

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED  
DISTRICT PLAN HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**            the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**                            the Proposed District Plan

**AND**                            Hearing Stream 13 – Queenstown Mapping  
Annotations and Rezoning Requests (Group 1C  
Queenstown Urban – Central, West and Arthurs  
Point)

**Hearing summary statement of Timothy Carr Walsh on behalf of P J & G  
H Hensman and Southern Lakes Holdings Limited**

---

Date: 24 August 2017

## **Introduction**

1. I have been engaged by P J & G H Hensman and Southern Lakes Holdings Limited to provide evidence in respect of its submission on the Proposed Plan.
2. I will briefly summarise the key parts of my evidence and comment on Council's further evidence in respect of its development capacity model.

## **Key Points**

### *Costs*

3. There are some costs involved in rezoning of the subject 8.14-hectare property from Low Density to High Density Residential including a potential reduction in the residential amenity of immediately adjoining neighbours and increased vehicle movements on the road network.
4. To mitigate the potential reduction in amenity I have suggested ~~that~~ an extended setback from adjoining Low Density zoned properties. In terms of wider neighbourhood character, development within the site will likely be more intensive in character than the adjoining Low Density zoned land, but it will not be significantly out of character and will be similar to the character of the development provided for by the adjoining Medium Density zone.
5. In term of impacts on the road network, Council officers are concerned that the requested High Density zoning would result in a larger car dependent population because the distance to town is not walkable and there is no public transport option. I consider the distance is walkable for most people and estimate that the journey from town to the site on foot would take approximately 18-25 minutes. Further, if the site and the large undeveloped Medium Density zoned site to the northwest were developed to capacity, the resultant population density could make operating a bus service viable.

### *Benefits*

6. I consider that the costs would be outweighed by the benefits including providing the opportunity to materially increase the Queenstown housing stock in close proximity to the town centre which has been identified as a critical issue facing Queenstown. If the site was developed to the theoretic High Density zone yield (suggested by Council), it would accommodate 1,370 more people than the proposed low density zoning. Further, if the site was developed to a high quality standard, then the proposal has potential to deliver the many benefits that come from well-designed higher density residential neighbourhoods.
7. I acknowledge that the site may not be perfectly located for High Density zoning, but I consider that it is an appropriate location and the proposed zoning will promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure.

### *Policy alignment*

8. Given the site is located in close proximity to the town centre, is within the urban growth boundary, can be serviced with existing infrastructure, and will have minimal impacts in terms of neighbourhood character and amenity. For these reasons, I consider the proposed rezoning is consistent with the higher-level objectives contained in the Strategic Directions and Urban Growth chapters of the Proposed Plan.
9. I also consider the proposed zoning gives effect to the NPS-UDC and the operative Regional Policy Statement, and is consistent with the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.

### **Comments on Council Development Capacity Evidence**

10. When I wrote my evidence, Council was in the process of updating its development capacity model in relation to Queenstown zones.

Supplementary statements in respect of the update were filed on 19 June 2017. The following are my comments on that evidence.

11. The evidence acknowledges that the model assumptions do not take into consideration the land improvement value ratio nor the potential for underdevelopment. In my view, these two factors have the potential to materially influence the feasible development capacity (accepting that the model incorporates a 22% development chance discount).
12. Notwithstanding this, the model predicts the 30-year development capacity will provide 15,100 dwellings which is over 5,000 more than the estimated demand. If this is the case, there appears to be a disconnect between Council's approach to the zoning of the subject site and its preliminary proposal for medium and high density housing at Ladies Mile.
13. While the development capacity may considerably exceed the predicted demand, the model estimates a 467-unit shortfall in the predicted demand for Queenstown Hill by 2048. The requested zoning would eliminate this shortfall.



**Timothy Carr Walsh**

24 August 2017