

IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS			
<b>Strategic Option</b>	<b>Option 1 - Council led approach</b>  This option continues with previous Council decisions where it was agreed that the Ladies Mile area may be developed for urban purposes in the medium to long term and that a proactive Council-led planning approach should be undertaken.  This approach was to incorporate the wide range of community, housing, recreation, transport, green space and infrastructure considerations for Ladies Mile and the surrounding area.  A Council-led masterplan and plan variation will set out a legible and clear structure to mitigate sporadic development.		<b>Option 2 - Developer led approach</b>  This option involves changing position on the urbanisation of Ladies Mile and implementing the zoning and plan provisions in the PDP which provide for Rural Lifestyle and Large Lot residential zones.  This could ultimately mean losing the opportunity of developing the Ladies Mile for urban purposes in a controlled way, acknowledging that private developers will be likely to apply for resource consents or private plan change(s) and given the stated intentions of a number of landowners, this is unlikely to be developed under Rural Lifestyle zoning
<b>Report Options</b>	<b>Option 1 – Council led, continue with masterplan as proposed</b>  Continue with the suggested 2400 dwellings that would support the masterplan objectives.  Place development of Masterplan <u>on hold</u> while continuing with additional work on resolving infrastructure design, funding and implementation. (particularly transport and stormwater).	<b>Option 2 –Council led, amend masterplan</b>  Amend Master Plan with lower density/heights  Continue with additional work on resolving infrastructure design, funding and implementation (particularly transport and stormwater).	<b>Option 3 – Developer led approach</b>  Council do not proceed with a Council led process and leave it to individual landowners  Council responds to individual plan changes and resource consents
<b>Brief Description of the Option</b>	Continue with the suggested 2400 dwellings that would support the masterplan objectives.  Offer a choice of lifestyles through a range of quality housing typologies, sizes and affordability;  Establish medium/high density living to support public transport, commercial activity and community facilities	The LMC team have suggested that a lower average density of 52 units per hectare (approx. 1890 dwellings) could still support the key elements of the masterplan i.e. public transport, commercial town centre as well as the schools and community amenities.  Another option would be lower again at 40 or 46 units per hectare (approx. 1452 dwellings), acknowledging that the commercial town centre would need to reduce in size.  The level of lower density development will determine whether key elements of the Master Plan can still be supported, such as a commercial town centre or achieve the modal shift to public transport and other modes of travel (such as car share).	The zoning and plan provisions in the Proposed District Plan (PDP) which provide for Rural Lifestyle and Large Lot Residential zones would apply.  If landowners developed as per the PDP zoning, the Rural Lifestyle zoning on the northern side would result in approximately 35 new dwellings and the Large lot Residential zoning on the southern side would result in approximately 99 additional dwellings.  Developers seeking an urban form of development (including higher density residential and/or commercial town centre) would need to apply for either resource consent approval or request private plan change(s) which could end up determined through the Environment Court.  The level of density under a series of private plan changes or resource consents is unknown, but It should be noted that there has been a large body of previous work undertaken that supports urbanisation of this area, plus work such as the HIF DBC has indicated that Ladies Mile could accommodate another 1100 houses before the bridge reaches capacity. This information could be used to support private plan changes and resource consents.  This option could ultimately mean Council losing the opportunity of developing the Ladies Mile for urban purposes in a managed way that integrates with the existing urban areas and is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure.
