

**Kim Banks for QLDC – Summary of Evidence for Group 1B, 21 July 2017
Queenstown Mapping – Hearing Stream 13**

1. I am the author of the Group 1B Queenstown Urban – Frankton and South evidence, rebuttal and supplementary rebuttal evidence. I summarise my recommendations but I do not address each rezoning submission individually.

"GEOGRAPHIC OVERLAP" SUBMISSIONS (GROUP 1A AND B)

McBride Street - Brett Giddens (828)

2. Brett Giddens seeks further residential intensification for relatively large areas within the Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) at Queenstown Airport. I have not supported this submission on the basis of traffic and parking effects; and also that Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise (**ASAN**) are not consistent with the land use management approach of PC35, which I support integrating into the PDP. This approach maintains the status quo and limits density within the Air Noise Boundary (**ANB**) and OCB to that which is currently enabled by the Operative District Plan (**ODP**).

Frankton Marina

Z Energy (768)

3. The Z Energy submission seeks rezoning of land around the existing Z Energy site and Frankton Marina. I do not support the Z Energy rezoning due to adverse effects on character, residential amenity and dominance; and a lack of information regarding potential site contamination. The Frankton Marina is also considered in the evidence of Ms Evans and we both accept that the notified LDRZ does not adequately reflect the mix of existing activities that make up the existing environment. However, I consider little benefit will be achieved by rezoning to MDRZ, taking into account these existing uses and traffic constraints at Sugar Lane.

NZIA (238)

4. The NZIA submission seeks further residential intensification for relatively large areas within the OCB at Queenstown Airport. I have not supported this submission on the basis of traffic and parking effects; and also that residential activities (ie. ASAN) are not consistent with the land use management approach of PC35, which I support integrating in the PDP. This approach maintains the

status quo and limits density within the ANB and OCB to that which is currently enabled by the ODP.

5. The NZIA (238) also seek rezoning of land around the existing Z Energy site and Frankton Marina. I do not support the Z Energy rezoning due to adverse effects on character, residential amenity and dominance; and a lack of information regarding potential site contamination. The Frankton Marina is also considered in the evidence of Ms Evans and we both accept that the notified LDRZ does not adequately reflect the mix of existing activities that make up the existing environment. However, I consider little benefit will be achieved by rezoning to MDRZ, taking into account these existing uses and traffic constraints at Sugar Lane.

Hansen Road/Ladies Mile Highway (Hansen Family Partnership (751), Universal Developments (177), FII Holdings, Jandel Trust (717) and Arnott (399))

6. Several submissions seek rezoning of land between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive, on the northern side of SH6 at Frankton. This land was notified part Rural and part MDRZ. I have assessed these rezonings from a strategic point of view, considering the overall scope of relief and the constraints on development applicable to this land, including the Outstanding Natural Landscape (**ONL**), the OCB and the national grid and substation. I have also considered the expert evidence addressing traffic generation effects of commercial or industrial zonings and the possible economic risks of additional commercial zoning in this location, recognising that economic evidence identifies the PDP provides sufficient commercial capacity to 2048 and for industrial land to 2038.
7. My recommendation is that the Rural zone is most appropriate for land between Hansen Road and the Hawthorne Drive Roundabout because this land is significantly constrained by the ONL, OCB and possible future roading infrastructure. I recommend that the remaining land from Section 133 Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway¹ to Ferry Hill Drive is re-zoned as High Density Residential Zone (**HDRZ**) because this land is less constrained and can provide greater development opportunities in an appropriate location. This recommendation results in accepting the submission of Stephen Spence (8) in part, for the rezoning of MDRZ to Rural, and accepting the submission of The Jandel Trust 717 in part.
8. In recommending the rezoning to HDRZ I have also recommended some new or amended provisions for Chapter 9 and 27, including:

1 Sec 133 Blk 1 Shotover SD

-
- (a) a 50m building restriction area fronting SH6, and a 6m boundary setback fronting the Quail Rise Special Zone;
 - (b) a new policy in Chapter 9 to ensure that an integrated road network is established through this land prior to, or as part of, subdivision and development;
 - (c) a new Rule in Chapter 9 to make four or more Residential Units on a site in this area a discretionary activity (as opposed to RD) to ensure strategic objectives and policies of the PDP can be considered for a significant residential development in this area;
 - (d) in Chapter 27, adding an exception to Rule 27.5.5 relating to controlled subdivision for multi-unit development, to ensure it does not apply to this land, and subdivision is otherwise assessed as an RD activity with council having the ability to decline consent; and
 - (e) adding a Rule (see Rule 9.5.14 for details) making National Grid Sensitive Activities inside the National Grid Yard a non-complying activity because this is not otherwise addressed by Chapter 30.

