

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY THE
QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
IN THE MATTER of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation in accordance
with section 80B and 80C, and Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the
Resource Management Act 1991.

**REPLY TO QUESTIONS ASKED OF ROBIN ALEXANDER KEITH MILLER
5 December 2023**

PO Box 323 QUEENSTOWN 9348
Tel +64 3 379 7622
Fax +64 3 379 2467

WYNN WILLIAMS

Solicitors: L F de Latour | K H Woods
(lucy.delatour@wynnwilliams.co.nz |
kate.woods@wynnwilliams.co.nz)

Introduction

- 1 My full name is Robin Alexander Keith Miller. I am the Director of Origin Consultants Ltd.
- 2 I prepared a statement of evidence on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) dated 29 September 2023 on the submissions and further submissions to the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation (**TPLM Variation**). I also provided rebuttal evidence dated 10 November 2023.

Response to Questions

- 3 My response to the questions filed by Glenpanel Developments and the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust are set out in **Attachment A** below.

Robin Alexander Keith Miller

05 December 2023

Attachment A: Response to Joint Questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)

#	Question	Responses
36	<p>You say that maintaining heritage features is one of the important contextual aspects of placemaking and that the study area extended from the Shotover River to Lake Hayes. Do you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consider that heritage attributes have been fully acknowledged and incorporated? b) Would this have been improved by including the expansion area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No – see my EIR at [16]. b) No – There are a number of heritage features located between Lakes Hayes and the Shotover River, and all are situated in a rural setting. Further extending the TPLM area would likely impact the contextual setting of these features.
49	<p>Do you agree that the Precinct and homestead need to be viewed in the wider context of other elements/features and their significance in terms of placemaking, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The historic Shotover River bridge (b) The Ferry Hotel and other buildings on the lower eastern river embankment (c) Spence Road as the historic entry route (d) The water races across Slope Hill (e) The three gully networks on Slope Hill identified by geological and landscape experts? 	<p>Together, these features tell a story of the early European settlement of the Wakatipu Basin and represent key transport routes, infrastructure, and industries. I cannot speak to (e). Their connections as early features does not equate to their needing to be included in the TPLM area.</p> <p>I do not really understand what is suggested by (f). I assume it relates to the proposition of linking heritage features along a trail route. If so, I think a route could be beneficial to the wider heritage features outside of the</p>

#	Question	Responses
	<p>And that:</p> <p>(f) The Collector Road and route along the toe of Slope Hill need to add / expand / support integrating the wider heritage features.</p>	<p>TPLM, but I don't think it is essential to the heritage significance/value of the Homestead.</p>
50	<p>Do you agree:</p> <p>(a) the value of the Homestead to the community (identity, heritage, placemaking, amenity) is too high to leave as residential;</p> <p>(b) but in order to enable the long term public use of the Homestead, it needs to be commercially viable and supported by surrounding uses of critical mass to ensure that it is protected, and appreciated, for the long term future.</p>	<p>(a) No, it could potentially remain as residential, but given the current high-end nature of the Homestead and the density of the surrounding proposed development, I think it is more likely that an adaptive reuse will maintain its heritage values in the long-term.</p> <p>(b) Agree – the intention is that adaptive reuse could provide a viable use for the Homestead, supported by the surrounding residential development. It provides an adaptive reuse opportunity that could potentially benefit both the listed heritage building and the people who live and work in the TPLM area.</p>

#	Question	Responses
51	<p>You consider that the proposed densities' and associated building heights have the potential to adversely effect the Glenpanel Homestead.</p> <p>Do you agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The primary objectives are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Preserve (as much as possible) the integrity of the key-elements – Homestead and surrounding grounds? ii. Establish the Precinct as a important 'heritage node' in terms placemaking and wayfinding? and b) If so, that enabling greater density and building height away from the key elements better would support the adaptive reuse of the Homestead – and thereby optimise heritage and public access outcomes? 	<p>(a) (i) Agree. (ii) Agree</p> <p>(b) I presume this question is asking about the potential for 'enabling development' within the Glenpanel Precinct. I agree with the principle of enabling development, but stress that to be acceptable in heritage terms, it needs to respect and protect heritage values. Each case should turn on its own merits. Greater density and building height might generate more revenue but could come at a price for the heritage values of the Homestead. There also needs to be a mechanism within an enabling development scheme to ensure that the revenue generated is <i>actually</i> ploughed back into the maintenance, and preferably the enhancement, of the building or site's heritage values.</p>
51	<p>Given the transport requirements for a midway (between the two signalised intersections) the Connector entry road from the SH and associated pedestrian crossing proposed by Glenpanel, do you also agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This new link and its alignment provides an important direct physical (pedestrian-centric) and visual link to the Homestead and grounds, and; 	<p>I believe this is something that has been raised as part of the traffic/transport conferencing. If I am correct on this, my responses are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) I would like to see the existing Glenpanel Homestead drive from the SH reused as a pedestrian/cyclist and visual link to the Homestead site. b) i. Yes, if it utilises the existing drive as above.

#	Question	Responses
	<p>b) That this added amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Effectively acts as an extension of the Homestead 'experience?'; and ii. Effectively alleviates many of his concerns with respect to building heights? <p>Providing for graduated building heights north of the Collector Road through the building setbacks and heights proposed, is a better approach to maintain and optimise heritage values than the proposed current conditions provide for?</p>	<p>ii. No</p>