PROPOSED TE PŪTAHI LADIES MILE PLAN VARIATION

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL LOWE ON BEHALF OF THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

1. As directed by paragraph 12.2 of Hearing Minute 1, I set out below a summary of the key points of my evidence.

2. I have prepared a statement of evidence in chief dated 29 September 2023, and a statement of rebuttal evidence dated 10 November 2023. I have provided answers to written questions from submitters dated 24 November 2023.

3. **Appendix A** of this summary provides a written response to the Hearing Panel Minute: Pre-Hearing Questions dated 21 November 2023.

Succinct summary of key points of my evidence

4. The TPLM zone provisions give effect to the unique outcomes sought for in the TPLM Structure Plan as a well-functioning urban environment set out in paragraph 15 of my EIC. The zone provisions were crafted using a suite of well-considered and well-designed site-specific provisions. Several notable rules include: requiring the efficient use of land through minimum and maximum residential density standards; helping building massing sit sensitively within the wider rural and landscape character context through rules for building heights, building separation, boundary setbacks and landscape buffers; enabling a connection to nature through more generous minimum residential outlooks, yard sizes, and landscape requirements; and helping to limit vehicular congestion through maximum carparking ratios and minimum cycle parking end of trip facilities.

5. These provisions were thoroughly developed and tested in 3D computer software using a range of density scenarios on a large ~7Ha test site. The proposed provisions considered key reference documents including the MDRS, the Auckland Unitary Plan Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone, and QLDC PDP. The provisions were continually tested through the evolution of the TPLM Structure Plan by members of the design consortium (which included three urban design professionals, and planners). That process concluded that the proposed TPLM Variation provisions would enable a balanced consenting approach between controlling for good outcomes and giving the market flexibility to enable a diverse range of housing

typologies and a range of development approaches to be used on the development site in question.

6. I consider the proposed *minimum and maximum residential density* requirement is the most critical rule. In my opinion, the rule is needed to ensure several outcomes:

   (a) That land in this finite growth corridor is efficiently developed over a 100+ year long-term outlook, noting that once this land is developed at medium - high densities it will be incredibly challenging to increase the density retrospectively due to the granulated and fragmented land ownership;

   (b) Deliver the population density to enable sufficient uptake of public transport and mode-shift;

   (c) Through the maximum densities, avoid enabling too much housing yield which would lead to unacceptable congestion levels on SH6; and

   (d) Steer housing variety towards smaller higher-density typologies which will improve the overall housing diversity in the prevalent low density neighbouring suburbs.

Latest position on the matters remaining in dispute (including any answers through the question process)

<u>Updates to the provisions in response to submissions:</u>

7. The East and Western site boundary edges were updated to soften the transition of the TPLM Variation area's rural edges through the introduction of planting buffers and a revised Collector Road B cross section. The maximum 2 storey height overlay along the Western site boundary has also been extended. These updates are shown in the current Structure Plan and Building Heights Plan provided to the Hearing Panel on 27 November 2023.

8. More height has also been enabled in the Eastern edge of the Glenpanel Precinct (as requested by Glenpanel) to lessen the building height transition adjoining the HDR Precinct. This is shown in the current Building Heights Plan. The dimension of a no build zone around the historic homestead is yet to be finalised.

Provisions which remain in dispute with submitters:

9. The minimum and maximum density range for HDR Precinct has been reduced from the notified range of 60-72h/Ha gross to 50-72h/Ha gross, along with the introduction of an alternative 55h/Ha average density calculation method. This was in response to relief sought from several submitters (mainly landowners and developers). I note that Ms Fairgray's calculations indicate a 55h/Ha average is likely to require between 200 and 400 higher density apartment dwellings in the HDR Precinct if the remainder of dwellings were constructed at medium densities of around 40 to 45 dwellings per hectare. For completeness, I note my 7ha theoretical yield bulk and location studies show that you could also achieve the 55h/Ha average with fewer 6-storey apartments if a greater share of the remaining yield was delivered as walk-up apartments.

10. Corona Trust Limited seeking reduced effects from the increased density in Sub Area H2 (outlined in my Responses to Questions):

    (a) I consider the proposed 4m setback rule along with a 25m minimum lot width rule adjoining the submitters land results in an edge condition generally consistent with Koko Ridge Limited's existing subdivision consent requirements, with the difference being acceptable given the submitters land sits within an urbanising growth corridor.

    (b) In my opinion, requiring a formalized planted landscape buffer within the Koko Ridge land as sought by the submitter is not necessary given the above.

    Dated: 4 December 2023

Appendix A - Response to Hearing Panel Minute: Pre-Hearing Questions

1.23 Is 2,400 dwellings seen as a minimum, maximum or something in between? What are the implications of the answer in terms of transportation and urban design? Do the TPLM provisions as proposed provide suitable clarity of intentions in relation to those same development limits? Would 2,400 dwellings, predominantly consisting of 1-2 bedroom dwellings, have different traffic and infrastructure effects to 2,400 dwellings predominantly consisting of 3-4 bedroom dwellings?

