

Amy Bowbyes for QLDC – Summary Statement for the Definitions, Urban Development and Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone

1. My evidence on PDP Chapters 2 – Definitions, Chapter 4 – Urban Development and Chapter 7 – Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (**LDSRZ**) provides recommendations on submissions received on the text of these chapters.
2. Only a small number of changes are proposed by the notified UIV to Chapters 2 and 4, and the main focus of my evidence is on the relief sought on Chapter 7.

Chapter 2 - Definitions

3. In my s42A I recommend that the notified definition of *outlook space* be amended to improve the clarity and operability of the notified definition. I recommend that the definition be amended to replace the words “principle living room” with “main living room”.
4. Ms Frishknecht’s evidence addresses use of the s42A recommended definition of *outlook space* in the provisions that include the term outlook space.
5. In my rebuttal evidence, I respond to planning evidence prepared by John Edmonds for Scenic Hotel Group Limited (763) that seeks amendments to the notified definition of *habitable room*. As outlined in my Rebuttal Evidence at Section 6, I recommend that the notified definition of *habitable room* be retained.
6. Scott Edgar has prepared planning evidence for the further submission of Edgar Planning Limited (FS1327) seeking amendments to the PDP definition of *ground level*. As outlined in my Rebuttal Evidence at Section 6, in my view the relief sought in FS1327 is not within the ambit of the relief sought in the original submissions that FS1327 is on. On this basis I recommend that the relief sought be rejected.

Chapter 4 – Urban Development

7. I do not recommend any changes to the notified version, which are minor, and attracted only minor matters in the relief sought by submissions.
8. No planning evidence was received from submitters on this Chapter. Therefore, I maintain the position expressed at Section 5 of my s42A Report.

Chapter 7 - LDSRZ

9. Turning to the LDSRZ chapter, due to the locations of the LDSRZ in less-central parts of the urban environment, and the LDSRZ's purpose to enable comparatively lower-intensity residential development, the notified changes to the LDSRZ place most emphasis on addressing identified barriers to achieving the density currently provided for.
10. Submissions received are in both support and opposition to the following key matters (in summary):
 - (a) Residential density – in particular regarding the proposed shift from the current *minimum* net site area to *average* net site area;
 - (b) Inclusion of matters of discretion to enable consideration of the capacity of existing or planned infrastructure/servicing and low impact stormwater design;
 - (c) Building heights, in particular the notified amendments to remove the current height restrictions on infill sites and sloping sites;
 - (d) Recession planes, in particular the notified amendments to remove the current recession plane exemptions for sloping sites;
 - (e) Building coverage and landscaped permeable surfacing, which the notified UIV does not propose to amend, however submitters seek amendments to increase permitted site coverage and decrease landscaped permeable surfacing requirements; and
 - (f) Setbacks, which the notified UIV does not proposed to amend, however a submitter seeks more permissive setbacks, including for corner sites.

11. In my s42A Report I recommend that notified Objective 7.2.6 be amended to broaden the Objective, so it applies to both existing and planned infrastructure.
12. Scott Freeman has prepared planning evidence for the “multiple Queenstown submitters” that seeks to amend notified Rule 7.5.5 to amend the requirement for compliance with recession planes on sloping sites. Mr Freeman’s evidence is supported by urban design evidence prepared by Paula Costello.
13. Ms Costello and Cameron Wallace (urban designer for QLDC) have completed Joint Witness Conferencing and have an agreed position that supports removal of the recession plane requirement for sloping sites (excluding for accessory buildings, which they agree should be subject to a recession plane with 25 degree angle, measured from a height of 2.5m above ground level, applied along internal boundaries).
14. At section 7 of my Rebuttal Evidence, I consider the evidence provided and consider the key reasons for the notified provisions. I acknowledge that there will be some instances where site conditions, including topography, will make development challenging.
15. However, I remain of the view that it is appropriate to apply recession planes to all buildings on sloping sites in the LDSRZ, and that restricted discretionary activity status for breaches to Rule 7.5.5 (as notified, which amended the activity status for breaches from non-comply in PDP Rule 7.5.5) provides an appropriate consenting pathway. In my view, restricted discretionary activity status for breaches demonstrates that breaches are anticipated, and are able to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Amy Bowbyes

28 July 2025