

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

By email: services@qldc.govt.nz

Name of Submitter: Warwick Osborne
33 Suburb Street, Queenstown
0274469835

This is a submission on the Urban Intensification Variation to the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan ("the Variation").

I am not a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA 1991).

I am able to speak at the hearing

I am directly impacted by the urban intensification variation.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Chapter 9 - High Density Residential - Oppose
Chapter 12 – Queenstown Town Centre - Oppose

I oppose the Variation as identified in this submission.

My submission is:

I have resided at 33 Suburb Street, Queenstown for over 18 years where I have enjoyed the existing amenity values. The urban intensification variation would ensure that I would have my existing amenity value (ie) view, reduced significantly.

The evolution of the surrounding area over this time has been from a mix of owner occupier and long term rental to now a higher percentage of VA approved holiday homes and a decline in long term rental and owner occupiers.

Overtime the area has moved away from being an "affordable" area and in turn the VA portion has significantly increased, and the long term rental has reduced.

It is unlikely that the urban intensification variation would see any significant increase of affordable full-time housing in this specific area therefore not meeting the key objectives so a change would be not warranted or achieve the variation objective.

Additionally increased density in the area would also continue to add to the problem of water runoff on Queenstown hill.

The NPS-UD is a directive and "one size fits all" approach, motivated very much by achieving a "public good" (increasing affordable land/ housing supply), rather than recognising and maintaining the

environment that local communities value, and / or protecting people's quality of life in their neighbourhoods.

I do not believe there is a real need for the level of intensification proposed, as the Council's 2021 HCA identifies that the Plan and the spatial plan has sufficient capacity to accommodate housing growth and is more than sufficient to meet projected demand in all locations of the district in the short, medium and long term as required by the NPS.

Does the variation meet the aim of filling the affordable housing gap? While the feasible and realisable capacity meets the requirements of the NPS, the HCA identifies a shortfall of housing in price bands below \$500,000. There is no supporting analysis in the s32 report that intensification in the locations promoted will be affordable. In fact, the opposite is more likely with land values remaining high no matter the zoning. Further, the town centre zone in Queenstown has more of a tourism and hospitality focus, with the shopping needs of local residents being increasingly met at centres such as Frankton, where arguably the intensification should be.

Will this variation provide more housing? Visitor Accommodation is enabled in both the town centre and HDR zones. There can be no guarantee that the variation will result in increased actual housing in the HDR or town centre zones. There is no analysis of this in the s32 report.

The housing market of the Queenstown Lakes is different to other areas of New Zealand as a result of tourism and the low average household income in proportion to house prices and rental cost. This appears to be overlooked in the Council's justification for current areas of intensification as providing affordable housing supply.

The analysis and justification for intensification in the locations and to the extent proposed (including upzoning, some urban areas), is flawed given it does not explore or analyse the potential intensification in significant parts of the Queenstown Town Centre and zones that have not yet been reviewed in the staged Plan review.

When considered in the unique 'Queenstown Lakes context, the variation will not fulfil Objective 1 of the NPS-UD being well functioning urban environments and cultural well-being, and for health and safety – now and into the future. The proposed changes will instead add to the quota of unaffordable housing at a cost to the environment valued by local communities and tourists alike.

The underlying challenge is the maintenance of existing amenity value.

In respect of the Town Centre Zone, My Submission is that the 24 metre height will significantly reduce the amenity value of the town centre and will result in an urban form that is unattractive. The direct consequences of increased building volume include demands upon 3 waters infrastructure and further traffic and parking impacts (none of which have been addressed in the Variation), that will further erode the amenity of the town centre as a place to visit.

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That the zoning of 1- 17 Panorama Terrace, 26 - 34 Suburb Street and 7 – 13 Dublin Street be retained in the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone.

That the Maximum building height within the Town Centre zone be limited to 18m maximum.

.....

Signature of person authorised to sign
on behalf of submitter

21 September 2023

Address for Service of Submitter: 33 Suburb Street, Queenstown
Warwick.osborne@harcourts.co.nz
0274469835