

Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan Submissions

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Hayden J Blackler | Neutral | | | |
| Allan E Meredith | Neutral | <p>views native planting acknowledging heritage focus on sustainable transport, cycleways and pedestrian paths parks sustainable housing</p> | <p>The proposed road access to Lake Hayes estate via Sylvan Street is not a good idea. This should be just a path for pedestrians and cyclists. If you make a safe and pleasant way for them to get up to Ladies Mile that is away from heavy traffic ie buses and cars people will be more likely to do it as they will feel safer and it will be more pleasant especially for school children accessing the schools and shops. You can the connect this path to the sports ground and other public transport hubs or underpass. This would more strongly integrate with your idea of getting people to use sustainable transport methods. The proposed access way is way too close to current houses and the breaking and accelerating of busses/cars would not be good for people or appropriate for that area resulting in a negative effect on residents. Sylvan street is already a narrow road when cars are parked on the road meaning cars often have to wait as it can be virtually 1 way at times. Less high density, keep to medium density Is there medical facilities needed eg hospital</p> | |
| Allan Meredith | Neutral | | <p>Too many roundabouts on Ladies Mile to add to the other ones already present as you enter Frankton. Get rid of the one that links to Sylvan street</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Krissy Gullick | Oppose | | Any more development on the Ladies Mile | |
| Neven | Oppose | No comment | Letting this area get further developed which all ready has traffic issues is short term thinking | |
| Leah White | Neutral | Finally having accessible Facilities in the area. Not having to cross the bridge for shops/ sport/ swimming/ yoga/ gym/ up to date playgrounds etc should be a basic minimum for the price of our rates and the Development contributions in the area. | Focussing on reducing cars. Majority of people who live in the area love driving to their favourite hike or ski field. To access ski fields - you need a big AWD car for safety. Also Stop focussing on taking people to facility's via public transport and focus on bringing what people want to the people. | |
| Dave Macleod | Oppose | Nothing. | The new bridge that needs to connect to town and disperse our problem traffic | Can the council think about the long term effects of Covid 19 and how this situation will affect any growth or lack of in Queenstown and in particular this proposed development. |
| C.N. Boyd | Oppose | Thinking toward the future | There are lots of vacant sections in already approved areas. L.M. should only be developed for high density housing as a last resort. We don't need more people putting more pressure on our resources | Have a "cup of tea" while existing developments are completed and figure out the roading issues before making things worse. The town is losing its soul to development. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Rachel Land | Oppose | Nothing | Far too high in density representing a tragic loss of a vital green/rural vista for the community. Make town high density and protect the resort nature of the community we all love. Plus adding hundreds of residents to existing traffic overload. The idea that not providing parking will force people to use public transport is insanity. | Please leave Ladies Mile alone. |
| Marta Uhlig | Oppose | | Putting to much pressure on an already overloaded main road leading in and out of Queenstown . There are already accidents happening because of the chaotic morning and afternoon traffic . Please consider us that live in LHE and SC as this development will make things ten times worst ! | |
| Andrew | Oppose | Trying to build more houses | Where you are wanting to build them | |
| Phil Andrew | Support | Most of it, BUT Very little to no mention of a water taxi service being positively progressed, along with a park and ride down by Bridesdale. The Jetty has minimal mention in few draft plans. This should be a core step in the overall development process..and globally water taxi services are well supported as long as they run to time and are affordable and reliable. I understand K Jet has already been given resource | See above - Park and ride for River water taxi into and back from Queenstown and Frankton Marina and Kawarea lower Remarkables Park etc.... | as above |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | consent, so how dd we keep up tp date with this? | | |
| Claire Blackadder | Oppose | Adding a high school, park, hospitality, grocery and sports facility. | SH6 cannot cope with more housing. Too much congestion already. You've added lots more housing but theres no changes to road infrastructure except a few extra roundabouts. | Sorting out current traffic problems should be your main priority. |
| Maureen | Oppose | No high rise and high density housing should be developed | Where are the schools?? Roundabout at Spence road not suitable | Who pays for the roading and extra an entities |
| kibbana | Neutral | i like that there is another school and more housing. | to cramped | no |
| Jasper Thomas | Neutral | the idea of apartment buildings | could be better | nope |
| Unknown | Neutral | sports feilds and apartments | 2 lane bridge, | no |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Huglad bumashi | Oppose | I think you have the whole design right and the concept. | I don't think you included enough decisions from the public or community. This is a major part in it as we would live there and have to be around it. | I don't agree with this development and think it should be moved to a different area, or just not add any more places. |
| Sophie | Neutral | Building a new high school and adding in parks | You can't expect people to bike or bus when they can drive because it's more convenient and you get a sense of privacy. Also, most people will want to live in single standing homes and you might find that people will be selfish and not want to leave their land | no |
| Rochelle | Oppose | i dont know | | |
| Liam | Neutral | Stop the housing crises being as bad | There will be alot of traffic and transport from there would be hard | no |
| Josh | Neutral | That there needs to be more housing | That the traffic is going to get even worse with people pulling out to go to work and school. | Why don't you build in speargrass flat. |
| Madison | Oppose | another high school. | I think it would be too cramped and there will be so much more traffic congestion and I think even if there are activities to do in the development people will still want to drive their own cars to get place to place because the bus is very very inconvenient. | |
| izzy | Neutral | the style/the look and layout | I think it is the wrong place and will make more traffic | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Jesse hutchins | Support | the amout of housing | the road there will be a lot more trafic and it will be even more bisser | |
| oscar sandstrom | Support | Apartments and walk-ins are a good use of space. | I think your relying on people not using their cars to much because most people will still go out of the ladies mile area daily | |
| Ruby Guilfoyle | Neutral | creating new living spaces. having places close so that it limits the travel. | transportation and traffic there is going to be more build-ups of traffic on the bridge and before wether, you add a hundred buses or not. | Location isn't the best |
| Kai Milburn | Neutral | Sports center | Tennis courts | |
| Oscar | Neutral | The housing, the short transport to places, the shops | the housing type | |
| Cara Quinn | Oppose | They presented the eco plans well, like what happens to the running water, using apartments instead of individual houses. | What happens to the traffic when there more people using it, the traffic is horrible as it is they are just making more mess and they are not looking at making the bridge bigger? They are not coming up with good solutions for the traffic problem, it all is in hopes that everyone will go to that school or football field but they cant ensure that everyone will do the same thing. The choice of space is really bad there is not enough room if they went for somewhere out the way like the | nope :) |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>jack point area where it's not affecting traffic and space. they did say that it's the gateway to Queenstown but it's not much of a gateway if there is ugly buildings in the way! it could stop tourists and people wanting to travel for Queenstown as its known for its views but they would be none.</p> <p>it's really not a good idea!!!!</p> | |
| Maya | Oppose | <p>I think that the thinking around environmental impact and ways it can positively contribute was reasonably well thought out. For example, the idea of putting in wetlands to reduce toxic runoff is a great idea but likely won't fit into the design very well.</p> | <p>I think that the location of this plan isn't well thought out and just simply won't work. There aren't proper solutions to the obvious problems of this plan and are mostly all idealised; not based on what would be the reality. Having a shopping centre and schools in the area doesn't solve the traffic issue whatsoever, if anything it'll just make it worse. First of all, most people living in the proposed apartments will be going to work outside of the Ladies Mile area and therefore are adding to the traffic problem. Saying that the morning traffic is almost all due to the high school is not true at all (as I've experienced first hand) so building a new high school in that area won't solve anything. Also saying that they're targeting younger people to live in these apartments just doesn't make sense. You're telling us that the solution is having schools and a shopping area near by when those young people will likely be still using SH6 daily to go to work. It just doesn't make sense. Once again, I believe that this plan is heavily influenced by idealities and isn't well thought out in any shape or form.</p> | No. |
