

Alistair Hey (Submitter Number 281)

Subject – Urban Intensification Variation – Lay Witness Evidence

1. I have submitted in opposition to the change in zoning of the land in the block shown in my submission from low density zoning (LDRZ) to medium density zoning (MDRZ) being that land in the vicinity of Sunset and Star Lanes and Peregrine Place.
2. I own and have lived at 86 Hensman Road for varying periods since 1998, having bought the site off the plans in 1992.
3. Relevantly, I have extensive experience developing residential and mixed use property in Queenstown and elsewhere, including the house at 86 Hensman Road, medium density residential development on Melbourne Street, and a comprehensive residential development on Belfast Terrace, Queenstown Hill. Through that experience, I have in-depth knowledge of the block of land that is the subject of my submission, the feasibility of developing property on Queenstown Hill, and the key attributes that attract people to certain parts of Queenstown.
4. I note that the Council's experts now support amending the MDRZ boundary to run along the southern boundary of these lanes. As a consequence, I take it that all experts now agree that the sites to the immediate south of my property should not be zoned MDRZ. This is positive and satisfies the specific concerns I raised in my submission about the effects on visual amenity of the building height enabled by the MDRZ and about the ability of Star Lane in particular to accommodate any extra housing.
5. That said, in the event that the panel wish to further consider the issue of height for some reason, I provide the following observations.
6. The key, and in all reality, the only attribute of this area is the view. The area faces south; has very limited sun in the winter which causes the lanes and footpaths to be icy creating hazardous conditions for pedestrians; is expensive to build on due to the topography; and has no public transport, with the nearest being Frankton Road which, during freezing conditions, is mostly unwalkable.
7. Star lane is very narrow, has no ability to carry any additional traffic, and has no footpaths.
8. With reference to the cross sections in Mr Rhind's evidence and whether they depict realistic development options on the site:
 - a) Under LDRZ it is highly unlikely that redevelopment of the sites on the northern side of Star Lane would extend to the rear sites. Given that only 1 – 2 units would be enabled, the width of the sites (which would easily enable duplex style development) and the fact the lower parts of these sites are still sufficiently

elevated to provide for views, the significant additional cost of building at the rear of the sites is unlikely to be justified. As such, the 8 m high building envelope shown extending to the rear of these sites in those cross sections is not a realistic outcome.

- b) To the contrary, under MDRZ the ability to build 3 units as permitted and an unlimited number of units (as a restricted discretionary activity, as I understand it) mean that 12m high buildings at the rear of these sites would be a realistic development outcome if the rezoning was to proceed.

Yours faithfully

Alistair W Hey