11. Good urban design is about achieving balanced outcomes across various (at times competing) functions. In this case there is a tension between transport capacity vs enabling long-term housing supply. The 2400 dwellings 'cap' is based on the transport modelling assessment (as is outlined by Mr Shields in his response to this question). It is a transport related limitation only and in my opinion the Structure Plan could incorporate more yield from an urban design perspective if this transport constraint was resolved.

1.25 How robust is the likely delivery of the density levels, especially given the uncertainty as to when or if the highest density outcomes will occur? Is it likely that (here and now) low and medium density will be more attractive to the market – and if more is included then how will overall density levels be achieved? How would minimum density requirements (whether gross or net) be affected by potentially land-intensive non-residential activities such as schools, churches, stormwater systems and other infrastructure locating in areas subject to those requirements? Is more medium density required elsewhere in TPLM (or on land owned by submitters subject to scope issues) to make up the slack?

12. The revised lower end minimum density has been reduced to 50h/Ha in Mr Brown's rebuttal evidence. My bulk and location yield studies show that this density can be achieved at 2-3 level building typologies with potentially zero 6 storey apartments. The economics JWS states that low rise apartments, terraces and duplexes are likely to be realised in the short term, and that tall apartments are a long-term prospect.

13. The density modelling and minima and maximum range takes into consideration loss of developable land due to public schools, key structure plan elements like main roads, and a further (15%) for stormwater. However, there are uncertainties for example: if schools were not built; if land is developed to a higher site building coverage or efficiency than predicted and the density cap is reached pre-maturely; if land for stormwater ends up greater or less than the 15% allowance.

14. Built environments are constantly changing and will be shaped by externalities which we cannot predict. The TPLM Variation is our best judgement at this moment and will undoubtably be recalibrated in the next District Plan cycle in 10 year's time to align with a new development demand outlook.

1.37 Please explain in its entirety the 'gateway' into Queenstown from 'end to end', including with reference to the setback along the southern side of SH6 adjacent to Frankton Flats? How important is the 'gateway' and is it referred to in any District Plan objectives or policies? Other than a landscaped setback, what other ways can a gateway be expressed and were these considered? (This is particularly relevant to the Panel's consideration of what form of development and development setback might be most appropriate.)

15. Mr Dun's statement has primarily addressed this question. In addition to Mr Dun's comments, I add the following comments:

16. The SH6 cross section must also function as a <u>best practice designed street</u> that is both safe and pleasant to use by pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and abilities and provides a high-quality landscape privacy buffer that filters outlooks for residents' living adjacent a noisy highway with 60km/hr speeds, high-traffic volumes, bus lanes, and oversized freight.

17. I note in Council's experts' revised cross sections appended in the Urban Design JWS, the only dimensions that I see specifically attributed to the 'gateway' concept are: A) the Southern SH6 setback to enable views Southwards to the ONL and the Remarkables, and B) a few meters within the feature tree area – however noting this is doubling as the tolerance for any unknown road corridor widening which will not be known until detailed designs for SH6 are completed.

1.39 With the potential 60km/h speed for SH6, please consider further the amenity and building setbacks appropriate to that speed (including to maintain that speed rather than promote faster speeds) and liaise with the transportation experts as to what the SH6 transportation corridor cross section should contain to support a 60km/h speed limit. Please consider the combined width of SH6 and landscaped setbacks either side of that, and comment on the extent to which this may become a severance rather than an integrator for north-south pedestrian travel and integrating the two communities either side of SH6.

18. Mr Dun's statement has primarily addressed this question. In addition to Mr Dun's comments, I add the following comments:

19. Design speeds are informed by several factors such as: vertical traffic calming (most affective), vehicle lane widths, lateral friction from repetition of streetscape elements (trees, light poles, footpath activity), building setbacks, traffic congestion, and even speed cameras. From an urban design perspective, a balanced approach is needed and there are other traffic calming measures (other than reducing the building-to-building cross section width) that could be applied which have a lessor effect on the quality of streetscape amenity for pedestrians, cyclists, and residents.

20. The sections tabled by Council experts in the Urban Design JWS are an appropriate response as outlined by Mr Dun in terms of balancing an urbanised edge condition

with a place-responsive filtered landscape experiences, and which good active transport amenity. New Zealand has examples of memorable urban/rural gateways which have similar dimensions and space characteristics to these sections (i.e. Pahiatua and Cambridge).

21. I do not believe that these cross sections create severance. Removing important landscape and active transport amenity is not the critical factor to improving ‘potential severance’ across SH6 when compared to there being safe and convenient crossing points along the State Highway that allow people to cross at key pedestrian desire lines. Taking 5-10m out of a cross section has almost no improvement on pedestrian journey travel times or neighbourhood connectivity compared to time spent waiting for signal phasing at intersection or lack of mid-block crossing points.