

**Further Submission on Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Variation –
Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan**

Under Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council
pdpsubmission@qldc.govt.nz

Name of Submitters: Milstead Trust

Address for service: Milstead Trust
C/- Vivian and Espie Ltd
PO Box 2514
Queenstown 9349
Attn: Blair Devlin
blair@vivianespie.co.nz
021 222 6393

- 1 Milstead Trust (the **Submitter**) made a submission (**OS108**) on the Variation to the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan (**Variation 1, PDP**).
- 2 This is a further submission by the Submitters on Variation 1, PDP.
- 3 The Submitters are a person who has an interest in Variation 1, PDP that is greater than the interest that the general public has.
- 4 Milstead Trust own land included within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan area.
- 5 The Submitters' further submissions, reasons for submissions and decisions sought are set out in Appendix 1 (**attached**).
- 6 In addition to the specific reasons set out in Appendix 1, the relief sought by the Submitters in this further submission:
 - a. will promote sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**);
 - b. represents the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of Variation 1, PDP, in terms of section 32 of the RMA;
 - c. will assist the Council in carrying out its statutory duties under the RMA including the integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land; and
 - d. will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.
- 7 The Submitters wish to be heard in support of this further submission. If others make a similar submission the Submitters will consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

2 August 2023



Blair Devlin
On behalf of Milstead Trust

Annexure 1

Name of Original Submitter (and Submission Number)	Submission Point	Decision requested by Original Submitters	Further Submitters' support/oppose	Reason for Further Submitters' support/opposition	Decision Sought by Further Submitters
Department of Conservation (OS44)	OS44.1	That the proposed Variation is not approved unless or until there is adequate offsetting and/ or compensation for the loss of bird habitat, and provision for a consolidated stormwater management approach.	Oppose	Urbanisation will likely increase tree coverage compared to the open paddocks that currently exist on the majority of the Ladies Mile.	Decline the relief
	OS44.4	That the Variation is not approved unless or until off-site monitoring and effects management measures have been developed and confirmed in relation to native bird species. These could include stand-alone measures, and/or collaboration with, or support for, existing community initiatives	Oppose	<p>The Submitter does not support the requirement for off-site monitoring and/or effects management measures as part of the Variation.</p> <p>The Submitter considers the effects of urbanisation on bird habitat is a wider issue and do not consider that that the plan change should be contingent on monitoring being established as it would require coordination</p>	Decline the relief

			<p>between multiple government agencies, including Council and DOC.</p> <p>In addition it is unclear how effects on native bird populations could be monitored and attributed to the development of Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile rather than development in the vicinity of the Lower Shotover more generally.</p>		
	OS44.6	<p>That an additional matter of discretion be inserted into Rule 27.7.8.1 as follows, or wording to like effect:</p> <p><i><u>“x. ecological and natural values”</u></i></p>	Oppose	<p>Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile is proposed to be a high density urban area, with some of the highest density development in New Zealand. Requiring consideration and compensation of effects on ecological and natural values would not support achieving the levels of density required and proposed through this plan change.</p>	Decline the relief
	OS44.7	<p>That an additional assessment matter be added to 29.9.8.1 as follows, or wording to like effect:</p> <p><i><u>“x. the extent to which the subdivision protects, maintains or enhances indigenous biodiversity, including through offsetting or compensation measures.”</u></i></p>	Oppose	<p>Requiring offsetting and ecological compensation would undermine the intent of the Plan Change, particularly since the loss of foraging habitat in this instance is large open fields that cannot be replaced with trees or other urban vegetation solutions.</p>	Decline the relief
Glenpanel Development Ltd (OS73)	OS73.4	That the generally over-prescriptive nature of the Variation is opposed.	Support	These submissions support the general direction and amendments sought by the Submitter.	Accept the relief to the extent it is consistent with what is sought by the Submitter.
	OS73.5	That the development triggers relating to road access into			

		Ladies Mile from SH6, and Lower Shotover Road are opposed.			
	OS73.6	That the location of the Collector Road type A is opposed.			
	OS73.11	That the density in the Medium Density Residential Precinct be set at a minimum of 25- 30 units per hectare.			
	OS73.14	That flexibility is enabled for the collector road or alternative roading and access connections which achieve positive outcomes.			
	OS73.42	That Rule 49.5.50 (Staging development to integrate with transport infrastructure) is deleted.			
Lake Hayes Estate Community Association (OS79)	OS79.1	That the Variation be declined until the traffic issues, housing affordability, and a commitment to the provision of community and commercial facilities are resolved.	Oppose		Decline the relief
	OS79.2	That QLDC prioritise incentivising high density housing in locations that are near existing amenities and already appropriately zoned and served by infrastructure.	Oppose	This is beyond the scope of the plan variation.	Decline the relief