<b>Transport Implications</b>	The Masterplan proposes land uses and densities that would encourage trip internalisation and support the move to public transport, reducing car dependency and the number of trips required to cross the Shotover Bridge.  Both of these options will provide the opportunity to continue working with ORC & Waka Kotahi on delivering a transport solution that addresses the needs of both the existing and future communities of Te Pūtahi – Ladies Mile.  Whilst these transport solutions are continued to be worked on, traffic issues will continue to increase from development capacity available in Frankton, Arrowtown, Gibbston, or further afield in Cromwell or beyond.		There is less certainty in respect of option 3, 134 dwellings built as per the PDP would have the least impact, however the ability to require the density which supports the shift to public transport, for the existing and future communities and a viable town centre would be lost.  Traffic issues will continue to increase from development capacity available in Frankton, Arrowtown, Gibbston, or further afield in Cromwell  An additional risk, is that if developers are successful in gaining resource consents and/or private plan changes, the final density numbers may all add to the wider traffic issues but not be of the density required to support the shift to public transport or lead to the creation of a town centre.  This option doesn't preclude Council from continuing work on progressing the District wide transport interventions.

Advantages	Option 1 - Council led approach - Advantages	Option 2 - Developer led approach - Advantages
	<p><i>Timing Implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both options 1 and 2 place the masterplan work on hold whilst continuing with additional work on resolving infrastructure design, funding and implementation, particularly in regards to transport and stormwater.</li> <li>Provides opportunity to continue working with ORC &amp; Waka Kotahi on delivering a transport solution that addresses the needs of both the existing and future communities of Te Pūtahi – Ladies Mile</li> </ul>	<p><i>Timing Implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 3 doesn't preclude Council from continuing work on progressing the District wide transport interventions.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Financial implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both options 1 and 2 would build on the investment made to date on the Te Pūtahi Masterplan;</li> <li>The Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) loan agreed with Central Government for \$17.5m would not be lost;</li> <li>Potential to apply for the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund (IAF) that is part of the Housing Acceleration Fund (HAF).</li> <li>Ability to ensure that development is integrated with the existing urban areas and is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Financial implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Plan work for this area is essentially done, limited future costs to Council if the land does develop at the zoned PDP densities;</li> <li>Resource Consent and Private Plan Change costs would be predominantly borne by individual developers; and</li> <li>Individual developers would investigate solutions for known issues, such as impacts on the transport network. The costs of resolving these issues are currently unknown.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Community Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council and the community retains control over how the area will develop</li> <li>Opportunity for the feedback on the Te Pūtahi Masterplan to be considered and incorporated into an amended proposal</li> <li>Opportunity for schools, community facilities and commercial activities to be located close to the existing communities, decreasing the current reliance on other centres and reducing the need to travel for all activities;</li> <li>Provides a high degree of certainty regarding the spatial layout of residential and non-residential activities and built form of subsequent development</li> <li>Provides for future community needs</li> </ul>	<p><i>Community Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining the current zoning would respond to the community feedback that opposed urbanisation of the area;</li> <li>The very low density of development provided for by the PDP would remain in the interim; and</li> <li>It is unlikely the high density residential outcome as proposed by the masterplan would be carried out as some landowners have indicated a preference for lower density.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Strategic Document(s) Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement the QLDC <b>Spatial Plan</b>, which has identified Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile as a priority development area;</li> <li>Assist with implementing the <b>National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020</b> requirements for planning for urban growth to meet anticipated demand, increasing the diversity of the District's housing offering, and efficient use of urban-zoned land;</li> <li>Opportunity to address the shortfalls in housing typologies identified within <b>Councils HBA (housing)</b> through the provision of medium and high density housing with affordable housing options provided through the different typologies, housing types and sizes;</li> <li>Would have regard to <b>Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> which is giving effect to the NPS UD;</li> <li>The <b>Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study 2017</b> recommended that Ladies Mile was highly suitable for more urban development. As this study formed part of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) process, this has significant weight; and</li> <li>Opportunity to support QLDC's <b>Climate Action plan</b>, ensuring an efficient use of land, providing for high quality medium/high density housing which has thermal efficiency benefits, and to support and encourage mode-shift from private vehicle use to public transport thereby supporting emissions reduction behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Strategic Document(s) Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban development signalled by the <b>Spatial Plan</b> may occur in some form but there is no certainty what form that might take;</li> <li>If developer led urbanisation does not occur, the land would remain zoned rural lifestyle, so would not form part of the urban environment for the purposes of the <b>National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020</b>;</li> <li>Individual landowners/developers seeking to urbanise would be required to have regard to the <b>Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> which includes objectives and policies that manage urban form and development;</li> <li>This may result in the private plan change process being used by developers, rather than individual resource consent applications, which may result in better planning outcomes; and</li> <li><b>Climate Action plan</b>. If the current PDP rural residential densities are retained, they would have less environmental impact compared to Options 1 and 2.</li> </ul>

Disadvantages	Option 1 - Council led approach - Disadvantages	Option 2 - Developer led approach - Disadvantages
	<p><i>Timing Implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For both options, putting a Council led process on hold whilst sorting out transport may lead to Developer led outcomes overtaking, given known landowner intentions; and</li> <li>Even with additional work, It may not be possible to achieve the desired transport solution ahead of residential development.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Timing Implications for Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban development may occur earlier than can be provided through Option 1 regardless of whether transport issues have been sorted;</li> <li>May lose the opportunity to develop Ladies Mile in a way that integrates with the existing urban areas and is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure; and</li> <li>A Developer led approach, may reduce the pressure working with ORC &amp; Waka Kotahi on delivering a transport solution that addresses the needs of both the existing and future communities of Te Pūtahi – Ladies Mile.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Financial costs to Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For option 2 (lower density) Infrastructure costs likely to remain the same, resulting in higher costs per dwelling, thereby reducing housing affordability;</li> <li>There is currently uncertainty regarding methods to address issues relating to transport that would need to be resolved;</li> <li>The costs associated with resolving these issues are currently unknown; and</li> <li>Council would continue to bear the financial costs of leading the urbanisation process including any subsequent further consultation, plan changes and environment court appeals.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Financial costs to Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential costs to Council in the event that a Private Plan change or Resource Consent is sought; and</li> <li>May call into question previously agreed investment with Central Government Partners in respect of the long-term and integrated approach to land use and infrastructure planning such the HIF.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Community Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The feedback received through consultation on the draft Te Pūtahi Masterplan shows a low level of community support, this may have political implications for the Council should this Option proceed, however this could be reduced via option 2 (consider lower density and additional time to work on the traffic)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Community Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council and the Community has limited control over how the area will develop if they are not leading the process;</li> <li>The area could deliver a density that doesn't support either Public Transport improvements, other community facilities or a viable town centre, continuing the need to travel for all by car; and</li> <li>May continue to deliver the same unaffordable standalone housing as now and so doesn't deliver better for existing and future community needs.</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Strategic Document(s) Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is currently uncertainty regarding the methods to address issues relating to transport that would need to be resolved prior to urbanisation being enabled (<b>Spatial Plan, Climate Action Plan</b>).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Strategic Document(s) Implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk that the land is further fragmented under the current rural densities, meaning any intention to urbanise effectively in the future will be limited, resulting in sub-optimal planning and urban design outcomes (<b>Spatial Plan</b>);</li> <li>Council's ability to influence the individual proposals put forward by landowners/developers is limited when compared to Option 1 and 2 (<b>RMA</b>)</li> <li>Lose ability to require higher density residential development which supports transport mode shift to public transport and active modes (<b>Spatial Plan, Climate Action Plan</b>)</li> <li>May limit Council's ability to strategically influence the diversity of the District's housing offering in this location (<b>Councils HBA (housing)</b>);</li> <li>With Private Plan Changes, there are limited grounds for rejection, it should also be noted that the <b>NPS UD 2020</b> includes a policy that require decision makers to be responsive to plan changes that would add significant capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if unanticipated by RMA planning documents or include out of sequence planned land release; and</li> <li>The <b>Climate Action Plan</b> has limited weight applied through a resource consent or private plan change process as it is a non-statutory document in RMA processes so may not be able to achieve a transit orientated development.</li> </ul>