| Russell & Jan Kelly | Support | the consultation process. | <p>No provision for a fuel / charging station, if the ethos of this is to deter vehicle from crossing the Shotover bridge, where do they fuel up? Combustion engine vehicles will be part of our lives for some time to come!</p> | <p>Happy that QLDC are taking a pragmatic, proactive approach to the future, however "you are damned if you do, damned if you don't".</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| George Apse | Support | the reasoning behind the idea | Statistics about costs and popularity of the idea | A big variable for people deciding whether or not they should support this idea |
| Kate | Neutral | Open spaces & storm water plus increased busses | traffic management vs number of dwellings vs amount of jobs to be created in the area | |
| Graeme Harold Rodwell | Oppose | ZERO | The traffic NOW is absolutely terrifying with queues along Ladies Mile/Lower Shotover Rd/over the Shotover Bridge. To expect this huge volume of new residents to use a bus or ride a bike is pure fantasy. NZers just won't do that and biking down here for work reasons in our climate is totally unrealistic. There will be an escalation in traffic congestion of such huge proportions that makes the notion of this scale of development on Ladies Mile quite preposterous. As a resident of many years in this area I strenuously oppose this proposed development. | I propose that the scale of the financial models for the involved developers and the potential fiscal gains, has completely overshadowed the sheer negative impact that this development will have on the current residents of the area and the traffic problems on the main SH6 / Shotover Bridge /Ladies Mile roads |
| Mark Kunath | Oppose | Both schools being on the same side of the road. The underpass which needs to be wide enough, and designed using CPTED principles, for people and cycles at the same time. | The transport plan presents unrealistic proposals for modal shift to PT and other active forms of transport. When tourists start driving rental cars again the journey times will increase again. There needs to be a duplication of the Shotover River Bridge for resilience, and active modes that want a DIRECT route across the river. If the Old Shotover River Bridge route is that great, let cars use it one way! See how the drivers like the additional time for their journey. Active transport needs direct routes to minimise already long journey times. There needs to be bus priority measures across the river too - you can't just squeeze everyone through a 45 year old bridge. It is going to take 10 years to get a | I support good quality high density living. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>duplication, start the process now...</p> <p>The existing house on the Walker block is not shown in your proposals - it would be VANDALISM to tear it down. It needs to be used for community purposes and this needs to be incorporated in your proposals.</p> <p>Indoor community courts are needed as is a dedicated gymnastics gymnasium.</p> | |
| Nadia Lisitsina | Oppose | <p>Building another high school would be a good outcome. Allowing for open space and playgrounds is also a positive.</p> | <p>The Masterplan hinges on the idea that people will be moving away from using personal vehicles. This makes sense in an already established urban environment with a robust public transport network (a city centre for example) where people often already do not own or use personal vehicles. To allow this particular development to happen in what is effectively considered a rural residential area with absolutely no real infrastructure solutions allowing for future increased capacity of personal vehicles is unacceptable. Moreover there are only two public transport options currently available- using the bike trial network or taking the bus. In a town where most people enjoy many various activities and the outdoors (go skiing, hiking, mountain biking, kayaking etc). It doesn't seem realistic to expect a substantial portion of residents of the new development to not own or not frequently use personal vehicles.</p> | <p>The lack of infrastructure and facilities in Queenstown as a whole is also worrying when looking at projects that ultimately enable population growth. SH6, the Shotover bridge, the BP roundabout and other routes will undoubtedly be even more adversely affected with such a large new development along SH 6. They were not designed to handle this amount of people and vehicles. Our Hospital has also been extremely outdated and underfunded for some time now, yet we have seen incredible growth in the last few years and will see even more according to projections. We effectively rely on helicopters to get people to a facility that can provide proper healthcare. None of these issues along with many others are being addressed when we look at adverse effects of new development, but they most definitely should be considered as part of the planning process.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Jeremy Payze | Support | <p>516 Ladies Mile is a long awaiting and highly needed community asset. Love this. High School will be a huge plus to local families already in Lake Hayes/Shotover/Bridesdale & Arrowtown. Great to locate with easy access to 516 Ladies Mile under the highway to be able to utilise fields for the school or vice versa for events. Another Primary school essential. Not building too close to the Lake (after listening to feedback). Good storm water controls to ensure no water makes it's way to Lake Hayes and parks/paths surrounding. Good to have some options for Jobs in the area with the town centre. Just need to make sure there is the types of jobs there that locals would actually work at.</p> | <p>PARKING IS A MAJOR MISS with this design - The apartments had only 1/2 a space for each one bedroom apartment, 1 space for 2 bedroom, 1.5 spaces for 3 bedrooms and 2 spaces for 4 bedroom. I get you need mode shift but that may work for commuting to central work locations but we live in the lakes district, there are adventure activities, walks, biking, and sites to see in so many random places not to mention kids sports/activities. Don't make the same mistakes like Bridesdale Farm (where I live and love) like not giving enough space for 2 cars offstreet in front of each 3 bedroom house, as the cars will be blocking the pavement (eg Dewar St). The pretty pictures of green will be covered with cars backed up on kerbsides around the neighbourhood (Another example is Remarkables Park apartments and the Terrace houses in Frankton/Queenstown Central where cars are sprawled all around the neighbourhood which is fine when there are empty fields but what happens when everything is developed?). I agree you need density and a variety of spaces to allow affordability but just do the design well with suitable parking and make sure you enforce storage on the street level for bikes/skis/equipment etc if there are no garages.</p> <p>I am also OPPOSED TO LAUREL HILLS Development in its current form. It is still a nightmare getting out of Shotover Country if you need to drop kids at school first or can't leave home early because of kids. Traffic was backed up to the school again this week and this is in the quietest month of the year with no tourists. If you think you can get mode shift do it now and SORT THE TRAFFIC ISSUES PLEASE BEFORE MAKING MORE. A bus priority lane now is the way you can do this (if NZTA are</p> | <p>I know its NZTA and they don't want to upgrade the Shotover bridge but they need to be pushed to include a safe crossing for active travel and 2 lanes each way. Saying that a new bridge would only move the problem up the road is nonsense. When heading into Frankton the roads turn off in many directions (Glenda Dr, Remarks Park, Qtn Central, 5 Mile, Jacks Pt and Downtown Queenstown. And the opposite is the case at the end of the day when you have all these locations merging to get back over the bridge. How is Frankton going to develop without having the bridge upgraded. It is already gridlock after work (you can't go to pak n save as you won't get out for 20+ mins).</p> <p>Make sure there is a decent playground and not just pocket park styles. Shotover Country has nothing (other than a scooter track for 5 year olds) so don't make the same mistakes. Kids need to be able to walk 10 mins or so to a decent playground ideally.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>not going to upgrade the bridge). Laurel Hill would get priority exiting above the roundabout where people merge from three ways and this would not be fair and impact substantially on quality of life (how can you get to work on time?)</p> <p>ACTIVE TRAVEL is still rubbish unless you have an ebike due to the massive detour across the old bridge. Building a new active travel bridge or connecting one under the existing bridge would be a consolation prize but at least it may help achieve more mode shift that you are relying on.</p> | |
