

Rachel Morgan for QLDC – Summary Statement on Residential Rezoning

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 I prepared evidence on submissions seeking rezoning requests for residential zones for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) on the Urban Intensification Variation (**UIV** or **Variation**).

1.2 In my evidence I provide recommendations to the Hearings Panel on the submissions, further submissions and evidence received on the proposed UIV mapping/zoning changes in Queenstown/Whakatipu and Wānaka for the Residential Zones. I have grouped my analysis of these submission points into topics by area.

2. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK / ZONING APPROACH

2.1 I set out the relevant statutory framework in Section 4 of my EIC. This is also discussed by Ms Bowbyes in her evidence.

2.2 The relevant objectives are contained in Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction and Chapter 4 – Urban Development, which are largely unchanged by the UIV. These chapters of the PDP set out the strategic approach to urban growth for the District. The objectives and policies in Chapter 3 and 4 are considered to give effect to the urban growth and form objectives and policies of the Operative (**ORPS**) and Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (**pORPS**).

2.3 Policy 5 is a key consideration for the UIV and is reflected in UFD-P3 of the pORPS, in particular clause (3), which directs Council to *enable heights and densities that meets the greater of demonstrated demand for housing and/or business use or the level of accessibility provided for by existing or planned active transport or public transport*.

2.4 A range of matters informed the notified boundaries of the Residential Zones including primarily the accessibility and relative demand analysis and the residential development capacity analysis, although these are not the only considerations. Translating this to mapped zone extents requires planning judgement and there is some flexibility in how they are applied depending on the site and environmental context.

- 2.5** In this context, the submissions I have considered have required me to consider what is the most appropriate zone (e.g. the MDRZvs. LDRSZ) for a particular submission site.

3. AREA 1: EAST OF QUEENSTOWN GARDENS – LAND FROM PARK STREET TO CECIL ROAD

- 3.1** I support applying the HDRZ as per the notified UIV to Area 1 because, as the most intensive residential zone in the UIV, the HDRZ would be commensurate with the area’s high level of accessibility and high relative demand for housing when considered relative to other locations in Queenstown (Policy 5) and UFD-P3 of the pORPS. Relying on the evidence of Mr Powell, development can be effectively integrated with existing and proposed infrastructure over time (Policy 3.2.2.1).

4. AREA 2: NORTHEAST OF QUEENSTOWN TOWN CENTRE AND FRANKTON ROAD

- 4.1** I do not support any downzoning or reduction in height in this area in response to submissions. In my view the proposed application of the MDRZ and the expanded HDRZ within this location would be commensurate with the area’s high and moderate levels of accessibility and high relative demand for housing when considered relative to other locations in Queenstown (Policy 5) and UFD-P3 of the pORPS.

- 4.2** To ensure consistency of urban form, Mr Wallace supports extending the MDRZ in addition to the 8m height control to a small number of isolated sites around Windsor Place, northeast of the Queenstown Town Centre. I agree that this amendment would support a logical and integrated zoning pattern despite the topography being a barrier to accessibility.

5. AREA 3: FERNHILL

- 5.1** Submissions sought the rezoning of 139 Fernhill Road, 10 – 18 Richards Park Lane and 18 – 22 Aspen Grove to MDRZ. Ms Fairgray has confirmed that this rezoning is supportable from a market demand perspective. Mr Wallace is of the view that the rezoning will result in a logical zoning pattern and enable comprehensive redevelopment of a larger landholding, despite it having a relatively lower level of accessibility. I agree with this expert advice.

- 5.2** I do not support including 45 Wynyard Crescent within the MDRZ given the lack of accessibility and elevation changes between Fernhill Road and Wynyard Crescent. In my view this rezoning request will result in a “spot zone” and will not achieve a logical and integrated built form outcome.

6. AREA 4: REMARKABLES PARK

- 6.1** Relying on the expert advice of Mr Wallace and Ms Fairgray, I support the notified zoning and height limits in Remarkables Park, as the MDRZ is commensurate with the area's moderate level of accessibility and relative demand for housing when considered relative to other locations in Queenstown (Policy 5) and UFD-P3 of the pORPS. Relying on the evidence of Mr Powell, development can be effectively integrated with existing and proposed infrastructure over time (Policy 3.2.2.1).

7. AREA 5: BRIDESDALE

- 7.1** I recommend retaining the notified MDRZ and applying a maximum 8m height limit to the site via a further amendment to notified Rule 8.5.1. In my opinion, the lower height limit would be commensurate with the lower level of accessibility that the area has and would be consistent with the patterns of relative demand in this location as assessed by Ms Fairgray.

8. AREA 6: ARTHURS POINT

- 8.1** I support rezoning the site at 117 Arthurs Point Road from LDSRZ to MDRZ, subject to applying notified Rule 8.5.1.1(a) consistent with the surrounding MDRZ. The site is currently under development and has resource consent for a four storey multi-unit development on the site. I do not support the request to rezone 111 Atley Road given it has poor accessibility and the MDRZ would form an isolated pocket of higher density zoning on the edge of the current Arthurs Point urban boundary.

