

**Vicki Jones for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 16 May 2017**

**Upper Clutha Mapping – Hearing Stream 12**

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide rebuttal evidence in relation to planning matters regarding rezoning requests grouped as ‘Wanaka Business’ in the Upper Clutha area of the Queenstown Lakes District
2. 9 submissions and 7 further submissions on rezoning or mapping annotations have been received in relation to the Wanaka Business area. These are considered in the S42A report of Amy Bowbyes and most are further considered in my rebuttal evidence.
3. For the purpose of drafting my rebuttal evidence, I have agreed with and adopted Amy Bowbyes’ s42A report and, in some cases, have provided additional detail in response to submitters’ evidence. In all instances, I concur with the recommendations of the S42A report.

**The Local Shopping Centre Zone (LSCZ) on Cardrona Valley Road**

4. In response to submissions from Willowridge (249) and Mr Ledgerwood (507), I recommend that the Local Shopping Centre Zone (**LSCZ**) on Cardrona Valley Road:
  - (a) be reduced from 2.7ha to 1ha;
  - (b) that a maximum 3,000m<sup>2</sup> cap be introduced on the total gross floor area (**GFA**) of retail and office activities enabled within the zone (along with a policy supporting this); and
  - (c) that the balance land is rezoned as Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**).
5. In my opinion, reducing the size of the zone, together with capping the total amount of retail and office activity, will be more effective at providing a local shopping centre of a limited scale that is focused on the day-to-day needs of the community (Objective 15.2.1) and which does not undermine the larger shopping centres.
6. In response to submissions from Satomi (622) and JA Ledgerwood (507), in my opinion additional requirements relating to height, ground level, and the provision of

landscaped boundary setbacks are not necessary in order for development within the LSCZ to respond appropriately to its neighbourhood setting (Objective 15.2.2). Specifically in respect of the submitter's land, I anticipate that the recommended removal of the LSCZ from the land immediately adjacent to the submitter's boundary should wholly address their concerns. For completeness, I note that the reference in paragraph 5.6 of Ms Bowbyes S42A report to her Business Zones Hearing S42A report should refer to paragraphs 13.8 - 13.17 of that report, rather than paragraph 4.13, as stated.

7. In response to submissions from Wanaka Lakes Health Centre (Heath Centre) (253) and Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village (Hospital) (709), I recommend that the Large Lot Residential Zone (**LLRZ**) be retained over the Wanaka Health Centre and Hospital sites at 21 and 23 Cardrona Valley Road, rather than rezoning this land as LSCZ. The range and density of activities provided by the LSCZ is considerably greater than what is currently enabled through (implemented) resource consents that exist for the Health Centre and Hospital sites. In Mr Heath's opinion, the provision of any more than 7,000m<sup>2</sup> of local shopping centre land in this location is unwarranted and I note that the submitter has provided no evidence to the contrary. As such, consistent with the reasons for reducing the notified LSCZ on Cardrona Valley Road, I consider that rezoning a further 2.15 ha of land as LSCZ in this location would not be an appropriate means of achieving the PDP objectives. Furthermore, relying on the evidence of Ms Banks, such rezoning would likely exacerbate existing traffic and parking issues.
8. In response to the submission from Jim Ledgerwood (562) I recommend that the LDRZ be retained on the sites located on the corner of Cardrona Valley Road and Orchard Road, rather than rezoning these sites as either LSCZ or a mixed use zone. The rezoning of this relatively large (2.34 ha) area of land to either LSCZ or BMUZ would enable a considerably greater density of commercial use than is currently enabled by resource consents for the site. Such rezoning could therefore potentially undermine existing commercial centres, as well as the viability of the recommended LSCZ on Cardrona Valley Road and would result in a reduced level of service at the Cardrona Valley Road intersection. In summary, such zoning would not be consistent with the relevant objectives of the PDP.
9. In response to the submission by Susan Meyer (274), I recommend retaining the 75% building coverage rule of the LSCZ, rather than increasing it to 80% as sought. While I accept the triangular shape of the zone may restrict the

development potential of some sites, in my opinion this can be considered at the subdivision design stage and, if necessary, dispensation of the 75% rule can be considered through a restricted discretionary consent at the landuse consent stage. I also recommend facilitating a connection between the health centre and the LSCZ by maintaining LSCZ zoning over that land which adjoins the health centre.

### **The Medium Density Residential Zone - Town Centre Transition Zone (MDRZ-TCTO)**

10. In response to submissions from Varina Property Limited (**Varina**) (591) and Sneaky Curlew Limited (**Curlew**) (737), I recommend that the MDRZ-TCTO be retained as notified, rather than rezoning the area to Wanaka Town Centre Zone (**WTCZ**), as sought. I note that the MDRZ-TCTO covers an area of approximately 3.9 ha.<sup>1</sup>
11. In my view, the key issues relate to achieving a high quality, compact Wanaka Town Centre (**WTC**); achieving high quality streetscapes along both Brownston and Russell streets; managing the potential effects on neighbouring residential properties; managing parking and access issues and uncertainties; and providing for flexible landuse that is responsive to market demands.
12. In my opinion, the MDRZ-TCTO zoning is the most appropriate in that it will:
  - (a) enable development that supports, rather than competes directly with, the WTC;
  - (b) provide for a wide range of activities, hence enabling a mixed use environment including medium density housing at ground level;
  - (c) encourage high quality urban design outcomes;
  - (d) ensure built form and activities that are sensitive to the adjoining residential properties;
  - (e) enable parking and access issues to be considered through the resource consent process; and
  - (f) avoid the need for unnecessarily complex provisions and, very likely, the need to apply different underlying zones to the Brownston Street and Russell Street parts of the transition area.
13. In response to the submission from Curlew (737), I recommend that the boundary of the MDRZ-TCTO is retained, rather than extending it to include those sites

---

1 This differs from the 3.5 ha area given in paragraph 8.6 my rebuttal evidence, which was incorrect.

fronting Upton Street between Helwick Street and Dungarvon Street, as sought. Ms Banks considers that extending the TCTO to sites along Upton Street would result in increased vehicular traffic movements in that area and would exacerbate the current high parking demands in that part of the MDRZ. I note that no evidence has been provided on behalf of Curlew in support of extending the transition overlay to Upton Street.

**Vicki Jones**  
**16 May 2017**