

Queenstown Lakes District Council

Variation to Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan: Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile

Hearing Panel Minute: Pre-Hearing questions

- 1.1 The Hearing Panel has been reviewing the evidence and material provided to date. In advance of the hearing, to assist the council and all parties, we set out below a number of high-level questions / requests that we would like the council team (and all parties as they wish) to consider in advance of the hearing and to be ready to address at the hearing.
- 1.2 These questions are focused on parts of a few of the many matters the Hearing Panel will need to consider and will not replace questions at the hearing. Rather, the intent is to allow greater time to consider more fulsome responses / obtain information.
- 1.3 For ease we have set the questions under headings, but we recognise there is overlap of expertise required to answer them all.

Transport

- 1.4 The planners agreed that the LM SH6 corridor will be a RTS under the NPS-UD. The system is not existing so given the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD, can the planners confirm that it is a form or feature of transport within "a regional land transport plan prepared and approved under the Land Transport Management Act 2003." If so, could more information be provided on the RLTP provisions relevant to the LM SH6. If not, then can the LM SH6 be considered a RTS and how?
- 1.5 Road speeds, traffic lights and provision of public transport (and other SH6 upgrades beyond TPLM) are beyond the ability of the Variation (and the council and developers) to control. The evidence is that funding for and delivery of these 'wider initiatives' is not guaranteed and has no defined timeframe associated with it. On that basis what are:
 - (a) The transportation implications of the schools and commercial developments not occurring until significant development has occurred within TPLM (which could be a 'gap' of a decade or more);
 - (b) The transportation implications of Way 2 Go strategies not being delivered; and
 - (c) The transportation implications of target modes shares not being achieved, and
 - (d) Have the effects, effectiveness and efficiency, and overall appropriateness of the TPLM been considered from the point of view of necessary passenger transport services not eventuating?
 - (e) How can an integrated transportation solution, particularly for walking and cycling modes, be achieved as individual sub areas are developed when there does not appear to be any consideration within the zone provision of relative staging of TPLM?
 - (f) How could TPLM be planned to mitigate such risks / effects? For example:
 - (i) zoning options (such as deferred zones);

- (ii) development thresholds or mode shift / active mode, / public transport targets; or
- (iii) staging options,

to deliver a well-functioning urban environment with growth aligned with the developing transport network (and/or reducing adverse effects on it, for example through the commercial area/schools) and what provisions would be required to provide for that?

- 1.6 Would Council-led delivery of transport infrastructure (noting of course the role of Waka Kotahi as the road controlling authority for SH6) be appropriate / provide a better outcome than seeking individual landowners to coordinate delivery and why? What mechanisms might be applied to allow the Council to recover costs from developers, if appropriate?
- 1.7 Will TPLM on its own justify a public transport system or is greater density required along the whole SH6 corridor (and including Queenstown Country Club, Lake Hayes estate, Shotover Country Estate)? If the latter:
 - (a) What is the Council doing along the corridor to support / speed up the delivery of public transport?
 - (b) How important is the density of TPLM compared to the rest of the corridor?
- 1.8 What is the minimum density needed to initiate and sustain a high frequency public transport system needed for TPLM? How does the existing housing to the south of TPLM also affect this?
- 1.9 Given our density question below, how does a delay and potential reduction of high-density development within TPLM affect the ability to provide the frequency of public transport needed to support TPLM?
- 1.10 While the transport evidence does mention it briefly, please provide more information on how TPLM may reduce traffic on SH6 (for example by providing a commercial area, open space and potential school etc outside of the Shotover bridge).
- 1.11 What is the 2053 Base Model 1,100 households within the TPLM area founded on (including assumptions) and does this provide a genuine basis for assessing traffic effects of the anticipated 2,400 TPLM households at 2053 and if so, why?
- 1.12 Given the car parking controls proposed, how would an application for a car parking building within the commercial centre be treated? What consent requirements and policy tests would apply? How would an application for a car parking building outside of the Ladies Mile zone - say Hawthorne / Glenda Drive be treated? What would happen if a group of landowners purchased a vacant residential lot within TPLM and simply used it for car parking?
- 1.13 Given the different transport patterns and lifestyles in Queenstown, how realistic are the mode shift and travel assumptions made, noting that commuting to work or school is only one small part of travel needed by a household?
- 1.14 Is there a point where vehicular congestion along SH6 and the bridge becomes so severe drivers seek out either a) alternative routes or b) alternative destinations (ie Arrowtown / Cromwell)? Or is it the case that traffic will always and without exception seek to add loading to the bridge?
- 1.15 What is the existing daily variation in traffic volumes on SH6?

- 1.16 Please provide more information in relation to the international research on housing density and a reduction in vehicle trips.
- 1.17 Please provide SIDRA modelling for signalised versions of the key roundabout intersections currently assessed.
- 1.18 Please expand the assessment that the comparability of the Aspen and Queenstown transportation environments indicate that the mode share targets, are, as the Panel understands it, in your view achievable.
- 1.19 Please provide further detail on the PT modelling methodology at 4.1 of the Abley Technical Note.
- 1.20 Please provide a comparison of the assumptions, and if there is variation between the two, the significance and implications of that variation, of the Tracks transportation model and the retail economic assessment around the number of jobs available within the TPLM area.

