

Natalie Hampson for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 17/18 - BDCA, General Industrial Zone, Settlement Zone (Hāwea)

1. My evidence discusses the latest update of the Business Development Capacity Assessment (BDCA) for Queenstown Lakes District (QLD). My evidence then focusses on the proposed General Industrial Zone (GIZ) and the economic costs and benefits of the proposed zoning.
2. I pay particular attention to submissions on the notified GIZ in Wanaka and also the proposals for GIZ in Victoria Flats. I comment briefly on submissions in Luggate¹ (where I support zoning that would enable the relocation of an existing trade supply and service business) and Arrowtown (where I do not support a change to Business Mixed Use Zone (BMUZ) due to the adverse effects this is likely to have on existing industrial and service activities which dominate that zone area²). My rebuttal evidence on the UDL³ submission in Hāwea covers the request for GIZ, Local Shopping Centre Zone (LSCZ) and residential zoning.
3. The BDCA, like its housing counterpart (the HDCA), is an assessment under the NPS–UDC designed to inform Council whether their zoning provisions are providing sufficient commercially feasible capacity to meet long-term demand for industrial, commercial and retail development. It is a high-level tool, based on a mix of data and assumptions, that should be used in conjunction with other local level data to help inform decision making and responsive planning by Council.
4. Permissive Operative industrial zones have not been successful in securing capacity for industrial and service growth due to competition for land by higher-value commercial, retail and other activities. I support the objectives, policies and rules of the GIZ, as modified by Mr Place in response to submissions. From an economic perspective, I consider that they will be effective in achieving the strategic objectives in Chapters 3 and 4 of the PDP and ensuring that industrial and service activities can operate sustainably in QLD. The GIZ complements other operative and proposed urban zones and the locations of GIZ supported in my evidence will lead to efficient and positive outcomes for the industrial and wider economy.
5. Overall, my research has shown that the ‘industrial economy’ accounts for a large number of businesses and employment in the district. It is not appropriate to compare QLD’s industrial economy with other districts. The mix and size of businesses is shaped by the nature of demand in this district and the district’s location and relationship with other economies. These drivers are not expected to

¹ Submission of Upper Clutha Transport (3256).

² Submission of Michael Thomas (3003).

³ Universal Developments Limited (3248).

materially change in the future. What we see today is a sound basis for future planning and continued strong growth relative to other sectors is projected.

6. **Relevant to all rezoning submissions:** In my view, a ‘surplus’ of capacity reported in the BDCA on its own is not justification to take capacity from one land use and give it to another. Nor should a reported ‘surplus’ of capacity prevent Council from zoning additional capacity where there are strategic benefits in doing so and the additional capacity materially enhances the functionality of urban areas/settlements in the short-medium term. Each site needs to be considered in the local and wider context.
7. While a reported ‘shortfall’ of industrial capacity in the BDCA in Queenstown does need to be addressed by Council, it is important that any decision is approached strategically in terms of long-term urban form outcomes. The BDCA is a key input to the Future Development Strategy (FDS) / Spatial Plan, which is intended to take a strategic and long-term approach to the future growth of the district. Council need only zone sufficient capacity to meet demand over the medium-term (i.e. next 10 years) and identify long-term growth areas in the FDS (i.e. to meet demand in 10-30 years’ time).
8. **Rezoning submissions:** I support the submission of WDL⁴ to rezone the area of GIZ in Three Parks to the Three Parks Business Zone and further extend that zone. In that location, the notified GIZ would not in my view be effective in achieving the objectives of the GIZ.
9. I do not support the Breen Construction et al⁵ or TRL⁶ submissions for BMUZ (or similar permissive outcomes) in place of GIZ west of Ballantyne Road. The economic benefits of retaining this cohesive industrial area as GIZ, including the centrally located greenfield site owned by TRL, outweigh the economic costs in my view.
10. While the GIZ proposed by CCCL⁷ and The Station at Waitiri Ltd (3357) may be commercially feasible from a development perspective, options to provide additional GIZ in, or adjoining, existing urban areas are likely to contribute more to the economic wellbeing of the Wakatipu Ward (and be more efficient and effective locations), and these potential opportunities still need to be evaluated. I consider that the economic benefits raised by CCCL are limited and are potentially not unique to the Victoria Flats location.

⁴ Willowridge Developments Limited (3220).

⁵ Submitters 3234, 3235, 3266, 3286, 3298, 3300.

⁶ Tussock Rise Limited (3128).

⁷ Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (3349).

-
11. I do not support the proposed GIZ in Hāwea sought by UDL. The wider economic benefits of consolidating industrial and service activity in Wanaka outweigh any opportunity costs for additional employment and shorter travel times for the local Hāwea community. In my view, the relatively large GIZ proposed in Hāwea would not make strategic sense from an economic and zoning perspective.
 12. I support the proposed LSCZ in Hāwea by UDL. While there is a reported surplus of commercial and retail capacity in the Wanaka Ward, there would be net economic benefits to the Hāwea community from this second centre.