| Martin Barrett | Oppose | Almost nothing | <p>Just about everything! - ~Bad location, ~Too high density of residents proposed, ~Inclusion of high rise buildings, ~Lack of adequate resident parking spaces, ~Lack of garaging, ~Inadequate satisfactory solutions to overcoming gridlocked traffic congestion, ~No proposal for new Shotover bridge or cycle bridge that will be required, ~Undesirable plan to route traffic through Arrowtown and Arthurs Point, ~Inadequate buy-in from NZTA, MOE, and others, ~Inability of QLDC to control the project given the number of landowners, ~Inability of QLDC to force developers to stick to the masterplan, ~Unrealistic expectation that residents will not want to own cars and will use public transport, ~Undoubted Legal and Court costs due to the lack of ownership of the</p> | <p>Once the land is rezoned or the Masterplan authorised there will be no turning back. What happens from then on may well be partially or wholly outside the control of QLDC and be more in the hands of the Environment Court, Landowners, Developers, ORC, or various Government Departments.</p> <p>If QLDC (or Govt) owned the land and were themselves undertaking the complete development they would, of course, have total control, but this is not the case.</p> <p>Before sanctioning this proposal, QLDC</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>land/multiple developers/contentious nature of project/etc, ~No plans for a new hospital or extension to the existing hospital that will be required for the additional 6,000 people, ~No consideration given to the effects this unprecedented growth will have on further accelerating growth patterns and the need for more dwellings to meet the demands of Te Putahi, ~The likelihood that such ultra high density population with lack of vehicle space will ultimately lead to discontent and general degradation, ~No consideration given to mitigating climate change effects, ~Huge additional load on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Te Puhati (2,400 dwellings) will be a 'new town' with a population the size of Cromwell, but packed into a fraction of the space. This will present many problems and likely "Unintended Consequences".</p> | <p>needs to think through every likely future consequence and how they will be mitigated. Better still abandon the proposal in its present format.</p> |
| Mitzi | Oppose | Moving the housing away from lake hayes | <p>The traffic is going to be a major problem, trying to encourage people on the bus and cycle ways is great but would need a massive uptake to fix the traffic issues that we will have with this volume of extra vehicles, even when they made the quail rise traffic use the roundabouts it was absolute carnage.</p> | <p>Please fix the traffic issues before anymore building.</p> |
| Wendy Banks | Oppose | | | |
| Vicky Hibbett | Oppose | Another high school. Under or over passes | <p>The bridge. Zero plans to extend it or build another so the bottleneck will be horrendous</p> | <p>It is bad enough already, this is year of construction. The bus is not an option when getting several young children to multiple afterschool activities and working myself and the bus would also be stuck in the traffic.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Robyn Shearwood | Oppose | Nothing | Traffic congestion, no parking, no single dwellings, I oppose apartment blocks and high rise development along Ladies Mile the entrance to Queenstown and no solution to traffic problems. | Oppose development along either side of Ladies Mile |
| Michel Marchand | Neutral | Nothing until you get the traffic right, add a bridge or suspended train but do something before adding 3000 to 5000 people | Not taking in consideration the traffic but offer buses and fixing the bridge, add a bridge or suspended train but do something before adding 3000 to 5000 people | Fix the traffic |
| Clare waddick | Neutral | Community facilities, though no details yet, I just hope it's big enough and able to meet the needs of Queenstown's many and diverse community groups | It's a lovely piece of land and should have houses that blend in, I don't like the idea of apartments, cheaper housing in the form of terrace housing ok, but not large blocks of apartments. It would be great to provide some kiwi build houses. | I like that the school will be next to glen panel, such a lovely old house in fabulous history should always be surrounded by bare land, it would be spoilt if surrounded by houses. The playing field of a school would suffice or a play ground. I hope it's not too long before this development can start. |
| Hine Marchand | Oppose | NOTHING until you sort the transport issue out because it is already a huge problem. The Traffic IS A PRIORETY. Its not reality, thinking people in this area will take a bus over their vehicle. Its not practical for the type of employment that is here. For example I'm a social worker and would not be able to use a bus for my work. The process is back to front. I think also your high density housing is going to be a nightmare of WHO you | Dealing with the traffic issue FIRST before spending money on the planning of the huge extended dense housing. | I believe that the interest of the community is NOT AT THE HEART OF THE POWERS that be that control who and what happens in this community. It is in the hands of the ones that SPEAK, with MONEY. this in my opinion determines the agenda that moves ahead and it is very disappointing and i have lived and watched on for over 40 years in this community. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | will have living there. An EYE sore for our beautiful entry into our area. I'm not against growth and development but high density, I'm NOT FOR. | | |
| Morgan Ford | Oppose | Gave the public an opportunity to give feedback | Med/High density is a terrible idea. Encouraging walking and cycling is great in theory but doesn't work. Just look at the congestion in Hanleys and Shotover. Low density is a better option, along with considerations for vehicles | |
| Patrick Leslie | Oppose | Little to none. Lack of consideration with wider affects on the basin particaly around movement of people to and from schools or work | The lack of effects on the shotover bridge as there is little to no industries going to be there. Everyone will drive to work over the bridge just adding to the traffic problems. This will push more traffic to onto speargass and Malaghans trying ti get around or away from thr traffic. | How will the high school be zoned will it include arrowtown bring more traffic in along sh6 |
| Sean McCarroll | Support | More houses, school, shops. | BMX track like in Cronwell. Large Pump track like at henleys farm. The pump track in Shotover county is way to small. | No, thanks |
| Allan Huntington | Support | The high proportion of High Density land and the requirement for a minimum number of residential units per hectare . | I would have liked a bigger stback from SH6 say 100mm plus that would have the provision for sports fields. Traffic management and veghicle numbers. It will be a paradigm shift to get people out of cars and there will be substantial traffic issues and congestion created on ladies mile and along SH6 into Frankton. | A substantial reserve contribution should be levied on each unit/lot or carparking space created to assist in resolving traffic issues. Say \$40,000 plus CPI. x 2400 lots = \$100,000,000 ring fenced for transport infrastructure |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Travis Sydney | Oppose | <p>To the extent there were 3 options you chose the lowest density option with development and density push back away from Lake Hayes (a lot of people think you purposely created 2 options which you knew wouldn't be acceptable so people would think you comprised on option C). Be sure that I oppose density development but if it is fait accompli then critical it is done well so glad that there are open spaces, retailing and school. It would be great if it had the same feeling and vibe as downtown Queenstown with a bias towards residential. Everyone wants the look and feel to seamlessly lead into queenstown as queenstown is NZ's only true world class city.</p> | <p>I utterly oppose the walking track from the development that threads through Threepwood to Lake Hayes. Threepwood Farm is a historic farm and having a walking track cut through the middle of it will create significant health and safety hazards that cannot be managed even with fencing (stock and machinery move through the farm). Dogs will loose and attack stock (as already happens), people will stray from the path into the private community areas, and we will encounter a significant loss of productivity. Our operations are already subscale and subeconomic and this has the real potential to cause it to become economically unviable and we have to cease operations. Not only does the farm add to and preserve the rural amenities and beauty of lake hayes but it also supports the upkeep of Slope Hill. Should the farm fail the paddocks would deteriorate, lake hayes and the gateway queenstown become less attractive, and slope hill could become overgrown. What happens if a child gets hurt on our farm when straying off the track, dogs kill our livestock, and we close down all over a silly track? There is already a track that leads from lake hayes going west - it boggles the mind why you don't just extend it and connect it to the development. If someone gets hurt and/or the farm fails because of this development and track it will be due to the poor planning that let this happen and on the Council's shoulders. Residents are vehemently opposed to this which you continue to ignore and not even consider an extremely simple and superior alternative.</p> <p>Literally no one believes you will be able to meet your public transport goals and as a consequence traffic will grind to a halt. You are naïve to draw assumptions from other parts of NZ and offshore and apply them to</p> | <p>Given this region and Queenstown in particular are the #1 reason why visitors come to NZ and stands out among international peers are world class why are we in such a rush to overly develop the region. I don't believe we should have density in the region, we shouldn't encourage people moving to the region, and if there must be density to house hospitality workers it should be further out of NZ with outstanding public transport to bring people to the city for work. It is not necessary to have it so close to Queenstown.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>Queenstown as A) kiwis love our cars and B) queenstown residents even more as we are all down there to get out into nature which requires transport. We drop our kids off at school (no one wants to catch a bus in the freezing rain during winter), go to work, take our bike on the car for a cycle later, pick up groceries on the way home. The consequences of putting these faulty assumptions into your traffic modeling will dramatically reduce the quality of life for everyone in the region and negatively impact commerce. This requires lower density and more investment into infrastructure.</p> <p>Lastly, no one believes the development will occur anywhere near as what have planned and drawn up in your pictures. There are too many landowners, MOE is not on board, NZTA is not on board, and none of the residents are on board. You need stricter controls to enforce development happens in a desirable way, further reduce density, invest in infrastructure and please god dont kill off threepwood farm with your silly track through the heart of our farm when there is an existing track right that just needs to be extended.</p> | |
