

Queenstown Lakes District Council

Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Urban Intensification Variation

Hearing Panel Directions 4:

The Panel has been reading the material provided to date and has some initial questions it would like the Council (and other parties as they wish) to consider when presenting at the hearing (or earlier if it wishes). The Panel considers that asking these questions now will enable a more efficient and effective hearing. To be clear, the Panel presently has no position on these questions (that will all be determined through the hearing) and the Panel will have more questions during the hearing.

The questions are:

1. The 2021 HBA identified that the district has more than sufficient plan enabled capacity to meet the demand in all locations of the district for the short, medium, and long terms scenarios. We recognise that the Council must give effect to the NPS-UD but what are the fundamental drivers for the "very large [capacity] compared to demand in most locations" proposed in the UIV in Policy 5 and 2 terms? In relation to Policy 5 how do these drivers fit with the word "commensurate"? The Panel is not stating that greatly exceeding demand is necessarily an issue (and we have evidence of benefits). We just want to be very clear of the connections to, and alignment with, Policies 5 and 2 that underpin the UIV.
2. Please explain the existing dwelling capacity in the identified Arrowtown area and the basis for concluding that its existing zones (in their current state) do not already provide sufficient dwelling capacity to address NPS: UD policies 5 and 2. This is especially so given its "less central location". What is the Policy 5 and 2 'resource management issue' for Arrowtown and how does this fit with the use of "commensurate" in Policy 5?
3. Please explain the identified area of the Arrowtown settlement. Although reliance is placed on the Arrowtown Design Guide 2016 this is approaching 10 years old. Please include in the explanation why "Arrowtown" Lifestyle Village should or should not be considered part of Arrowtown.
4. Please identify on a map or maps, the area(s) in Arrowtown other than the TCZ and ARHMZ that the Council says justify limiting dwelling capacity primarily due to the presence of S6 RMA historic heritage constraints, and the area(s) that are primarily due to S7 RMA amenity value (character) constraints. Indicatively, the Panel suggests that these differently statutorily weighted matters cannot be seen as interchangeable.

5. Please provide typical / representative examples of existing dwellings in Arrowtown in the proposed LDSRZ and MDRZ areas and explain the specific historic heritage and/or character values that warrant limiting development capacity.
6. Please explain with specific reasons why relevant historic heritage and/or amenity (character) values in Arrowtown would not be adequately protected by way of the notified UIV LDSRZ or MDRZ adjacent to them, including what specific adverse effects might result and how these are being measured.

If counsel for the Council has any queries in relation to the above matters, please let the Panel know via the Hearing Administrator.

David Allen, Ian Munro and Councillor Lyall Cocks

Commissioners

15 July 2025