

Submitter 101 David Finlin

Thank you for the opportunity to speak, I apologise in advance if my terminology is not technically correct, as this process is not one, I am particularly familiar with.

I have been visiting Queenstown as a holiday destination for nearly 60 years and a resident in Queenstown for 30 having resided on the Ladies Mile for last 10 years.

I operate an arboricultural consultancy and contracting business in the district.

I am the property owner at the eastern boundary of the TPLM, immediately adjacent to the Threepwood development.

Queenstown is a spectacular place to reside and people clearly want to live here so it is our responsibility to do our best to provide capacity for this to occur.

Growth is inevitable and though it can cause pressure on the existing residents and town planning, the positive benefits of growth are huge, providing a rich diversity of people, employment opportunities beyond tourism, improved facilities, hospitals schools, aged care, supermarkets, retail and recreation activities, most of which were not readily available some 30 years ago.

So I am supportive of the proposed TPLM variation to the District Plan.

With regard to my submission, I wish to raise 3 points.

- A, I had raised in my submission and at the prehearing discussions matters relating to the amendments detailed in the Revised Eastern Boundary Study Plan (dating 27 Sept.23) Essentially the creation of a Landscape Buffer to the eastern edge of the boundary and adjustments to the Collector Road Type B.

I note that within TPLM Structural plan -General, dating 21/11/23, these matters have in the most part have been addressed.

- B. With regard to the Open Space Area, as detailed in the TPLM Structural Plan -General, dating 21/11/23, located toward the northeastern boundary of the property.

Referenced Table 2 Section 49.5.15 d. -The location of these items identified with a * on the structural plan shall be generally consistent with the Structural Plan.

I am in agreement with the proposed open space size/area however, I still believe that the location should have sufficient flexibility to allow a developer to integrate the park across the development.

I consider this would enable a developer to identify the most suitable location as part of their proposed mixed of dwellings and density across the HRD & MDR precincts within the site, and that the best location may only come to light as a development plan evolves.

I note that in the earlier Indicative Mater Planning maps for the Ladies Mile, Open Space Areas were expressed as an indicative circled area indicating the approximately location which I considered to be less prescriptive and provided a higher degree of flexibility as to the final location.

- C. With reference to staging of Transport and Infrastructural Works along State Highway 6.

As detailed in Hearing provisions 8th Dec.

Section 29.5.33 Staging of development to integrate with transport infrastructure.

Page 24, Sub-Areas -Transport and infrastructure works.

I am supportive of the proposed infrastructure and the pattern in which it is evolving through this planning process to date, however the staging of development being specifically linked to particular sub-areas is of a concern.

For convenience I would refer to Mr Smith Statement of Evidence on behalf of Waka Kotahi. Section 2.5.

Noting his recommended changes to the Structural Plan, highlighting 3 packages of Infrastructural work along the Ladies Mile.

The Transport infrastructural requirements are evenly dispersed over the length of the Ladies Mile, being at the middle and at either end.

Package 2: Stalker Roundabout, currently operational and will requiring further upgrade.

Package 3: Howards Drive, designed, may be amended and due to commence construction next year.

Package 4: Eastern Roundabout, an important component for active transport linkage noted on the Structural Plan but with no detail, design or commitment from the controlling authority Waka Kotahi.

Of the 120ha within the planning variation land area, there are 3 packages of Transport Infrastructure that identify with staging of development through Sub-areas A- I.

Sub-areas F & G staged to (Package 4) have a combined land area of around 11ha, 9% of the overall scope of the planned variation land area.

The balance of the land 91% is distributed within sub areas A-E & J-I. linked to staging Packages 2 & 3.

What I'm trying to articulate is that potentially 91% of the land can be delivered for development within Packages 2 & 3 whilst Sub areas F & G at 9% of land area is associated with the staging of Package 4.

This appears to be rather a disproportionately small amount of development area for the level of transport infrastructure assigned to these sub-areas F & G. when viewed over the collective staging.

My concern is, there is a risk that Waka Kotahi may consider this Package 4 of Transport Infrastructure very low priority and or may not prioritise it at all.

This would seriously disrupt the intended Major Active Transport Route connectivity with Lake Hayes Estate and State Highway 6 and prevent the delivery of many residences with Sub -areas F & G.

I would ask that council planners and you the commissioner to give further consideration as to how best to integrate the Sub-Areas with the staging of the Transport Infrastructural works.

This may be as achieved by including the Eastern Roundabout infrastructure along with the dedicated Western Bus Lane on State Highway 6 which requires the staging of Sub-Areas A,B,C,E,F, G as noted in the bottom of the Table in Section 49.5.33.

The eastern roundabout is fundamentally linked to the Major Active Transport Route and the Western Bus Lane on SH6, one cannot function without the other so there is in my view a logical synergy in combining them.

I respect that there may be a better alternative solution however, making no amendment to the current provisions may led to a less than desirable transport outcomes.

Finally, I wish to thank the commissioners, council staff, the planners, urban designer and consultants many of which have been working on this project for over 5 years, I personally cannot fault their professionalism and willingness to engage and assist with the multitude of complexities with this variation process.

I welcome any further questions.

Thankyou.

