

**Timothy Heath 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 evidence on retail economic matters specifically in relation to the Jacks Point Zone Chapter 41 of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
2. Based on my research and analysis, the operative planning framework for the Jacks Point Village activity area already has more than sufficient allocation of developable land (15.07ha) to meet the 'at capacity' retail and commercial service requirements. This is my view even recognising the inclusion of the operative Hanley Downs Village area, which I understand interested parties agreed to remove and replace with residential, prior to notification of the PDP. In my opinion there is no economic basis to increase the Jacks Point Village area from 15.07ha (ODP) to 18.70ha (as notified), or to 26.80ha as included in the Jacks Point Memorandum of Counsel dated 15 December 2016 and subsequently confirmed in Mr Christopher Ferguson's evidence<sup>1</sup> for the Jacks Point submitters, without any relevant retail or commercial caps in place. Any increase in the allocated area of Jacks Point Village will increase the capacity for Jacks Point Village to develop a retail and commercial provision of a scale and scope that would create tension with the PDP strategic directions objectives, and would result in a level of enablement in the policy settings that seems unlikely to have been envisaged within the notified provisions.
3. In my professional opinion, given the 15.07ha land allocation for Jacks Point Village is already in the ODP, my recommendation would be to reduce the notified Village Activity Area to 15.07ha, and install retail and commercial activity caps to ensure the enablement of such activity is appropriately managed in the context of the PDP. If my recommended caps are imposed, the balance of the Jacks Point Village land (which is the vast majority of about 12.95ha under the ODP and about 16.58ha under the notified PDP) can be utilised by other land uses that facilitate and support both the Village's development and ongoing vitality and amenity to the community, such as high density residential, medical facilities, community facilities and Education activities. This would provide a cluster of synergistic activities that would enable positive economic agglomeration benefits to be generated for the good of both the community and the village development itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> Statement of Evidence of Christopher Ferguson dated 3 February 2017 for #762, 856, 1275 and 1277, Appendix 6 Jacks Point Zone Yield Analysis.

- 
4. Under Jacks Point's version set out in its Memorandum of Counsel dated 15 December 2016 and subsequently confirmed in evidence, about 24.68ha<sup>2</sup> could be utilised for other land uses (as above).
  5. My analysis suggests an 'at capacity' land requirement of 2.12ha (21,200sqm) of developable land is required for an efficiently developed retail and commercial service provision 'at grade'. This includes provision for a medium sized supermarket in the future.
  6. In respect of commercial office potential within Jacks Point Village, as in my Local Shopping Centre Zone evidence dated 2 November 2016 (Business Hearing Stream 8), I would recommend an individual tenancy cap of 200m<sup>2</sup> for both consistency and surety of development outcomes.
  7. The extension of Jacks Point Village proposed under the PDP to 18.7ha (or 26.8ha under the 15 December 2016 Memorandum / Jacks Point evidence) would only have merit in my view on the basis the EIC precinct was incorporated into the Village area, and retail and commercial caps were incorporated into the planning provisions. However, serious doubts remain in my mind about the veracity of the EIC concept being realised and demand for such activity to the extent envisaged, given the large land area involved.
  8. No other material retail or commercial service offerings are required in either the Jacks Point or Hanley Downs parts of the zone. Only the potential for a very small (few localised shops) within Hanley Downs is considered appropriate as in effect this market would be serviced by the Jacks Point Village convenience offer given its close proximity.

#### **Response to Relevant Submitter Evidence**

9. Mr Michael Copeland's evidence for the Jacks Point submitters asserts I have made incorrect assumptions in my statement.<sup>3</sup> However, my assessment was based on the notified version of the PDP and this was prepared prior to receiving the 15 December 2016 Memorandum identifying changes to the notified version.
10. The main point of difference between Mr Copeland and myself appears to be that I consider a retail and commercial service GFA cap is appropriate given the

---

<sup>2</sup> Calculation 26.8ha VJP less 2.12ha (Statement of Evidence of Timothy Heath dated 17 January 2017, Table 2, at page 13).

<sup>3</sup> Statement of Evidence of Michael Copeland dated 3 February 2017 at paragraphs 72-74.

---

extensive land area proposed for the Jacks Point Village, whereas Mr Copeland considers no cap is required.

11. Additionally, Mr Copeland appears to assume the envisaged activities within the Jacks Point Village will eventuate, whereas I consider there remains considerable uncertainty if envisaged land uses within the village do not get developed to the scale required to fill 26.8ha.
12. Mr Ferguson also for the Jacks Point submitters<sup>4</sup> appears to arrive at a position where he seems to have a level of comfort around the potential of an aggregate retail and commercial service cap within the Jacks Point Village, as he states "*the overall cap is unlikely to impose any real problem*".
13. The genesis of this position appears to be with Mr Copeland's view that the retail and commercial service activity in Jacks Point Village is likely to play a convenience role only. Based on this view, I respectfully suggest the submitter should therefore have no problem with a retail and commercial service cap within the village as recommended in my evidence.

---

<sup>4</sup>

Statement of Evidence of Christopher Ferguson dated 3 February 2017 at paragraph 11.13.