| Sarah Wild | Oppose | Having better bus services and green space | <p>There simply must be an expansion of the bridge over the Shotover to 2 lanes each way if you put any more housing out this way</p> <p>There is planning for more schools but what about health services. The Queenstown lakes area is seriously lacking in public health facilities</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Roland Lemaire-Sicre | Oppose | The LMC has done a good job but it's totally the wrong place for it. | We have been earring from the start that Ladies Mile is the "gate way" to Queenstown. If it's the front door would it be better to leave it uncluttered and try to embellish it rather than to transform it in another suburban area. Queenstown does not rely on its reputation as a suburban region but is renowned for its natural beauty. There is nothing beautiful in a suburb however we try to make it look nice it will still be a suburb with concret, people, traffic & pollution of all sorts. | <p>The 2nd paragraph of the Ladies Mile master plan draft feed back:</p> <p>“Extensive engagement with landowners, multiple stakeholders (including Way to Go, Waka Kotahi NZTA, Iwi, Ministry of Education (MoE), Kāinga Ora), public open days, targeted community associated meetings and expert traffic modelling, have all led to the development of the draft Masterplan and related planning provisions.”</p> <p>How come if you had extensive engagement with landowners</p> <p>1 -- We do not figure on any plans you have drafted so far (we have been vaporised in thin air)</p> <p>2 -- As we are extremely affected, how come the Council (not LMC) has not been in contact with us to let us know how they intent to mitigate these dramatic effects. i.e.: Boundaries change, Access to our propriety, access to all amenities ...</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Omid Mohtadi | Oppose | <p>If this development goes hand in hand with a feasible and fundamental solution to the inevitable traffic jam it will cause due to shotover bridge bottleneck, it would be generally a good plan, however as it is a formulae for traffic disaster, as even now we in shotover country right up to Lake Hayes wait around 40-45minutes every morning without Ladies Mile development of thousands of new residences or overseas tourists compounding the problem.</p> | <p>Issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your transport plan or 'solutions' is composed of a lot of wishful thinking and theoretical models around impact on peak hour traffic but does not provide a concrete transport solution that actually can work to alleviate the peak hour traffic jams that we the residents of Shotover country, Lake Hayes estate and vicinity have to put up with every day in peak hours. 2. Your models are based on number of vehicles, how about using a metric of waiting times which is what causes frustration and waste of time to the people, how long is the queue is meaningless unless tied to how that impacts waiting times in the queue. Is it reasonable for a shotover country resident to be stuck in the queue for 30-45 minutes just to get out of Shotover country (up to the roundabout) and then have to endure the queue up to the bridge? and those are what we experience today in peak hours without any international tourists or thousands of residences being built in Ladies Miles project. 3. your models or assumptions about large % of people taking the bus does not take into consideration the winter times, or rainy days in which most people with own vehicle would be compelled to use it rather than waiting in the bus queue. The single lane in each direction of the shotover bridge means that your buses as well as the rest of us will be stuck in traffic jam when thousands of new residences are built on this side of the bridge. 4. The elephant in the room is that Queenstown has grown both in number of actual residents as well as vehicles needing to get to the town and back, but roading infrastructure has not moved to cater for it significantly, we still have a single access to the other | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>side of the Shotover bridge (unless we go all the way through Arthurs point through Gorge road and the back up again to reach Frankton area), an outdated bridge with a single lane each way. THAT is the problem and your transport plan does not even have in its possible solutions another bridge connecting shotover/Lake hayes estate to Hawthorne drive for instance which would cut the problem in half. Not even a possibility, nowhere to be seen</p> <p>Fundamental solution: The solution I am proposing is not even future proofing. That would be too much to ask as the entire roading infrastructure of new zealand is typically suffers procrastination and unfolds like a slow motion camera until the situation becomes a crisis and then take years to get to build a solution which as soon as it is enabled it is obsolete already, there are plenty of examples including the famous harbour bridge in Aucland that as soon as it was completed it had to be expanded with additional lanes (at a huge extra cost), or South Auckland motorway merging project for motorway 20 with motor way 1, that in the very first day created a massive jam (obviously because 5 lanes were converging into 2 :) and in a few days resulted in traffic lights having to be placed as an afterthought, or more locally our own shotover bridge, where the underpass completed recently negates any possibility now of adding an additional lane each way, so making this bridge forever single lane in each direction regardless of Queenstown's future growth. So we are not even proposing future-proofing just to address the current nightmarish peak hour issues which will invariably get compounded by the Ladies Mile development.</p> <p>Is it possible to at least seriously consider having another</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>access point, a bridge from Shotover Country direct to Hawthorne drive? before this possibility is also negated by other developments in the area? Is this so out of reach that your entire Ladies Mile transport plan does not even consider this as a possibility?</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Miranda spary | Oppose | Nothing | You should stop trying to suck the local life out of downtown - make high density housing up against the hills and encourage people not to have vehicles Havjbg everyone move to ladies Mile is ridiculous - there are no community spaces like churches, libraries, cinemas, community spaces, banks, post offices - instead of building new or renting nasty cheap ones at ladies Mike you should be encouraging people to move into downtown | I know you were told by everyone in the last survey that none of your options were acceptable but you couldn't fill in the rest of the survey unless you picked one of the idiotic suggestions - it would help if you actually listened |
| Michelle | Oppose | | Not listening to rate payers. Traffic congestion will be made worse not better. Ministry of education has not confirmed schools in the area. Main entrance to Queenstown will be spoiled. | Can we TRUST that QLDC will ensure that Developers will actually deliver to the plan? Can we trust that this won't go ahead until the traffic congestion is sorted as per Jim bolts promise at the community meeting? |
| Cheryl Langford | Oppose | I agree that IF and that is a big IF this is the right place to be building on at all, then I agree that there should be a considered plan so developers can't just do whatever they like on their bits of land on ladies Mile. | I appreciate that people need somewhere to live, but I really don't know if this is the right place to be building a new township. The area is overly congested already and adding more people to the area just doesn't make sense until the infrastructure is in place first. It is also the 'gateway' to Queenstown and at the moment is a pleasant experience with great views. Plonking 12 metre high apartments and buildings and general urban sprawl is not ideal. How do you ensure that developer's follow through with their 'promises' of commercial and social services? For example the cafe at Bridesdale Farm? Why does the council not put more pressure on developers to utilise the Kelvin Heights peninsula? | THERE SHOULD BE NO MORE RESOURSE CONSENTS GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE LADIES MILE AREA UNTIL ALL INFRASTRUCTURE IS IN PLACE INCLUDING A FURTHER BRIDGE OVER THE SHOTOVER RIVER OR ADDING MORE LANES TO THE EXISTING BRIDGE - AND INCLUDING SCHOOLS BEING CONFIRMED BY MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (Which have not been confirmed even though they are showing on your plans) |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Gary Erving | Neutral | Council taking a proactive approach, to ensure an actual plan and design it to work, rather than being lots of developers doing their own thing. | Not comfortable with the growth numbers for the area, but also understand why that density is required to support all the other services i.e. bus, schools. | |
