

### **Amy Bowbyes for QLDC – Summary Statement for Strategic Evidence**

1. My evidence provides an overview of the purpose of the UIV, including its strategic context, the strategic issue that the UIV addresses, how it responds to the future urban growth challenges of the District and how it gives effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPS-UD**) that apply to QLDC as a Tier 2 authority, in particular Policy 5.
2. My evidence also responds to various submissions received on the strategic approach to the UIV, including responding to submissions on scope and the rationale for the notified Variation. My evidence also explains how the ‘urban environment’ is defined in the specific context of the District.

### **Summary of the purpose of the UIV**

3. The UIV seeks to specifically give effect to Policy 5 of the NPS-UD. This is a statutory requirement for all Tier 2 authorities.
4. Giving effect to Policy 5 will increase the district’s urban development capacity, which in turn will assist with achieving Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The development patterns encouraged through the application of Policy 5 have important effects on achieving a well-functioning urban environment, including through increasing development opportunities for attached housing in locations that meet the parameters of Policy 5.
5. In its simplest form, the UIV focuses greatest development opportunity in locations of greatest accessibility and/or demand. This will have the effect of enabling more development closer to jobs, community services, public and active transport and other amenities.
6. The UIV assists with implementing the QLD Spatial Plan 2021, which prioritises intensification and also identifies locations for future urban development via strategic future urban expansion. Whilst the scope of the UIV does not include urban expansion, it is noteworthy that future changes to the district plan signalled in the Spatial Plan will strategically provide for greenfield growth, resulting in additional development capacity.

**Summary of recommendations in my s42A Report on Strategic Evidence**

7. I recommend that submissions seeking an alternative interpretation of ‘urban environment’ be rejected, and that submissions seeking that the scope of the notified Variation be broadened to include land outside of the urban environment and land governed by the Operative District Plan to be rejected. This is a Variation to the Proposed District Plan. Submissions also cannot expand what has been notified, which is addressed by legal counsel.
8. I recommend that submissions seeking complete retention of the PDP status quo (i.e. submissions opposing any intensification), and submissions generally seeking greater enablement of development be rejected. In my view the notified proposal and subsequent amendments recommended in the various s42A Reports and Rebuttal Statements sit between these positions expressed in submissions received. In my view the Variation is also required so that the Council can give effect to the NPS-UD.
9. I recommend that submissions generally seeking greater enablement of development in the Queenstown Airport Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) be rejected, and that the existing PDP framework that limits Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (**ASANs**) be retained. I consider that the approach taken in the notified UIV is the most appropriate method to achieve the objective of the UIV, balancing the requirements of the NPS-UD whilst managing the effects of activities, including reverse sensitivity effects whilst implementing the strategic provisions of the PDP. I had this view before reading the airport filed by the Queenstown Airport Corporation, but acknowledge that it aligns with that evidence.
10. I recommend that submissions opposing the notified amendments to design guide references be accepted, so that the year references are correct. While no evidence has challenged this, in short the content of the design guides have not been reviewed through the notification of the UIV, and a separate process needs to be followed given those documents are incorporated into the PDP by reference.
11. I recommend that submissions that generally oppose intensification due to infrastructure capacity constraints be rejected. As outlined in the s32 Report, the Council’s approach towards current infrastructure constraints, is that if an area performs well in terms of Policy 5 of the NPS-

UD and the infrastructure can be upgraded in the future to service intensification, then the current infrastructure constraints are not considered to be a constraint to enabling intensification. This approach is supported by infrastructure evidence provided by Mr Powell, for QLDC.

**Summary of recommendations in my Rebuttal Evidence**

- 12.** In my rebuttal statement I consider the planning evidence provided by Scott Edgar for Scott and Jocelyn O'Donnell (641, 657, FS1358) regarding visitor accommodation activities in the High Density Residential Zone. I have considered Mr Edgar's evidence, and I have amended by position on whether visitor accommodation activities are within scope of the UIV.
- 13.** As outlined at Section 4 of my Rebuttal Statement, I agree with Mr Edgar that visitor accommodation activities are within scope, but only insofar as the UIV amendments to heights and density of development have bearing on visitor accommodation activities. Ms Frischknecht addresses this further.

**Amy Bowbyes**  
**28 July 2025**