

TE PŪTAHI LADIES MILE VARIATION

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF WERNER MURRAY FOR THE ANNA HUTCHINSON FAMILY TRUST

1. My full name is Werner Murray. I am a Principal Planner at The Property Group, based in Queenstown. I have been engaged by the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (**Trust**) to provide evidence in support of its primary and further submissions on the 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 the Trust seeks the following relief:
 - (a) The Extension Area relating to land shown in Attachment A, is included within the urban growth boundary and rezoned to Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation medium density residential precinct, and low-density residential precinct. The scope of this relief has been “pulled back” after more careful consideration of the terrace edges, and discussions with Mr Geddes the planning witness for the neighbouring properties.
 - (b) The relevant precinct provisions and standards set out in Tables 1 and 2 now include landscaping provisions (landscape edge treatment, heritage provisions, parking/garaging provisions, height controls along the terrace edges).
 - (c) Any alternative consequential or other amendments to the TPLM variation to give to give effect to the intent of the submission.

Succinct summary of key points of my evidence

3. **Strategic Location:** The Extension Area is strategically positioned for urban expansion as it adjacent to the existing larger urban area of Shotover Country, and to a wider degree along the frequent public transport corridor that extends into Queenstown. Due to ability to integrate with existing and proposed infrastructure and amenities, it is a logical extension to the area that available for the growth of urban settlements in the Wakatipu Basin.
4. **Housing Bottom Lines:** I consider the Extension Area crucial for achieving housing bottom lines as set out in the NPS-UD and brought into the PDP at 4.1.2. The Extension Area (even if reduced) provides significant benefits to the increased supply of affordable housing in the Wakatipu Basin, this is for important reasons such as willingness to develop, the strategic

location, role in modal shift by providing connectivity and proximity to existing active travel routes, and the proximity to services and increasing housing supply (4.2.2.21).

5. **ONF vs Growth pressure:** At 3.1A(b) the PDP contemplates the tension between growth pressure for urban areas and detracting from ONF, and ONL. I consider that the Extension Area would not inappropriately impact on these features and here I rely on Milne’s comprehensive assessment. The most appropriate way to work through this tension is set out in SO3.2.2.1.
6. **Mitigation and Plan Architecture:** Any potential adverse landscape effects can be avoided or mitigated through zoning, height rules, structure plan controls, policies, rules and assessment matters which have all been proposed. These include developable areas being defined by topography, limiting construction to terraces and excluding escarpments. Native revegetation is planned on the escarpments that have been identified to enhance biodiversity, and proposed landscape buffers in the Structure Plan aim to address landscape concerns that can be managed through the existing architecture of the TPLM plan variation. This occurs via a land use **and/or** subdivision consenting pathways that are linked. Land use alone has a consenting pathway through 49.4 Rules – Activities, and subdivision through 27.1 Zone Location – Specific Rules (27.7.28). There is a link between land use and subdivision at 49.4.4. The wording of this rule could be changed to encompass more than just stormwater as it currently does. Note that should further certainty be required as for density on super lots this could be secured as a consent notice in this part of the plan (27.1).
7. **Settlement pattern:** I consider that the TPLM including the extension area builds on historical urban settlement patterns¹ on the eastern side of the Shotover river. Historically there has always been development on the eastern side going back to when the old Ferry Hotel was first located south of its current location, and more recently Shotover Country and Lake Hayes estate. The expansion area helps to focus urban development primarily on land within and adjacent to the existing larger urban areas (4.2.1.2). SO3.2.2.1(v), states that urban development is to occur in a logical manner so as to protect the District’s rural landscapes from sporadic and sprawling urban development. It is my view that the inclusion of the extension area into the TPLM area does not constitute urban sprawl.

¹ QLDC PDP 3.2.2.11(ii)

8. **Defendable Edge:** I consider there to be a defendable edge, which can assist with containing sprawl, and in this case strong natural boundaries including the Shotover River, Slope Hill ONF, and prominent terraces and a gully system form this edge. While the Council has chosen to use some of these elements it has ultimately decided to also use man-made features like open space, Lower Shotover Road and a landscape buffer. The Proposed District Plan at Objective 4.2.1 refers to Urban Growth Boundaries as a tool to manage the growth of urban areas within distinct and defendable urban edges. There are a number of policies that outline how this is to occur (these include related policies 3.3.14, and 3.3.15²). There is no clear direction around how to determine what the defendable edge is. However, it is my opinion that the plan focuses on the strength of the UGB to provide the containment of urban development.