| Dan Gerard | Oppose | High density housing | Overwhelmingly there is concern about existing traffic congestion leading into Frankton. This can only make it worse. Traffic needs fixing BEFORE development happens. Bus services need to be every 15 minutes, with dedicated bus lanes. | Having schools on SH6 won't prevent school children having to be taken by car to and from Frankton. Reason is most sporting events will still be held in Frankton, and this means crossing the bridge. The bridge and the bridge to Hardware lane is the bottleneck. This need fixing. |
| Keri Lemaire-Sicre | Oppose | ? | Right from the start of this process there has been a definite lack of listening to the Community. The agenda to develop was already decided before the community was asked what they thought. We feel the whole process has been driven by a few stakeholders and QLDC and that the community have been 'dragged along' !! | QLDC have a responsibility of care to protect the beauty of this town, the very reason why Tourists come to visit, Sorry but your proposal just doesn't fit on Ladies Mile. It will be an absolute eye saw. What a horrible legacy to leave behind |
| Daniel Cole-Bailey | Oppose | | I do not believe that the traffic issues will be addressed, I would like alot more details on how the down scaleing of vehicle use is going to be achieved as at the moment I can not see how this will happen. | Will the council be allowing short term holiday let's in this area as this will cause traffic |
| Lauren Moore | Oppose | Proposed schools | The infrastructure to support your plan. Parking for both residents and visitors Transport solutions are not viable.. I.e. the climate and environs we live in will not be suitable for 9 months of the year to bike. | Ladies Mile re-zoning will be deferred until such time as: - Urban centres are intensified first (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). - - Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. - There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | and any future growth. - There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed. |
| Nicola Proffit | Neutral | | The Ladies Mile re-zoning will be deferred until such time as: - Urban centres are intensified first (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). - Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. - There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. - There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed. | |
| Simon Khouri | Neutral | The location of schools, parks, community facilities and commercial areas. | The potential for residential development without the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for the existing community | 'We request that the Ladies Mile is managed via deferred zoning. As such, any up-zoning will be deferred until such time as: - Urban centres are intensified (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). - There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. - There is a certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Ladies Mile Pet Lodge | Oppose | NA | Ladies Mile is the wrong place for another subdivision attracting several thousand people thus transforming the rural nature of Ladies Mile environment which the pet lodge need to operate into another suburban jungle (no matter how beautiful that jungle is) | The LMC (Ladies Mile Consortium) Did an impressive amount of well crafted work but the mandate of the council to the LMC was wrong. |
| Jackie | Neutral | Lots of the plans looked good but there are a few things that have not been thought through in regards to existing community and traffic | Exact timeframes - options in another areas also close to town - if landowners will agree to the plans - traffic for the building of a whole new town | Some thought around the current community facilities and sorting traffic now let alone when this whole thing is being built 😊 |
| Dean Dolan | Oppose | Planing a primary and secondary school | <p>Carpark allowance for multi storey residential apartments</p> <p>As much as it would be great to have up 60% for people using public transport/ cycling people are still going to need a car to get around the district</p> <p>How you can plan to have only half a carpark for (I understand this is a average) for a apartment just doesn't make sense, it may work in a big city but we are a very very long way off becoming that</p> <p>Public transport is great but if the busses are going to cross the same 1 bridge as all the other vehicles that use it and need to use it to for the type of work they do are we not just adding to the congestion that we already have</p> | |
| Thabit Ayoub | Oppose | Nothing. | You haven't implemented any measures which will effectively encourage a mode shift in transport habits to the level required to ease congestion. Never before has there been an example of transport mode shift at the level required to not clog our roads. You know this - but are continuing nonetheless. Until you and the NZTA bang your heads together and double the bridge capacity there is going to be carnage out there once implemented. The bottlenecks exist and have not been | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>addressed. 40% of people will not be hopping on the bus all of a sudden because you made a new route and added a few stops. This has been proven already with the \$2 bus and the number 5 route.</p> <p>You are going to make this a logistical nightmare and you continue to ignore that fact because of greed to take the developers dollars. You don't listen when we speak. You do what you want. You don't represent your people.</p> | |
| Louise Clark | Oppose | More amenities | Public transport, road network, safe cycling routes | It's just too much, without everything supporting this being in place first! |
| bill yuill | Oppose | nothing | development at all cost is what you want | <p>Yet again certain people have a fixed agenda</p> <p>Infill of existing land should occur first less load on infrastructure</p> <p>Before urban sprawl public transport and alternative transport measures must be in place not the halve arsed things you have in existence at present</p> <p>Rapid mass transport and direct cycle and walking tracks would have to occur before you even looked at what you are suggesting</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Stuart Victor | Oppose | Nothing. | <p>I oppose the rezoning of land currently zoned Rural, Rural Lifestyle, or Large Lot Residential to a mixture of High Density, Medium Density and Lower Density Suburban Residential Zones and the extension of the existing Urban Growth Boundary in this area to incorporate these areas.</p> <p>This development is in the absolute WORST location you can choose as it will cripple SH6 for traffic entering or exiting Frankton/Queenstown. The Shotover Bridge would need to be rebuilt as a 4 lane bridge before ANY further development is even considered.</p> | <p>QLDC's and the developers proposed accommodation for 10,000+ new residents on Ladies Mile is reckless and with the ever increasing amount of traffic travelling on SH6 from Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cromwell, and Alexandra, it will prevent current and future residents from accessing Frankton or Queenstown. A bus lane is proposed starting from the Howard's Drive exit, down to the Shotover Bridge, however, the buses will still have to wait in a long line with all the cars exiting Lake Hayes Estate/Shotover Country before they can even utilise that bus lane. Then, when the buses reach the Shotover Bridge, the merging of the bus lane will only create more traffic jams; therefore it will not solve the traffic issues.</p> <p>A BUS LANE WILL NOT SOLVE THE TRANSPORT ISSUES!</p> <p>QLDC, the Mayor and Councilors - please oppose the rezoning of land currently zoned Rural, Rural Lifestyle, or Large Lot Residential to a mixture of High Density, Medium Density and Lower Density Suburban Residential Zones and the extension of the existing Urban Growth Boundary in this area to incorporate these areas? If this development goes ahead, it will utterly cripple this State Highway to Frankton and Queenstown!</p> <p>If this development of Ladies Mile/SH6 actually gets approved, QLDC must work</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>with the NZTA ***BEFORE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED TO START*** to add a new 4 lane Shotover Bridge. This way, bus lanes can continue across the bridge to/from Frankton and Lake Hayes and will then allow the bus travel time to be an acceptable 15 minutes and will then encourage people to leave their cars at home.</p> <p>I think Arrow Junction (near the bottom of the Crown Range road) is the most suitable location for a Park and Ride. It is a short drive for Arrowtown residents, and captures the Wanaka, Cromwell, and Alexandra commuters before they get too close to Frankton/QT. Putting a 300+ parking lot at 516 Ladies Mile Highway (SH6) is not appropriate as drivers are then so close to Frankton so will not want to stop to get on a bus.</p> <p>Thank you very much for reading my submission.</p> |
| Matthew Barnett | Support | A high standard of development, well considered with good provision of outdoor space and community facilities. | Very poor connection between existing communities (Shotover Country & LHE) and new Ladies Mile community. This connection is critical to SC and LHE seeing the benefit of the adjacent development. NZTA have their head in the sand as to the impact this is going to have on traffic movements through this critical entry corridor to Queenstown. Shotover Country needs a bus only lane for departing | Suggest re-considering re-routing SH6 along the foot of Slope Hill so that there is not a main highway dividing SC & LHE from the new development. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Shotover County not just along Ladies Mile. I appreciate this is not an easy task, but this is vital to the function of the bus service leaving the subdivision.</p> | |
