

**David Compton-Moen for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 13 February 2017**

**Chapter 41 Jacks Point Zone – Hearing Stream 09**

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide Urban Design evidence on Chapter 41 of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**). The following are the key conclusions of my evidence and any subsequent changes following review of other relevant evidence.
2. The notified Education Innovation Campus (**EIC**) area could have a detrimental effect on the viability and vibrancy of the Jacks Point Village area.
3. Healthcare facilities are better suited to the Jacks Point Village area than the Education area, in order to maximise the number of uses and activities within the Jacks Point Village.
4. Development on sites larger than 380m<sup>2</sup> should become the threshold for permitted medium density development (subject to permitted activity standards), and for sites equal to or smaller than 380m<sup>2</sup>, consent should be required on a Restricted Discretionary basis. I consider that it is possible to design a typical standalone dwelling under the current activity standards on sites 380m<sup>2</sup> and above.
5. For medium density residential (**MDR**) development on sites where a density of more than one residential unit per 380m<sup>2</sup> will be created, a series of assessment matters should be addressed including, but not limited to, the provision of private outdoor living and proximity to public open space. I agree with the evidence of Mr Brett Thomson, paragraphs 41-55, which outlines the benefits of a Comprehensive Development Plan (**CDP**) for the Village and all activity areas. Prescriptive rules can often result in undesired outcomes where the CDP process tends to lead to a better design outcome. It provides the flexibility for developers to offset higher densities with higher amounts of open space. The proposed increase from 50% to 70% for MDR building coverage is too high in my view and would not allow sufficient on-site space for private outdoor living areas (communal outdoor spaces would be optional) or vehicle manoeuvring.
6. I consider that diversity and variation in lot size and dwelling typology are positive attributes to a development and can lead to greater housing affordability as well as catering to a greater proportion of the community. Not all people wish, or can afford, to buy a 3-4 bedroom, 180m<sup>2</sup> dwelling on a 400-600m<sup>2</sup> section. There is a

---

noted shortage of 1 and 2 bedroom units but this does not mean there has to be a loss of private or public amenity. Open space is instead moved from private ownership to public ownership where it can be utilised by more people.

7. Density standards (Standard 41.5.8.1) should be retained within the PDP as this has a direct impact on infrastructure planning and implementation, as well as the character of a neighbourhood/area. The current levels allow a level of flexibility that is considered positive without constraining development adversely. I partly agree with the evidence of Mr John Darby regarding the use of a gross area for determining density, but I consider that the relative residential yields that would eventuate under Ms Jones' recommended provisions should be maintained.
8. There is some variation in the numbers in terms of floor space in the Village AA in my evidence when compared to Ms Vicki Jones and Mr Timothy Heath based on different assumptions. I am comfortable with the differences as I feel the key aspects of good urban design are providing a legible movement network; the provision of an open space network; providing diversity of dwelling typology and achieving an appropriate relationship between the street and a building.
9. Standards for site coverage, setbacks, colour in terms of reflectivity and glare, continuous building length, height, garages and other built forms should be contained within the PDP to enable Council control. These are elements that could have tangible adverse effects on the living environment of neighbouring properties or the walkability of a neighbourhood for pedestrians.
10. I support the use of design guidelines for roof pitches, details, materials, window/glazing and door elevations, exterior cladding, boundary walls and fencing, under the control of a Design Review Board. These elements are considered more intangible in their value, albeit important, but more based on aesthetics than a physical effect.
11. The proposed PDP standards for the Village area over development of the Jacks Point Village and Education areas (and the EIC if it were to progress) are necessary in the PDP as the Jacks Point Village Building Design Guidelines approved by resource consent RM080410 contain high level urban design principles and do not contain prescriptive criteria. If design controls are not contained within the PDP, it could adversely limit the Council's ability to provide input into a design.