9. The Auckland Unitary plan gives some guidance on the location of rural urban boundary³. There are many factors that go into determining whether or not development would creep north. Cost of development, sunk costs, existing subdivision patterns, size of land that could form a viable development parcel, servicing costs and capacity, and most importantly distance from services. This is on top of the defendable edge that has been described by landscape and urban design experts. The PDP provides strong guidance on where Urban Development is appropriate. Chapter 3 and 4 outline how one would go about making sure that urban growth is managed in a strategic and integrated way, and the RPS and the NPS-UD further support this. I consider it virtually impossible for urban development to occur without support for it in SO3.2.2.1. This risk of the flood gates opening and development creeping north from including the extension area is extremely low.

10. I note that Mr Brown made a comment that the northern boundary was arbitrary, as it follows a fence line. This is true but, given the location of the gully system just north of the fence line, I consider that there would little to gain by including land up to the edge of the gully and so it has been decided to go with the fence line only.

11. **Building Heights:** Building heights for the extension area were chosen to reflect the MDR precinct proposed. This will ensure development respects the landform and is appropriately integrated with natural features such as escarpments, but will still enable valuable medium

² This is corrected as the reference in the plan has the incorrect numbering

³ Chapter B2.2.2 of the Auckland Unitary Plan

density capacity and affordable housing typologies. It has also been proposed to keep buildings on the upper terrace setback from the terrace edge and to screen them by incorporating the proposed Landscape Buffer into the Extension Area as well.

12. **Heritage:** It has been decided to abandon the relief sought on land that is located on northern end of the lower terrace, adjacent to the current neighbours to the west. This has an added benefit of ensuring that future dwellings are located further away from the heritage features and qualities of adjoining land, namely the Ferry Hotel which is below the Extension Area. In relation to heritage matters, I have appended a summary of the how the District Plan deals with heritage matters. There is a requirement under 3.2.3, 3.2.3.1, and 3.3.17 of the PDP that a quality built environment takes into account the character of individual communities. At 3.2.3.1, it states that the District's important historic heritage values are protected by ensuring development is sympathetic to those values, and that heritage values are identified and protected from inappropriate development. I believe that the Trust's relief can meet these goals especially given the level of separation screening (this will provide a frame to the Ferry Hotel) that the Landscape Buffer will provide. I also want to draw in SO3.2.2.1 (at it is stipulated in the PDP that SO3.2.2.1 is relevant to 3.3.17), which requires urban development to occur in a logical manner so as to build on historical settlement patterns.
13. **Connectivity:** The TPLM variation underscores the importance of connectivity and integration, particularly with the Frankton Metropolitan Hub, in urban planning. Aligned with Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) principles, the Frankton masterplan aims for a well-functioning urban environment by reducing private vehicle usage through a public transit system, and pedestrian and cycle trails. This approach, is crucial for achieving modal shift and sustainable transportation, emphasizes the need for comprehensive connectivity. The lower portion of Lower Shotover Road is identified as a key element in active travel and connectivity within Ladies Mile, with opportunities significantly enhanced by including the Extension Area. Combining various modes of travel into a comprehensive network is seen as essential for creating a connected and sustainable urban environment, making the Extension Area a central and vital component of TPLM's modal aspirations.
14. **Housing need:** The Queenstown housing market, despite national trends of price drops and increased construction pressure, has maintained high prices, impacting affordability. With an average house price over \$1.7 million, Queenstown faces housing affordability challenges,

exacerbated by a decline in new dwelling consents, nearly half of the previous year and below the 10-year average. I want to highlight the importance of housing capacity assessment under the NPS-UD (that is now potentially outdated). An assessment indicates a potential shortfall in the Eastern Corridor 'Reporting Area' over the next 30 years, with long-term infrastructure issues and insufficient feasible capacity for the medium term (next 10 years). The economic experts agree, there is a clear need (or demand) for the inclusion of the Extension Area into the Variation area, and it has been assessed as likely providing for genuine realisable development capacity, rather than theoretical development capacity, at the right density.

Latest position on the matters remaining in dispute or requiring clarification

15. **Medium Density:** I generally support the medium density residential (MDR) provisions however I'm concerned about the relatively high MDR spectrum with a requirement for 40–48 dwellings per hectare. 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. I think that this lower range would better achieve Objective

16. **Hutchinson Extension Area:** I maintain my view, as set out in my evidence, that the Extension Area is appropriate for urbanisation. I note that Mr Brown has raised a number of outstanding matters that I address below:

Location of urban development – upper terrace, lower terrace?