| Nicky Busst | Neutral | <p>The connections with better bus and cycle ways. A dedicated bus lane. PLEASE can the school bus use it too. The parents of school kids just take kids off buses and into their own cars when traffic gets worse so as not to be late (esp at NCEA time of year - Nov) which is also peak summer traffic. So you need to have a dedicated bus lane for school buses too which are safe so parents will put their kids on the. The roundabout at LHE entrance and (might have missed this, but thought there was a bike safe crossing e.g tunnel/underpass for crossing SH6</p> | <p>High Density Zoning argument that this will enable the bus and cycle lanes to be prioritized and a roundabout at LHE entrance (which is great!!) HOWEVER it is based that the high density zoning will not increase traffic in private vehicles as more people will use public transport. This argument is flawed for the following reason: With growth of development more tradesman will be required who can not use public transport as need their own tools and vehicles. I understand some studies where done that showed most people leaving SC and LHE estates were 50% tradesman and another 30% were families with children. These are the 2 groups you are least likely to be able to move from their own cars. SO, you are only actually able to shift the remaining 20% of single use occupants and they are not typically the demographic you who will be occupy the high density new housing development n the other side of Ladies Mile you are proposing, they'll be the other 70% so this is why your argument is flawed NZTA have already advised the bridge over Shotover River has exceeded capacity and yet building more roads and bigger bridges will also not help. You need NEW ways in and out of Queenstown. Ladies Mile whilst a commuter belt AND the entrance to</p> | <p>Please add an alternative way to get out of LHE/Shotover (old school road) so not everything goes onto Ladies Mile. Look at commuter traffic issues BEFORE they even reach Ladies Mile. SLOW the traffic down by ensuring NZTA lower the speed limit to 60kph along their, 100kph is ridiculous.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>Queenstown is NOT the right area to build up</p> <p>Also, your argument that more facilities in Ladies mile (School, shops etc) will also stop people having to travel over the bridge to get to Frankton is again flawed. People have kids already at the schools and won't; want to move them. The key shops! will always remain in Frankton. An expensive 24/7 and a primary school will not make enough of a difference to stop the congest. At the very least if you are going to proceed, PLEASE ensure you have a 2nd way out of LHE and Shotover Country (Old School Road was muted at one of the community input meetings and you can not leave us commuter stuck in heavy traffic and think that more busses and bike routes will save it. I personally would choose to bike/bus if I could however I also don't have a bus route to my place of work Arrowtown) and then you have 4 months of the year when it is too cold/icy to travel by bus.</p> <p>Planners, I like you are trying with solutions but they still need much work .</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Matthew Barnett | Support | See previous notes | See previous notes | <p>Could you please add the following to my previous commentary. I hit submit to soon. Thanks.</p> <p>The Laurel Hills development which was declined consent raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Novogroup review of Shotover Country/Ladies Mile Queuing: It is specifically noted that this queuing issue should be largely remedied by the proposed Programme 3 works identified in the WSP / Opus assessment. This relies on a 40% mode shift which the WPS / Opus report notes is higher than could be reasonably expected. (Table 7) <p>Programmes 3 & 4 is only achievable with MRT which is cost prohibitive.</p> <p>How does the new traffic data show this mode shift is achievable, if it was previously not considered possible?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSP / Opus 2.1.3 Regional Policy Statement for Otago (1998) Otago's Regional Policy Statement for transport promotes and encourages the sustainable management of Otago's transport network through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting the use of fuel efficient modes of transport • Encouraging a reduction in the use of fuels which produce emissions harmful to the environment • Promoting a safer transport system • Promoting the protection of transport infrastructure from the adverse effects of |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>land use activities and natural hazards. As of late 2017, the Policy Statement is under review. However, Otago Regional Council will continue to provide social, cultural and environmental wellbeing, community and safety for future generations. The current transport network infrastructure is already under pressure. SH6 is referred to as the lifeline to Queenstown. It's imperative this route remains functional and that it's protected. Most goods and services supplying Queenstown enter over the Shotover Bridge. The efficient function of the entire district could be significantly impacted by poor management of traffic in this one area.</p> |
| Juliet henry | Oppose | | <p>Access should be from stalker road not Spence road. Oppose to any high rise, high density buildings.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Richard | Neutral | <p>Extra schooling (I assume for the local community?).</p> <p>Community hub.</p> | <p>Transport strategy. Of course there will be much more traffic. Is a traffic jam the best gateway Queenstown could have? Bus and cycle options are neither a sensible or realistic answer.</p> <p>Cramming terraced and multi-level housing in goes against the areas aesthetic.</p> <p>There was no mention of pollution caused from extra housing. I assume wood burners would not be allowed otherwise LHE and SC would be covered in smog all winter.</p> | <p>The only thing driving these developments is the developments themselves. What industries, other than tourism does Queenstown have? Once the developers have their buckets of gold and leave town, taking all the tradies and ancillary services with them these areas will be ghost towns.</p> |
| Steve Hardy | Oppose | <p>I do not think anything is right about this masterplan</p> | <p>I do not agree with the level of development proposed in this master plan, I believe there could be some housing along Ladies mile that would not effect the beauty of the area or overload the infrastructure but this would be single level, stand alone housing with adequate setbacks from SH6.</p> | <p>It wasn't long ago the ladies mile was considered an outstanding natural feature and the gateway to Queenstown and as such there was to be little or no development.</p> <p>I do not understand why the council are now proposing high density development which I do not believe any current residents want, anyone will want to live in and I am sure the visitors to the area will not want to see as they enter the town.</p> <p>The ladies Mile already has traffic problems and this will only make it considerably worst.</p> <p>Queenstown has a finite amount of land and therefore a limited amount of growth before it reaches its capacity, I feel this is being overlooked and this master plan is an attempt to meet demand for housing.</p> <p>The reality is the demand of people wanting to move to this area is many times higher than the capacity the town</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | <p>has.</p> <p>I believe the master plan should be what Queenstown would ideally look like when at capacity and then areas are opened up for development (along with sufficient infrastructure upgrades) in stages, this master plan just looks like a desperate attempt to provide housing quickly and easily.</p> <p>Aside from the fear that this will make the area less desirable to live in I believe we risk making it somewhere tourists will not want to visit.</p> <p>We have the opportunity to maintain Queenstown's beauty and have it a place that residents love to live in and tourists want to visit, I do not believe this master plan achieves this.</p> |
| Lisa Pond | Oppose | Mixed density housing | Transport. People won't get the bus as much as you are saying. It's a family neighbourhood, parents need their cars for after school activities, supermarket etc. Lots of tradies live here and need vehicles for work. It needs to be four lanes from the Shotover Country roundabout to Hardware Lane. | |
| Andrew Langford | Oppose | Stopping original consent application & starting this process | A solution to the traffic congestion this proposal will create. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this the right place within the Wakatipu for high density development at the moment? • Can we TRUST that QLDC will ensure that Developers will actually deliver to the plan? • Will Commercial and Community Amenities be built in conjunction with residential? |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence of adequate solutions for traffic congestion. |
| Mark Kelly | Support | The idea of town centre with supermarket, banks , shops plus schools is good . this reduces the need to cross the bridge. | The traffic issue is being brushed to the side, the growth of the whole of Central Otago Region needs to be taken into account. we need another bridge. Im not happy with high density development in this area. | Traffic is the major issue, busses are not going to fix that problem |