OTHER GROUP 1B SUBMISSIONS

Submissions accepted or accepted in part

9. I recommend accepting or accepting in part the following submissions:
- (a) James Canning Muspratt (396) – rezoning of approximately 12,000m² of Rural land below the Outstanding Natural Landscape (**ONL**) to Rural Residential enabling 3 additional residential units;
 - (b) QLDC (790) – rezoning of 1 lot in Frankton of 855m² from Rural to LDRZ, enabling 1 additional residential unit; and
 - (c) Bonisch Consultants (425) – rezoning of Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**) to Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) and Local Shopping Centre Zone (**LSCZ**); and Rural to LDRZ at Kelvin Heights, including extension of the Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**) to align with the recommended LDRZ extent. Together these rezonings could enable 26 additional residential units. For the Balmoral Drive MDRZ, I have suggested that a building restriction area could be established adjacent to the Lakeland Christian Camp (FS1328).

-
10. Together these rezonings are estimated to provide an additional 63 residential units, with 60 being within the Queenstown UGB (as recommended to be amended).

Submissions rejected

Lake Johnson and Tucker Beach

11. A number of submitters seek rezoning of rural land at Tucker Beach and around Lake Johnson. Some submissions made in this location were transferred to Hearing Stream 14 due to being subject to the outcomes of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study, and these submissions are not addressed within my section 42A report.
12. Submissions 338, 396 and 476, although within the area of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study, remain subject to this Hearing Stream either because the submitter chose to be heard in this stream, or in the case of 338, because the Panel directed that it remain heard in Hearing Stream 13.
13. The most intensive rezoning in this area is the submission of the **Middleton Family Trust (338)** who seek the rezoning of land north of Lake Johnson to a combination of LDRZ and Rural Residential (**RR**). I have rejected this submission on the basis that the rezoning would result in inappropriate landscape, amenity and traffic effects. In particular, Council's landscape evidence suggests that the proposed LDRZ rezoning is within the backdrop of high value views within the basin, and would result in significant adverse effects on the character and quality of the landscape. I have responded to Mr Geddes' rebuttal evidence on dwelling capacity within my strategic summary. In relation to 8.17 of this evidence Mr Geddes comments that little plan enabled residential capacity has been provided to the market in the last 10 years, it is relevant to also consider that if this land were rezoned, there is no certainty of it being brought to market.
14. Other submitters in this area sought Rural to RR rezonings. I have accepted a small extension to the RR zone below the ONL proposed by **James Canning Muspratt (396)**. However I have rejected the rezoning of Keith **Hindle and Dayle Wright (476)** as I consider the rural zone to be most appropriate in managing the effects of development on the landscape of Ferry Hill. I do not support the submitters' requested bespoke density rule of 3000m² to allow further subdivision of this land, which would not meet the minimum lot size for the RR zone sought.

Land affected by hazards

15. I do not support some submissions on the basis of outstanding issues in relation to natural hazards. These are 48 (Kerr Ritchie), 661 (LINZ), 533 (Winton Partners), 429 (F.S Mee Developments Co Limited) and 434 (B Grant). In my view the level of information provided by the submitter is insufficient to quantify the level of risk for the particular hazards previously identified on the land where rezoning is sought. There is also insufficient information to demonstrate that the intensity of development that could be enabled on the site, via a rezoning, can be achieved in light of the hazard. Also, to what extent mitigation may be required and where this might be located. Without suitable information being provided the proposals seeking more intensive urban zones are in my view contrary to the purpose of the Act and are more appropriate to be considered under the Rural zoning.