Density

- 1.21 How is the development of TPLM (LD, MD, HD, commercial, open space) intended to occur over time? Is it sufficiently coordinated and managed to minimise inefficient outcomes (including a reduction in typologies) and adverse environmental effects (including on and for infrastructure)?
- 1.22 How is the development of TPLM housing (LD, MD and HD) intended to occur over time and how will that link to the development of the commercial precinct? If it is not coordinated and managed then could that result in inefficient outcomes (including a reduction in housing variety) and deliver adverse environmental effects (including on infrastructure)?
- 1.23 Is 2,400 dwellings seen as a minimum, maximum or something in between? What are the implications of the answer in terms of transportation and urban design? Do the TPLM provisions as proposed provide suitable clarity of intentions in relation to those same development limits? Would 2,400 dwellings, predominantly consisting of 1-2 bedroom dwellings, have different traffic and infrastructure effects to 2,400 dwellings predominantly consisting of 3-4 bedroom dwellings?
- 1.24 If TPLM is only one small part of a much bigger passenger transport and traffic management solution, how essential is it that it achieves the identified density targets?
- 1.25 How robust is the likely delivery of the density levels, especially given the uncertainty as to when or if the highest density outcomes will occur? Is it likely that (here and now) low and medium density will be more attractive to the market – and if more is included then how will overall density levels be achieved? How would minimum density requirements (whether gross or net) be affected by potentially land-intensive non-residential activities such as schools, churches, stormwater systems and other infrastructure locating in areas subject to those requirements? Is more medium density required elsewhere in TPLM (or on land owned by submitters subject to scope issues) to make up the slack?
- 1.26 In terms of minimum density and typology requirements, particularly relating to higher densities, where examples of these within Queenstown have been identified and used to substantiate market demand or feasibility, are those locations comparable to the TPLM site (ie is high density in central Queenstown or on a prime lakefront site fairly comparable adjacent to SH6 at Ladies Mile)?

- 1.27 If lower density development occurs in the short term, with higher density in the longer term (if at all) what happens if, at a point in time, the low and medium density opportunities have been maximised, the zone is part-implemented, but there is market rejection of higher density housing and applications for inadequate density are being refused consent. When (if at all) would it become better for the part-implemented zone to 'freeze', even if it means failure to achieve some commercial and other non-residential outcomes due to a lack of sufficient local catchment? Further, when (if at all) would it be better to accept lesser-than-hoped-for densities if that helps provide more on-site non-residential activities such as shops to provide as much public transport support as may be achievable? Do the Plan provisions allow such trade-offs to be made, should they, and if so, how?

Stormwater / ESC

- 1.28 Are there sufficient planning provisions (objectives, policies and rules) for stormwater and ESC to avoid additional adverse effects on Lake Hayes? If not, what changes are required?
- 1.29 The Candor3 report notes that the Council has made it clear that landowners are expected to manage stormwater within the development areas with no discharges to Lake Hayes:
- (a) Is that achievable?
 - (b) What will the stormwater receiving environments be when the stormwater system capacity is exceeded?
- 1.30 The Candor3 report comments the "the magnitude of the rainfall event that will generate surface water flows from the masterplan area is unknown". Has further work been done to quantify the event size?
- 1.31 If the development in TPLM increases the risk of surface water runoff to Lakes Hayes, what could be done to avoid increased sediment and other contaminants entering the Lake?
- 1.32 Are potential overland flow paths and treatment systems sufficiently provided for, including for first flush events, in particular towards Lake Hayes? Is there sufficient provision to keep the overland flow from Slope Hill away from TPLM?
- 1.33 Would further investigation as to priority of flows east/west to avoid impacts on Lake Hayes be beneficial?
- 1.34 Given the reliance on multiple landowners, what is the risk of a non-integrated stormwater system being delivered? Are there examples of a proposed 'integrated' stormwater system, and its associated planning provisions involving neighbours working together / written approval / limited notification and, if so, how well have they worked, especially with a sensitive and significant receiving environment? In particular, what lessons would the examples provide for the proposed provisions?
- 1.35 How could the development of TPLM be best staged to deliver an 'integrated' stormwater system (and could this align with potential transport related staging above, and if so how)?
- 1.36 Would Council-led delivery of stormwater infrastructure be appropriate / provide a better outcome than seeking individual landowners to coordinate delivery and why? Was this considered as an

option as part of the s.32 evaluation? What mechanisms might be applied to allow the Council to recover costs from developers, if appropriate?

Urban design

- 1.37 Please explain in its entirety the 'gateway' into Queenstown from 'end to end', including with reference to the setback along the southern side of SH6 adjacent to Frankton Flats? How important is the 'gateway' and is it referred to in any District Plan objectives or policies? Other than a landscaped setback, what other ways can a gateway be expressed and were these considered? (This is particularly relevant to the Panel's consideration of what form of development and development setback might be most appropriate.)
- 1.38 Simplistic modelling of the visual impact of development on the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust land has been provided. Can a similar assessment for the TPLM area for the viewpoints be readily provided? If so, please could that be done.
- 1.39 With the potential 60km/h speed for SH6, please consider further the amenity and building setbacks appropriate to that speed (including to maintain that speed rather than promote faster speeds) and liaise with the transportation experts as to what the SH6 transportation corridor cross section should contain to support a 60km/h speed limit. Please consider the combined width of SH6 and landscaped setbacks either side of that, and comment on the extent to which this may become a severance rather than an integrator for north-south pedestrian travel and integrating the two communities either side of SH6.

David Allen, Gillian Crowcroft, Hoani Langsbury, Judith Makinson and Ian Munro.

Independent Hearing Commissioners

21 November 2023