| Brandon Purdue | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The provision of further infrastructure and facilities throughout the wakatipu basin is required but this has to be balanced against the costs. When you conduct a cost benefit analysis of the ladies mile masterplan, the costs outweigh the benefits. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I object to the ladies miles masterplan which is over intensified (for the area) and based on poor assumptions/false promises which will lead to significant congestion. o The lake hayes and shotover country residential developments have already put enough houses into the ladies miles area. o The development of further high density housing should be focused on things like the remarkables apartments and te pa tahuna. More high density housing like the remarkables apartments could be built in the same area which allows residents to walk/bike to work easily. Furthermore, high density housing could be built at the end of gorge road which is close to town which will allow residents to walk/bike to work easily. o Transport congestion should be solved (solutions proven to be correct) before any consideration is given to the ladies mile masterplan. The proposed solutions are based on changing behaviours, behaviours can be influenced and may change but I doubt they will change to the levels indicated in the ladies mile masterplan. Simple things like winter make a huge difference. People also need cars to transport bikes, skis, boats, kids etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Has any consideration been given to providing free (or very low cost) buses from Cromwell/possibly Wanaka to Queenstown in the morning and return in the evening? Give it a go, if it helps, great, if not, cancel. Build the cost into rates. We will all be better off if there's less cars coming from Cromwell/possibly Wanaka to Queenstown every weekday and then returning in the evening. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>o People won't use buses until there are bus lanes and they can actually see that the bus gets somewhere quicker. At the moment the bus is stuck in the same traffic so why would you change from the car to bus?</p> | |
| Camille Khouri | Neutral | <p>I like the concept of high density villages where people can live, work and play. Having schools helps to reduce traffic.</p> | <p>Relying on the hope that people will not use their cars is foolish. People will still need to drive to Frankton for different reasons. A second lane over the Shotover River is the only answer if you are to be building this many houses on this side of Frankton.</p> | <p>While I like the idea of high density villages, I don't think this is the right place to put such high level apartment buildings as the 6-7 storey ones proposed. Stick to 2-3 levels as a more realistic option for the types of people who are likely to want to live here - ie families and young couples.</p> |
| Julia Eade | Oppose | | <p>The amount of traffic that this is going to generate!! I own a business in the construction sector here and increasing the construction in the area means more employees and more vans. There will end up being hundreds of tradies with vehicles travelling into an already congested area. Offering a bus service will not end the congestion!!! We are travelling in vehicles because we have to!!! Not just because we are opposed to using the bus. We will not be able to get out of Lake Hayes Estate as a family and as an employer I will be faced with employees sitting in traffic jams for large</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | parts of their day. Sort out the bridge issue first!!!! Please!!!! | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Ina Angova | Oppose | <p>I like that you are planning to build more schools in the area and create another "town center". There are also great ideas about extension of the recreational areas.</p> | <p>I read the whole document and the solutions about the traffic congestion. I was amazed that there was no mention of widening the existing Shotover Bridge or building a second bridge over the river connecting the bottom of Shotover Country and to the Glenda drive industrial area.</p> <p>The passing comment in the document "as merge/diverge pairs would leave a relatively short section of single lane road in the middle" was honestly very ignorant as that short single lane road is the one causing much of the problems at the moment.</p> <p>As someone who has lived around the world, in large cities with an amazing public, transport NZ can only dream of, your solutions and evaluations of the current issues are childish and naive. Even with 3000 more houses in the area, we will not have the scale of providing reliable, fast, affordable and frequent public transport.</p> <p>We also suffered through the Auckland Southern motorway "upgrades" before moving here. Those upgrades that made people lose many hours in traffic were already obsolete on opening day. My strong feeling is that this short-sidedness is being transferred here as well. We, the residents will have to endure many long months and years of worst than present traffic to later realize that the solution offered is only good for a year or 2 as will happen with the Kawarau river bridge once the new subdivisions are built.</p> <p>There were a lot of dreamy solutions in your document, that sound very politicly correct and green. Some of those are the assumptions that most people will be using public transport and park and rides when many of us can not move without a car as we have mobile</p> | <p>I do not believe that the development should go ahead unless we have a minimum of 2 lanes in each direction on SH6 and 3 lanes.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>businesses, non-fixed workplaces and even today, without all of these new cars and without tourists, we waste a lot of time and money having our employees stuck in traffic while coming in and out of the area. We pay them for every minute they travel and this is the type of cost you do not calculate.</p> <p>In addition, there wasn't a single mention of a designated bus lane either. That means the bus will be stuck in traffic as well, doesn't it?</p> <p>The dream about using Ebikes and the likes is amazing but it's a dream. We will not have the density of London, Paris, or even downtown Auckland. Most of us can not be bothered even if we could use the Ebikes for free to use them with temperatures under 10C or negative, on windy days (which are plenty!), after Between April and October when days are shorter, or in the winter. I will also not use them if it's too hot in summer and I can bet there are many like me.</p> <p>The assumption that people will not own cars in an area where you can't do much without a car is also absurd. We live in Queenstown so that we can go to the ski fields and not pay \$25 per person for the bus, we can get to walks when we need to, and for all that you need a car. I personally know very few people who do not own a car - even temporary workers do and they may have a company car or bus to work.</p> <p>In the Queenstown setting where a high percentage of people live as flatmates, you should calculate 1 car per bedroom and not per residence.</p> <p>My general feeling is that the project looks great on paper. It is clear that it will be very lucrative for a number of people and companies, but that the actual human consequences of its implementation have not been taken into account.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>I believe that until such time that we can widen our roads and fully resolve the Shotover crossing, and future-proof it, this development will prove to be another way to decrease our quality of life.</p> | |
| Theresa Kelly | Oppose | The idea of creating more of a hub with ammenities and retail this side of the bridge | <p>Traffic issues I don't see the bus idea as realistic or Houses with .5 car parks</p> | Strongly disagree with putting road in from highway through to Sylvan Street |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Harrison Lou | Neutral | Overall if development must occur then needs to be done well. Support lower density and making the development attractive. Pleased western shores of lake Hayes not being developed and the lowest option selected. | Still too much density and you have your heads in the sand on traffic. Live in Threepwood and against having the track cut through our farm. We will lose high productivity land, afraid of pests attacking stock, keeping people on the track and off private property, health and safety, and worried it will cause us to wind down the farm. Its beautiful and important for everyone it keeps going. Just link the track to the front of Ladies Mile!!!! | Need to address traffic or you will destroy Queenstown. |
| George Carver | Oppose | Open up land for housing | Shotover bridge needs upgrading to handle current let alone future traffic | |
| Sally Whitewoods | Oppose | I understand the need for growth and also the rezoning of areas. This needs to include changing LHE and Shotover Country to non rural and this to be reflected in the government with regards to WINZ as we are zoned out of extra help. Families are penalized from being by the schools. | I think we are all very short sighted to think that people will use other modes of transport before using the car. I struggle to get to town on the bus within 40 minutes on some days. The only way to allow for more cars and people is to create main dual carriageway either way in and out of town. We aren't even busy with tourists at the moment and it can be very bad. 5 years on and we will be stuck in traffic with another 2/3 cars per house at Ladies Mile. Will be impossible to turn out of side roads onto main road. | |
| Kirsty Mee | Oppose | Adding in of another high school if this goes ahead | Is this the RIGHT place within the Wakatipu for high density development at the moment? Can we TRUST that QLDC will ensure that Developers will actually deliver to the plan? Will Commercial and Community Amenities be built IN CONJUNCTION with residential? Lack of evidence of adequate solutions for traffic congestion and parking. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Traffic CONGESTION CONGESTION CONGESTION Is this what we want as the ENTRANCE to Queenstown? | |
