

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

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
IN THE MATTER of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation in accordance
with section 80B and 80C, and Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the
Resource Management Act 1991.

**REPLY TO QUESTIONS ASKED OF NATALIE DIANE HAMPSON
24 November 2023**

PO Box 323 QUEENSTOWN 9348
Tel +64 3 379 7622
Fax +64 3 379 2467

WYNN WILLIAMS

Solicitors: L F de Latour | K H Woods
(lucy.delatour@wynnwilliams.co.nz |
kate.woods@wynnwilliams.co.nz)

Introduction

- 1 My full name is Natalie Dianne Hampson. I am a Director at Savvy Consulting (and prior to that at Market Economics Limited).
- 2 I prepared a statement of evidence on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) dated 27 September 2023 on the submissions and further submissions to the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation (**TPLM Variation**). I also provided rebuttal evidence dated 10 November 2023.

Response to Questions

- 3 My response to the questions filed by Winter Miles Airstream Limited are set out in **Attachment A** below.

Natalie Diane Hampson

24 November 2023

Attachment A: Response to questions of Winter Miles Airstream Limited

Response to questions on behalf of Winter Miles Airstream Limited	
Question	Response
What is preventing the commercial precinct from being dominated by visitor accommodation activity, given it is a permitted activity in the precinct?	In accordance with Mr Brown's rebuttal version of the TPLM Zone provisions, rule 49.4.33 states that visitor accommodation in the Glenpanel Precinct and in the Commercial Precinct (above ground floor) is a Discretionary Activity, not a permitted activity. This activity status will assist in managing the adverse effects from cumulative visitor accommodation. Irrespective, there is significant plan enabled floorspace capacity enabled in the Commercial Precinct above the ground floor. Development of visitor accommodation will not materially compromise the capacity for retail activities (primarily ground floor) other than through lobbies, and may not compromise the capacity for commercial activities which I estimate may be limited to the ground floor and first floor in most cases. The presence of visitor accommodation in the Commercial Precinct will have net positive benefits by helping to sustain business activity in the centre and adding vitality.
If half of the commercial precinct was occupied by hotel development, would that result in a shortfall in commercial land to service the Ladies Mile area?	No, see above.
Would there be a shortfall in commercial land to service the Ladies Mile area if the number of households was around 3,100 (rather than 2,400)? Note: There are submissions that seek to extend the area that the Variation applies to.	If there was considerable certainty that the Variation was to deliver 3,100 additional dwellings rather than 2,400, then I would reconsider the scale of the Commercial Precinct. However, I am comfortable with the scale of Commercial Precinct provided on the basis that:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I understand that based on current traffic analysis/projections, there is a dwelling constraint of 2,400 additional dwellings for the TPLM Variation area. While not directly prescribed in the provisions as a dwelling 'cap', the provisions (and amendments to provisions) have continued to test dwelling yields relative to this traffic related constraint and have taken into account a range of scenarios with respect to different land holdings.2. There is evidence (refer to Ms Fairgray) that the market is more likely to deliver housing closer to the lower end of the minimum density ranges (which has been further reduced through rebuttal evidence to 50/dwellings per gross hectare in the HDR Precinct and factored into the updated yield figures along with other changes recommended by Mr Brown) as this reflects the dwelling typologies which are more likely to be feasible and realisable in the short-medium term. Achieving the minimum density required in the HDR Precinct is still likely to be a long-term outcome (with the majority of land in the HDR Precinct developed to medium densities in the short-medium term).3. As such, I consider that submissions that seek to add housing capacity to the TPLM Variation (such as the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust) are unlikely to exceed the 2,400 dwelling 'cap' if approved.4. The Commercial Precinct has (as a result of rebuttal evidence) been increased in size from 2.13ha to 3.2ha (gross and excluding collector roads shown on the revised structure Plan) based on conservative assumptions around gross land potentially lost to roading within the Precinct and other reasons. This extension has been supported by Mr Brown and Mr Dun for Council.5. I supported a minor increase in the size of the Glenpanel Precinct (consistent with the Economics JWS). This has not been addressed by Council's other witnesses in
--	---

