrastructure.
 - (b) Amended Medium Density Residential target of 30 dwellings per hectare of gross developable land.
 - (c) Increased maximum height of 17m within the Glenpanel Homestead Precinct.
 - (d) Extension of zoning and precinct boundaries to the toe of Slope Hill.
 - (e) Consequential amendment of outstanding natural landscape (ONL) boundary.
 - (f) Amended location of key roads within the variation.
 - (g) Greater flexibility in structure plan to support transport objectives.
 - (h) Greater flexibility of stormwater management with a preference for an integrated stormwater system along road corridors.
 - (i) The layout of Open Space.
 - (j) The requirement of the structure plan to retain trees.
 - (k) The Building Restriction Areas along SH6.
 - (l) The lack of provision for standalone housing.
 - (m) The requirement that all buildings will need consent.

Succinct summary of key points of my evidence

Urban Growth Boundary:

3. GDL proposes a realignment of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to better facilitate critical infrastructure development for the eastern corridor and extended the Glenpanel Precinct. Specifically, seeking to extend the UGB to include an area above Slope Hill for water reservoirs, addressing challenges in obtaining consents for these utility structures under current PDP provisions. Emphasizing the need for a planning pathway to consent reservoirs, which, despite being utilities, are also considered urban development, highlighting a potential oversight in the current provisions.

Medium Density:

4. GDL generally supports the Masterplan Development Regulations (**MDR**) however is concerned about the relatively high Medium Density Residential (**MDR**) spectrum requirement (40–48 dwellings per hectare). Challenges include impacts on housing typologies, affordability, and creating a well-functioning urban environment. GDL acknowledges the difficulty of delivering commercially viable higher density residential environments in Queenstown and emphasizes factors like amenity, public transport access, open space, and urban services. Mr

Weir suggests a density range of 33-54 dwellings per hectare, and I recommend 30 dwellings per hectare for the medium-density precinct. The establishment of maximum lot sizes within the subdivision is supported should the Panel find it necessary.

Height Increase:

5. A height increase of 17m around the Homestead is proposed to optimize the precinct's concept, support commercial viability, enable density provisions and to act as a landmark. GDL acknowledges the sensitivity of the Homestead's heritage setting, recommending an increase in building height to align with the adjoining high-density zone and additional matters of discretion to protect the heritage values of the homestead.

ONL Boundary and extension of development:

6. GDL is seeking an amendment to the ONL boundary to enable development on the toe of Slope Hill. Mr Weir has emphasised the value of this location for place-making, view shafts, and addressing the interface between urban and rural (ONF) land uses. The location of the current ONF appears to be an arbitrary boundary with limited Geo-scientific backing. Noting inclusion within the Geopreservation Inventory is not sufficient for inclusion as an ONF, with further Geoscience evidence required.

Transportation:

7. The GDL land in Sub-area B of the Variation features a Collector Type A road running east to west, but its current placement lacks connections to existing legal roads or public access. Dependency on adjacent land development for public access raises feasibility concerns. This risks impeding development, increasing costs and inefficiencies regarding road stoppages and new access agreements with unprepared developers.
8. Critical to mode shift targets, rely on the proposed public transport system faces challenges due to funding uncertainties and reliance on State Highway 6. Alternatives to encourage live work and local commercial facilities are recommended along with a focus on active transport and alternative transport solutions.

Latest position on the *key* matters remaining in dispute

9. **Density:** While a lot has been made of density in the HDR it appears that there is now discussion about bringing it down to 40 du/ha with an averaging mechanism in the HDR. That is less than the density in the MDR which is still proposed to be 40-48 du/ha. I have submitted that 25-30 dwellings per hectare is realistically achievable for medium density. After speaking with Mr Weir perhaps a sliding and incentive scale would be appropriate for the medium density as well. Whereby there is an average of 40 du/ha but a range of dwellings from 33-54 du/ha.
10. **Stormwater:** I note that Mr Brown has updated the stormwater management provisions to reflect the need for a catchment-wide hydraulic model and to achieve as close as possible the need for soakage to ground for a 1% AEP storm event. Note that it is my view that there is a lot of guidance and control already in the stormwater space (eg Land Drainage Act, QLDC Code of Practice, and more best practice guide, eg Te Ao Māori & Water Sensitive Urban Design). While I support an integrated approach, I caution against any requirements that will end up delaying development as I do not think that this would help to achieve the objectives (4.2.2.21(b), and 49.2.2) of the variation. There is disagreement from the Council about placing underground soakage devices in roads. My response to this is that this is medium density development in an area where there is a shortage of flat developable land, this means that all

elements of the development need to “work hard” and if one element can have multiple functions then this should be preferred.

11. **Amenity Access Area:** the TPLM Provisions set out policies and rules for this area, these mainly relate to the function and form of the setback and the rules link to the cross sections. I think that the rule framework Mr Brown is working on will be able to capture whatever the cross sections end up being. I also acknowledge the significant amount of variation that there could be. My only comment is that the purpose of the Zone is to ensure efficient use of land for the provision of housing and supporting schools, community, and commercial facilities, and that integrates with nearby zones to achieve an integrated, well-functioning, and more self-sustaining urban community in the Eastern Corridor.
12. **Transport triggers:** There was agreement in the planning JWS that transport triggers would be appropriate. The only caution I have is that we don't end up with provisions that inhibit development unnecessarily, rather than enabling it. My view is that the bus corridor is an RTS under the NPS-UD and that planned forms or features of transport that have been approved under the Land Transport Management Act can be relied on now.
13. **Height in the Gelnpanel precinct:** After reading the JWS between Mr Weir and Mr Miller, I think that the concept of providing a height incentive for achieving better design outcomes, and in order to achieve feasible development outcomes is worth capturing in the provisions. In light of this, I have recommended a varied rule framework to address height versus setbacks from the Gelnpanel Homestead. This includes keeping the 8m height limit that can be applied for as a restricted discretionary activity. I have then proposed to allow for a height of 17 metres if buildings are setback from the homestead by 40 metres, and to require a discretionary activity. This is similar to the height rules in the PDP in the town centre. I have also recommended a policy that is aimed at enabling this to occur. (Note that this submission also seeks a 10 metre height in the Medium density precinct.)