	OS79.3	That the Variation is placed on hold, OR a deferred zoning is applied until there is a guarantee that the traffic solutions will be achieved; the Ministry of Education has committed to constructing secondary and primary schools; community facilities and affordable housing are committed to; and that inclusionary zoning will apply to the Zone.	Oppose	The relief sought would not achieve the objectives of the plan variation. The Minister of Education will use their designation powers for a school when they are ready to do so. It is not possible to specify an affordability price point through a plan change as there are too many variables e.g. construction costs, land costs, interest rates, unit size etc.	Decline the relief
Waka Kotahi (OS104)	OS104.1	That the proposal is supported in principle as the vision and principles set out in the Transport Strategy are consistent with the outcomes sought by Waka Kotahi.	Support	These submissions support the general direction and amendments sought by the Submitter. Overall it is considered that the proposal can result in the construction of a transit oriented development (TOD) that is largely self-sufficient and helps support a modal shift in transportation in the District.	Accept the Relief
	OS104.3	That Policy 27.3.24.6 (is amended to read as follows: "Avoid development where specific transport infrastructural works in Rules 49.5.10, 49.5.33, 49.5.50 and 49.5.56 have not been completed, unless it can be demonstrated that development will avoid future and cumulative adverse effects from additional traffic movements on State Highway 6."	Oppose	The Submitter considers that Policy 27.3.24.6 should be retained as notified in order to allow some flexibility should it be demonstrated that specific infrastructural works are not required.	Decline the relief

	OS104.14	That Policy 49.2.6.5 is amended to read; "Avoid development where specific transport infrastructural works have not been completed, unless it can be demonstrated that development will avoid future and cumulative adverse effects from additional traffic movements, particularly at weekday daily peak periods on State Highway 6.	Oppose	The Submitter considers that Policy 27.3.24.6 should be retained as notified in order to allow some flexibility should it be demonstrated that specific infrastructural works are not required.	Decline the relief
	OS104.36	That further discussion with Council is required to provide clarity around how much on-street carparking is being provided.	Support	The Submitter supports and seeks to be involved in any future process that includes discussions regarding on-street parking provision.	Accept the relief.
Maryhill Ltd (OS105)	OS105.4	That public transport providers be required to ensure a reliable, frequent and convenient public transport service, and corresponding infrastructure, in order to facilitate a modal shift.	Support	These submissions support the general direction and amendments sought by the Submitter.	Accept the relief, to the extent it is consistent with what is generally sought by the Submitter.
	OS105.11	That the policies requiring strict adherence to the Structure Plan are opposed			
	OS105.17	That the provisions be amended to enable greater flexibility to ensure the developments are responsive to community demand, whilst encouraging a modal shift.			
	OS105.18	That the building and urban design standards be simplified in order to ensure the TPLM land is able to be developed efficiently and effectively.			

	OS105.19	That, in addition to the specific amendments requested to Table 2 with respect to height, residential density, non-compliance activity statuses set out in Appendix B of the submission, all standards in Table 2 (Standards for activities located in the MDR Precinct and the HDR Precinct relating to building form and design outcomes), which are additional to, or more restrictive than, the Medium Density Residential Standards (in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021) are opposed in part unless justified by further evidence and Section 32 assessment.			
	OS105.20	That the subdivision regime be simplified through concise objectives, policies, and assessment matters, which seek to achieve an integrated and high quality mixed urban/residential outcome for the Structure Plan area.			
	OS105.21	That the provisions and Structure Plan are amended in order to ensure the rezoning anticipates a realistic and feasible density and height outcome for residential development that will encourage a 'modal shift'.			

	OS105.22	That the provisions and Structure Plan are amended in order to promote the development of alternative modes of transportation (other than private vehicle usage) to complement the increased residential density enabled within the zone.			
	OS105.23	That the provisions and Structure Plan are amended in order to ensure that the requirements for infrastructure upgrades are realistic and proportionate to the development proposed, allowing for appropriate levels of development to occur prior to construction, and ensuring that stormwater is managed appropriately across the Zone to avoid stormwater runoff impacting adjacent landowners.			
	OS105.24	That the provisions and Structure Plan are amended in order to ensure that the affordable housing and development contribution requirements, if any, are determined through this Variation and withdrawn from the Inclusionary Housing variation, and that these provisions are realistic and equitable, taking into account the common infrastructure and community asset land indicated in the Structure Plan, such as to not dissuade affordable and efficient development of the land.			

	OS105.25	That the provisions and Structure Plan are amended to include methods by which the Structure Plan restrictions on development, including infrastructure areas, protected trees, parks, amenity access areas, and recreation, are to be equitably offset/ compensated with landowners.			
	OS105.45	That Policy 49.2.7.11 be amended as follows: 49.2.7.11 Apply recession plane, building height, yard setback and site coverage controls as the primary means of ensuring a minimum high quality building design through provision for level of outlook, sunshine and light access, while acknowledging that through an application for land use consent an outcome superior to that likely to result from strict compliance with the controls may well be identified.			
	OS105.62	That, where possible, standards should be deleted and replaced with policy direction for high quality urban design outcomes, to provide for high quality and varied urban design outcomes.			