	<p>rebuttal evidence. However, should this be approved, it will provide for additional retail and commercial floorspace in the TPLM Zone.</p> <p>6. I supported a minor neighbourhood centre (consistent with the Economics JWS). In the west of the TPLM Zone <i>if</i> the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust submission was accepted. While Mr Brown is not recommending accepting the relief sought in the Anna Hutchison Family Trust submission, should this be approved by the Panel, it will provide for additional convenience retail and commercial floorspace in the western end of the TPLM Zone.</p>
<p>In light of 1 to 3 above, do you still consider that a 2,500m² area of commercial precinct at a neighbourhood scale would have an effect on the commercial precinct that is problematic?</p>	<p>1-3 above do not change my view that the eastern end of the TPLM Zone will be sufficiently served for convenience retail and service activity within the Commercial Precinct (and via existing rules for commercial activity in the HDR and MDR precinct) and that an additional neighbourhood centre in the east would result in net costs to the wider catchment community in terms of the development of the Commercial Precinct in the short-medium term.</p>
<p>If the answer to question 4 is yes, could a small area of precinct on the Winter Miles land have a rule that limits certain commercial activity (such as retailing) to be considered appropriate?</p>	<p>While retail floorspace caps, for example, can be effective in helping to manage distributional effects on other centres (in this case the Commercial Precinct), the consequence of limiting one activity is that there is more of the other activities that are enabled. This is on the basis that landowners will seek to maximise the development potential (building footprint) of the site.</p> <p>Retail activities (especially convenience retail activities) are key to achieving the role of neighbourhood centres and restricting retail (for example) in a centre of this proposed scale may lead to a mix of activities that reduces the functional amenity of a convenience centre.</p> <p>More importantly, given the finite amount of demand available in the trade catchment to sustain commercial floorspace in the TPLM Variation, all the activities (retail and other) that</p>

	<p>could occupy the submitter's proposed centre would be more beneficial within the Commercial Precinct at only a marginal additional distance to access for some eastern households. The benefits of consolidating that convenience spending and people activity in the Commercial Precinct outweighs the very localised benefits that may arise from a neighbourhood centre in the eastern end of the TPLM Structure Plan. As such, I don't consider that introducing a prescribed rule makes the proposed centre more appropriate.</p>
<p>At paragraph 37 of your evidence you note that cafés or childcare centres would be permitted activities on the Winter Miles land (HDR Precinct) within appropriate size limits. Please identify the rules that this relates to and comment on whether you consider the sizes provided for in those rules would be viable for those activities?</p>	<p>I incorrectly grouped childcare centres (an Education Activity) with the rule for commercial activities in my rebuttal evidence. The specific rules are as follows:</p> <p><i>Rule 49.4.8 – Commercial Activities comprising no more than 100m2 of gross floor area per site in High Density Residential Precinct – Permitted Activity.</i></p> <p>100sqm is expected to be sufficient for a small café/coffee shop. It is expected to be sufficient for a takeaway food retail activity and a range of other small-scale retail and household service activities. For example, in the new Kawarau Park centre nearby, a hairdresser has leased a 63sqm tenancy, a beauty therapist has leased a 51sqm tenancy, an accountant has leased a 91sqm tenancy and pilates studio has leased a 72sqm tenancy. Any commercial activities seeking more than 100sqm GFA per site in the HDR Precinct can apply for a non-complying consent.</p> <p><i>Rule 49.4.17 – Education Activities within the Low, Medium and High Density Precincts and within the Open Space Precinct for Ministry of Education (or equivalent) operations only – Restricted Discretionary Activity.</i></p> <p>This rule does not limit the size of childcare centres in the HDR Precinct so long as the effects of traffic generation, access, parking, noise, infrastructure and servicing are</p>

	managed and there is appropriate provision of walkways, cycleways and pedestrian linkages.
--	--