

**Richard Powell for QLDC – Summary Statement for Infrastructure (Three Waters) Evidence**

1. I have provided evidence on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**Council**) addressing water supply, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure in relation to the Urban Intensification Variation (**UIV**). My evidence does not cover transport infrastructure. I have not prepared rebuttal evidence.
2. The UIV will enable additional development capacity across residential and commercial zones. This will place increasing pressure on three waters infrastructure, and while many upgrades are already planned and budgeted for in the Council's Long Term Plan (**LTP**), some projects may need to be brought forward if growth occurs faster than anticipated.
3. For potable water and wastewater, the delivery of Headworks infrastructure (e.g. reservoirs, trunk mains, treatment plants) is funded through development contributions and scheduled based on projected demand. Local collection and distribution infrastructure is more site-specific and often requires upgrades to be delivered directly by developers at the time of consent.
4. For stormwater, the Council's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 requires post-development runoff to be retained to pre-development levels, or to demonstrate that existing Council infrastructure can accommodate any additional flows. This ensures network neutrality and mitigates cumulative downstream effects from any increase in impervious areas.
5. I support the notified inclusion of "capacity of existing or planned infrastructure/servicing" as a matter of discretion for land use consents in the LDSRZ, MDRZ, and HDRZ. This enables Council to assess servicing capacity as intensification occurs and respond accordingly. I note, however, that my evidence confirms a density of 1 dwelling per 300m<sup>2</sup> is already enabled in the LDSRZ and anticipated in Council's infrastructure planning. Accordingly, no change to infrastructure planning is required for that zone.
6. My evidence includes commentary on infrastructure capacity in key urban areas including Queenstown, Frankton, Wānaka, Hāwea, Arrowtown, Arthurs Point, and the Kelvin Peninsula. I identify where planned upgrades are sufficient to support additional

development, and where localised constraints may require developer-led infrastructure improvements.

7. I support submissions that seek to retain servicing as a matter of discretion for land use consents, particularly in areas with known infrastructure constraints or where development uptake is uncertain. This allows Council to verify whether capacity is available and impose conditions or decline consent if necessary.
8. From an infrastructure efficiency perspective, I acknowledge that greenfield development areas can be serviced more cost-effectively when infrastructure is designed for higher densities from the outset. However, where unused capacity exists within established urban areas, this should be taken up first.
9. I do not support intensification of rural greenfield land where reticulated infrastructure is not currently available, unless the site is of a sufficient scale to support standalone infrastructure solutions in an efficient manner. I understand that rezoning of rural land is not within the scope of this Variation, but I give this position due to some submitters seeking rezoning of rural land.
10. Overall, I support the UIV framework subject to the retention of infrastructure servicing as a matter of discretion for land use consents. This provides a practical mechanism to ensure development is aligned with infrastructure readiness and funding availability.

**Richard Powell**

**28 July 2025**