17. I agree with Mr Church that the extent of urban development on the lower terrace has been reduced. For the reasons that Mr Church has stated it is better to plan for this now rather than try to retrofit a future extension onto an environment that has already changed. We have already have experience of something could have been planned for but the opportunity to do so now has passed – Koko Ridge, Threeewood, RM220821. Mr Bartlet also support the level and location of development from a transport and distance from transit stops.

Risk of acting or not acting and the uncertainties that may exist (heritage, transport)

18. The risk of not proceeding with the Extension Area is also echoed in Mr Osborne's evidence, which I consider quite sharply brings into focus the Urban Chapter - Chapter 4 that requires QLDC to enable development represented in the housing bottom lines. I can't stress this

enough the current HBLs are abandoned through the spatial plan 2.0 and QLDC will not meet its timeframes for creating a Future Development Strategy under the NPS-UD.

Relatedly: boundary location, UGB location and treatment?

14. The relief now sought is for the UGB to run around the area that is now being proposed to be included as the Extension Area. The boundary treatment that has been adopted in the Landscape Buffer and related provisions is at 49.5.XX – Landscape Buffer.

Landscape impacts – height limits, BRAs, design controls?

15. At this stage I propose the same design controls and height limits as the MDP precinct and the LDR precinct.

Roading / active travel links?

16. Roothing and active travel links have been shown on the relief sought plan, and on the plans attached. Adopting the proposed roading layout provides choice of a non-trafficked, active travel route to the historic bridge; resilient vehicle access, allowing for future proofing SH6 through widening of Spence Road. I note that Mr Church also recommends the 'Optimised' TPLM Structure Plan Western Amendment, recognising the importance of the western transit node and the opportunity to establish a best-practice TOD approach.

Integration with TPLM Zone?

17. The Extension Area and the western amendment integrate into the overall TPLM zone. Mr Church outlines how this position is similar to the strategy that has been applied in the other master planning that has been done in Queenstown. Planning for this now ensures that the land will be used efficiently and avoids integration challenges in the future once capital has been sunk into designing and building the western end as it currently sits.

Density?

18. Objective 4.2.2.21 seeks to ensure that development within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone provides for high and medium density residential development to enable diversity of housing choice through different typologies, to contribute to increased supply of housing and affordable homes. The Extension Area has been designed to achieve this objective, including forming a heads of agreement with the QLCHT to deliver this type of affordable housing. The location of the site in relation to existing facilities and transport routes means that it is highly suitable for to medium density development. XXdu/Ha?

Commercial node (at western end of TPLM Structure Plan) – size and location?

19. It has been suggested that 2000m² would be a suitable size for a centre (this could be a neighbourhood centre or commercial precinct) located at the intersection of the Collector Road and Lower Shotover Road. This would be similar to the Doolytle Submission requesting a Commercial precinct. Mr Church has outlined where this would be best located and the building heights that could apply to development around a node. Mr Church's opinion is informed by best practice transport orientated design and I adopt this approach on the merits.

Public transport linkage and walkability?

20. The site is located between 500m and 900m metres from the nearest rapid transit stop. The non-trafficked, active transport route across the terrace, can achieve a gradient that is standardised with the rest of the network.

Inclusion of other land on north east side of Lower Shotover Road north of TPLM Zone?

21. This relief was opposed by Mr and Mrs Stalker and has now been abandoned. The reason for that is that it has now been determined that the Collector road will be subject to more flexibility in terms of its location, so that additional land is not required in order to achieve good roading design.

Heritage

22. Given the distance of the proposed new zoning from the Bridge and Ferry Hotel, I am of the opinion that further heritage assessment is not needed. However, taking Mr Miller's advice on board it may be that there are some heritage considerations and these could be included in the Variation provisions to ensure that such matters are captured. This could be done in a similar way to the way that heritage values have been captured for the Glenpanel Homestead.

Ecology

23. I have appended an ecological assessment from Wildlands Consultants Limited, who have concurred with Ms Palmer's evidence and found that the Extension Area as now proposed has no particular ecological sensitivities. The report concludes:

"A site visit and ecological assessment of the Extension Area at 63 Lower Shotover Road has shown that the Extension Area contains landforms, land use activities, vegetation and habitats,

and ecological values that are very similar to the TPLM Variation Area. On this basis, it is concluded that the conclusions reached by Palmer (2023) regarding the ecological value and significance of the TPLM Variation Area also apply within the Extension Area.”

24. Currently my view is that there is enough information to address the matters raised above and the evidence that has been supplied is of (at least) a similar quality, depth and breadth as the Council’s evidence. In fact, in most instances, the Trust has opted to take advice from multiple experts on certain subject matters. This was done to ensure that evidence presented on the merits was robust and thoroughly considered.

Werner Murray

12 December 2023