9. AREA 7: FRANKTON ROAD

- 9.1** I support the notified zoning pattern set out in the UIV given the demand for housing in this area identified by Ms Fairgray. I do not support further upzoning as I agree with Mr Wallace that there are accessibility issues that are challenges to further intensification in this area.
- 9.2** Mr Harland has provided evidence on behalf of Alistair Hey, Carl Smiley, Barbara Jarry, Duncan & Teija Boscoe. I agree that a modest amendment to the extent of the MDRZ on the northern side of Peregrine Place/Star Lane/Sunset Lane to apply the LDSRZ would be appropriate. The zoning amendment occurs at the outer edge of the MDRZ and applies to 15 sites, and therefore has a minor impact on capacity. The amendment would achieve a logical and coherent zoning boundary in my opinion.

10. AREA 8: MDRZ AROUND WĀNAKA (SOUTH AND WEST OF THE WĀNAKA TOWN CENTRE)

10.1 I support applying the MDRZ as per the notified UIV to Area 8 given this area has been identified by Mr Wallace as having generally moderate to high levels of accessibility. Further, Ms Fairgray is of the view that the notified UIV-proposed MDRZ in south-west Wānaka is likely to be more efficient and better aligned with relative demand in this location than the current LDSRZ. Relying on the evidence of Mr Powell, there are no fundamental infrastructure constraints and infrastructure provision can be coordinated with development through the resource consent and building consent process.

10.2 Mr Wallace has considered the view raised in submissions that the escarpment provides a natural transition point for the boundary between the MDRZ and LDSR Zone within this area. I agree with Mr Wallace that the golf course provides a more appropriate transition point that acknowledges the overall intent of the NPSUD which seeks to encourage greater levels of intensification in existing urban areas.

10.3 I do not support downzoning in response to concerns about the high groundwater table and the impacts of development on the Wānaka Basin Cardrona Gravels Aquifer. In my opinion, the Regional Plan provisions relating to groundwater will manage the potential effects of development on the Aquifer.

11. AREA 9: EAST OF WĀNAKA TOWN CENTRE

11.1 I agree with the majority of submitters and consider that the notified upzoning 1-7 Ballantyne Road to MDRZ is not appropriate. The sites cannot in practice be used for residential development given their National Park status and public use. As such, I recommend retaining LDSRZ as per the PDP for this area.

11.2 I support retaining the notified MDRZ for the sites on McPherson Street as a means of supporting a compact urban form for Wānaka.

12. AREA 10 and 11: SOUTH, WEST AND EAST OF BUSINESS MIXED USE IN WĀNAKA

12.1 I support the zoning and height limits as notified in the UIV in the area to the south, west and east of the Business Mixed Use Zone in Wānaka. The MDRZ is commensurate with the area's moderate level of accessibility and relative demand for housing when considered

relative to other locations in Queenstown (Policy 5) and UFD-P3 of the pORPS. Relying on the evidence of Mr Powell, development can be effectively integrated with existing and proposed infrastructure over time (Policy 3.2.2.1).

13. AREA 12: THREE PARKS

13.1 Mr Wallace has supported requests seeking to rezone 7 Ballantyne Road, 100 and 124 Wānaka-Luggate Highway HDRZ given this area is accessible to Wānaka Town Centre by off road cycling facilities and is located approximately 400m from the school and recreation centre. Further, Mr Wallace supports the requested rezoning as the sites are currently vacant which enables the delivery of more intensive typologies in a comprehensive manner in a way that does not give rise to adverse urban design effects. I agree with this expert advice.

13.2 I have considered the evidence of Mr Thompson on behalf of Willowridge Developments, Orchard Road Holdings and Three Parks Properties. I generally agree with Mr Thompson's analysis and consider that a further expansion of the MDRZ extent recommended in my EIC would be efficient and effective, having regard to the site's accessible location, ability to be serviced with infrastructure and the need to use greenfield land efficiently for urban development in light of strong demand. However, I recommend an amendment to the activity status for subdivision from controlled to restricted discretionary to ensure that matters such as roading layout and lot design can be comprehensively considered.

14. AREA 13: NORTH WĀNAKA

14.1 Mr Wallace notes that Clearview Street is an area that performs relatively poorly in terms of the Accessibility and Demand Analysis. Mr Wallace further notes that in contrast, The Heights performs moderately well due to its proximity to schools, open spaces and employment opportunities. Based on these factors Mr Wallace supports a reduction in the heights that apply to the MDRZ around Clearview Street. I agree with the expert view of Mr Wallace on this matter.

15. AREA 14: WĀNAKA SOUTH

15.1 I support the rezoning of 45 Cardrona Valley Road to MDRZ on the advice from Ms Fairgray that this zoning will support the viability of the smaller commercial centre. I also agree with

Mr Wallace that there is an opportunity to deliver a more comprehensive housing development without giving rise to adverse urban design effects.

- 15.2** I agree with Ms Fairgray and Mr Wallace that the northeastern site is a less efficient location for MDRZ based on the existing range of activities and services in the area.

16. AREA 15: THOMSPON STREET

- 16.1** My EIC did not specifically address the zoning of this area but it is addressed in my rebuttal evidence. I agree with the comments made by Ms Clouston regarding the HDRZ being more commensurate to the level of accessibility in this area, particularly in light of Mr Wallace's comments regarding its potential future accessibility as the build out of the PC50 area progresses. Furthermore, I acknowledge that the extension of the HDRZ along Thompson Street will result in a more consistent zoning pattern. On this basis I support the rezoning of the MRDZ properties on Thompson Street and Lomond Crescent to HDRZ.

Rachel Morgan

25 July 2025