

**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 STUART JAMES DUN
24 November 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 Stuart James Dun. I am a Landscape Architect and Principal at Studio Pacific Architecture (**Studio Pacific**).
- 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.

Stuart James Dun

24 November 2023

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

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
Broad Topic: Landscape / urban design		
24	<p>The planning experts agreed that it will be a RTS under NPS-UD and that you recognise SH6 is intended to be an Urban Connector with a high movement and place function under the One Network Framework. As such, do you agree that:</p> <p>(a) the four CPTED principles of surveillance (e.g. active frontages), access management, territorial reinforcement (e.g. sense of ownership) and quality environment (e.g. cost effective extent and ongoing maintenance) need to be applied effectively for users within and adjacent to the proposed cross section and planning provisions within the variation, and, if so, do you agree that this requires modification to what is currently proposed?</p> <p>(b) the inclusion of an 'Amenity Access Area' that provides for a slip lane for local vehicle access (and associated crossing points, private accessways and car parking) in the cross section is conducive to the accessible public transport and active travel outcomes sought for the SH6 corridor;</p>	<p>The design of the setbacks to SH6 is complex and requires a considered and balanced approach to a range of objectives; CPTED, safety, supporting reduction in traffic speeds, connection to public and active transport links, connection between proposed and existing neighbourhoods, alongside the 'gateway' role of the Ladies Mile and the experiential qualities associated. In response to these particular questions:</p> <p>a) I agree that CPTED is an important consideration in the design of the SH6 cross section. I do not agree that the cross section as it is currently proposed requires modification solely in response to CPTED concerns.</p> <p>b) I do not consider that the lane impacts negatively on the ability to access public transport or active transport along the SH6 corridor. However, the role of the lane within the amenity access area has been discussed in additional expert conferencing. A further JWS for this</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	<p>(c) a 70m crossing of the proposed SH6 corridor is best optimised to reduce severance and increase the perceived convenience for pedestrians (and cyclists) moving between north and south parts of the Te Pūtahi / Eastern Corridor; and</p> <p>(d) if so, does the relative prioritisation of a proposed consistent and spacious gateway and arrival sequence remain higher and / or compatible with the above from an urban design perspective?</p>	<p>additional conferencing is being prepared and I can address this further at the hearing.</p> <p>c) Severance across SH6 is only one consideration in the design of the corridor. On balance I believe that a 70m corridor is appropriate – noting that the corridor is reduced to 55m (and potentially less) at the commercial centre and key connection point at Howards Drive.</p> <p>In my opinion a consistent landscape treatment to the SH6 corridor as proposed is compatible with the urban design outcomes sought.</p> <p>d) As noted above, a further JWS for additional conferencing on SH6 is being prepared and I can address this further at the hearing.</p>
25	<p>Given the recent update with respect to the lower design speed (60km/hr), the two signalised intersections (Lower Shotover Road and Howards Drive) and confirmed location of Rapid Transit stops on the western side of these, do you agree:</p> <p>(a) that a larger north-side highway curtilage to accommodate a road (access lane) is now no longer an appropriate response?,</p>	<p>A) See my response to question 24 - in my opinion a consistent landscape treatment as proposed to the SH6 corridor is compatible with the urban design outcomes sought.</p> <p>B) I maintain that the commercial area and associated high density residential is well located to integrate with</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	<p>and that reduced setbacks commensurate with an urban frontage is now more appropriate?;</p> <p>(b) the commercial area in, and associated higher density residential around it, may now not be optimally located with respect to the Howards Drive highway crossing point and the objective of integrating the sports hub as part of a complete, centrally located town centre?; and</p> <p>(c) that in any event, and/or if the town centre and associated higher density residential is to remain in its proposed location, that another small urban amenity node with appropriate residential densities at the western intersection (Lower Shotover Road) is now appropriate?</p>	<p>the sports hub and serve the TPLM Variation area being generally within a 10-15 minute walk for residents north of SH6.</p> <p>C) From an urban design perspective a small urban node at the western end associated with the Rapid Transit Stop and associated higher densities would be appropriate. However, as stated in paragraph 37 of my rebuttal evidence, given the transport constraints of the TPLM Variation that place a maximum cap of 2400 dwellings I maintain that the approach taken in the TPLM Variation to focus development around the proposed commercial centre, community park, sports hub, and potential schools with a focus on walkable neighbourhoods centred around Howards Drive is an appropriate response.</p>
27	<p>Do you accept that:</p> <p>(a) The 2,400 dwellings is not a design capacity per se, but simply a constraint on further development until further infrastructure solutions are implemented?</p> <p>(b) The location, size and form of schools cannot be guaranteed and therefore:</p>	<p>a) The 2,400 dwellings is a constraint placed on the project by existing traffic infrastructure which limits the amount of development that can be supported. My understanding is that even with further infrastructure solutions being implemented that this constraint will continue to exist (for example in part due to the capacity of the Shotover Bridge).</p>

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The masterplan should not be unduly influenced by 'likely' school positions? and; (ii) That best practice urban design principles and practise should prevail? (c) Two of the most critical objective are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Deliver an agreed minimum residential density to support public Rapid Transit services? and (ii) Encourage higher density outcomes in appropriate locations, principally focussed Rapid Transit nodes /stops? (d) Consequently, the highest urban amenity should provided along the SH corridor; and concentrated around transit nodes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) I do not consider that the 'likely' school positions have unduly influenced the masterplan design. I also note that the TPLM Variation Structure Plan, which is being considered in this process, does not show or depict 'likely' school positions. c) (i) Delivering residential density to support public transport <i>and</i> other key amenities such as the commercial centre and anticipated schools is a key objective of the TPLM Variation. ii) Encouraging density associated with public transport <i>and</i> other key amenities and facilities such as open space, Commercial Precinct, and anticipated schools is a key objective of the TPLM Variation. d) I'm unsure what is meant by urban amenity in this question and whether it is meant to refer to density? If so – density has been located to best access a range of amenity including the commercial centre, anticipated schools, open spaces, and public and active transport. Density is also associated with height to place higher

Joint questions on behalf of Glenpanel Developments Limited (73) and Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (107)		
#	Question	Responses
		density back from SH6 to maintain views and respond to the landform at the base of Slope Hill.
37	<p>You say that maintaining heritage features is one of the important contextual aspects of placemaking. In your opinion:</p> <p>a) Do you consider that heritage attributes were given sufficient weight to this placemaking attribute?</p> <p>b) Would the masterplan have benefitted from incorporating heritage elements within the expansion area?</p> <p>c) Do you accept that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Spence Road / Collector Road route provides that important heritage link which is substantially different to the urban Active Travel link along the SH? ii. Landscape attributes were deemed of higher order than urban heritage attributes expansion area (including the western heritage area and Old Shotover Bridge) is establishing the western masterplan extent? 	<p>a) In my opinion heritage aspects were given sufficient weight during the masterplanning process, and consequently in the TPLM Variation.</p> <p>b) I am unsure what this question is referring to? The AHFT expansion area was never part of the Masterplan and as such heritage elements associated with it were not considered to be included.</p> <p>c) i) The Spence Road connection provides an important link between the SH6 active travel link <i>and</i> the collector road cycle network which runs through the TPLM Variation area. I maintain that Spence Road provides an appropriate active transport connection linking TPLM to the Old Shotover Bridge and wider cycle network.</p> <p>ii) I am unsure what this question is asking or how to interpret this statement.</p>