| Stephen Clark | Oppose | I'm pro-development generally. | Traffic. Traffic. Traffic. Failure to upgrade Shotover Bridge. | <p>I can't believe the NZTA (or whoever is responsible for the Shotover Bridge) can hold an entire community and it's development to ransom, by refusing to contemplate expanding the bridge. It is an obvious bottleneck... all the plans I have seen so far to manage traffic fall under the category of "lipstick on a pig". As a family doing a range of kids sports etc. there is no way we will be using (or could use) public transport on a daily basis.</p> <p>I'm seeing in the future the council approving the ladies mile development anyway, and everybody living east of queenstown putting up with the diabolical traffic problems it will cause (which will be far worse than even those occurring today).</p> |
| Rebecca Orpin | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Tracey | Oppose | | Traffic!! | Traffic congestion is a problem. How is an additional 1.6km queue acceptable? |
| Renee Grove and Ian Bayliss | Support | <p>Emphasis on achieving efficient, more affordable, higher density land use in tandem with developing integrated transport solutions to keep the area highly accessible and not overly congested (relative to other dense urban centres). Emphasis on the need to achieve really high development outcomes in terms of attractive landscaping elements, high quality street furniture and carefully designed street environments, and other public open spaces.</p> | <p>The proposed underpass at the end of Howards Drive is likely to provide a very unattractive connection between LM and LHE and SC that is prone to vandalism and anti-social behaviour. A biking and walking over-bridge at this location would be very desirable but if that isn't practical or affordable a signalised intersection with easy (straight safe and at grade) pathways for walking and cycling should be part of the new intersection at the end of Howards Drive.</p> <p>The masterplan should signal the need for an itemised and specific set of complimentary capital works projects such as road upgrades, transport facilities, recreation facilities and other community facilities which can then be considered for funding in future LTP processes.</p> | |
| Sally Andrew | Oppose | Nothing, the whole plan is way to encroaching. | I believe the plan is not at all sympathetic to the area, we are not a city and build up in this area will take away part of what make this area beautiful. | I am strongly opposed to the plan that has been suggested. I think building these eye sores on this land is actually a stupid idea when there is quite clearly better places in our area for such high density building if we truly need it. Such as Frankton flats. We should be trying to preserve the whole Whakatipu, as much as we can not selling out to high density building because we think that's what we need. I believe it will detract from what make this |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | place special. Building something like this here might just be the thing that stops people from coming. |
| MICK Burdon | Oppose | This should be kept as a Green Area to welcome people to Queenstown as the infrastructure further on in will not cope | Why do we need to jam people into this lovely area well known for its agricultural importance when I came here perhaps push some over to Speargrass flat | Do we really have to jam up this area |
| Gayle Thornton | Oppose | Nothing until traffic is resolved | missing better transport infrastructure | |
| don | Oppose | absolutely nothing , it doesn't need developed in any way | you are still persuring a growth at any cost model that is the last thing this district needs | stop it all |
| Neal McAloon | Oppose | <p>This question is worded in the same spirit as hey , which of the 3 ladies miles development options do you prefer most Qldc? (None)</p> <p>Qldc seem to think the only option is for some large density housing development on lady's mile without any further infrastructure development?</p> | <p>An alternative option to usage of lady's mile. Also there has been zero reference to the climate action plan in these proposals. This is an overarching plan and a legal requirement for QLDC to consider in any developments or strategic planning??</p> <p>Mike Theelin said he would consider this when asked at a public meeting. What's happened since?</p> | Is anyone listening or even better, answering? |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | There is no alternative open for discussion this is a fait accompli and not how local government should operate. | | |
| Emma Black | Oppose | | No certainty for the community. The road is so dangerous as it is. No actual plan can be seen for where the schools will be. And who is going to be able to afford these houses?? | PLEASE! Ladies Mile re-zoning will be deferred until such time as: - Current URBAN centres are intensified FIRST (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). - Traffic SOLUTIONS are found that meet the needs of the EXISTING community. - There are COMMUNITY FACILITIES established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. - There is CERTAINTY that a high school and primary school will proceed and exactly where. |
| Rob Burnell | Oppose | Conceptually, a masterplan for developing areas of the Wakatipu district could work See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 38 | See Attachment A - So much is wrong - please refer to my feedback | See Attachment A - Please refer to my attached feedback (page 38) |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Jill howell | Oppose | | | <p>I request that the Ladies Mile re-zoning will be deferred until such time as: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current URBAN centres are intensified FIRST (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). - - Traffic SOLUTIONS are found that meet the needs of the EXISTING community. - - There are COMMUNITY FACILITIES established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. - - There is CERTAINTY that a high school and primary school will proceed |
| Ian Moore | Oppose | | <p>There is an unsupported assumption in the plan that Ladies Mile must undergo significant development. Claims that developers somehow can force this development on the community against their wishes, and that the community's best form of protection is the development of a masterplan seem extremely unlikely and have never been justified. Council needs to take a big step backwards and start talking to the community about these issues, before they produce detailed plans. The council has never asked what the community wants to see for Ladies Mile based on benefit to the community and without these unjustified restrictions. I do not consider the current process to be a proper consultation. The previous online survey forced contributors to choose between three options, all of which involved significant development. Many of the comments indicated that people resented this, and wanted much less development than any of the options offered.</p> <p>I personally do not want to see any significant urbanisation of Ladies Mile. This area has already been</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>massively overdeveloped with Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country. The proposed masterplan is driven by short term economic gain, not by the much more urgent considerations of climate change, community well-being, sustainability, the visitor experience, economic diversification and long-term planning. In general, I believe we should be avoiding rezoning that increases urbanisation.</p> | |
| John Wilson | Oppose | Nothing | You've got it all wrong Ladies Mile should not be rezoned. | Ladies Mile should be kept as a green zone. |
| Sarah Arkin | Oppose | Green areas and community services should be located in this area. | <p>' It is our opinion that the proposal to change the zoning of the Ladies Mile area from rural to a master planned, high density development is flawed. This does not represent intensification; it represents greenfield, dispersed development.</p> <p>As outlined above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ladies Mile is a greenfields site and is physically separated from services and employment. Whether it provides 1100 homes or 2300 homes, it will increase traffic movements in an already congested environment. Traffic is already causing significant adverse effects to our community's wellbeing. Until such time as the existing traffic issues are resolved, then there should be no further development at Ladies Mile. - We have taken on board Mr Avery's concerns around existing zoning not being adequate to 'stop developers doing what they want'. We propose a deferred zoning. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Any development must be deferred until such time that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues are resolved; there must be a workable public transport system in place, and the Shotover Bridge provides four lanes. If these actions are not taken then traffic congestion will only get worse. - The school sites are confirmed - Community facilities for the existing community are provided, and there is capacity for future development. - Existing centres are intensified to accommodate growth. <p>Until the traffic issues are resolved, the existing community is provided for, and greater certainty provided that the master plan can be achieved, then we oppose the Ladies Mile proposal.</p> | |
| JennyWhite | Oppose | | <p>Far too many houses/ multi- level in a small area which will require access onto LadiesMile which is already heavily congested at certain times of the day.</p> | <p>I fail the see how this developement will solve any issues now or in the future. The biggest problem is Shotover bridge. It needs to be 4 lanes before any further housing goes ahead.</p> |
| Maree Wheeler | Oppose | <p>Community Facilities at 516, Sports fields for the the existing community, long awaited underpass to Lake Hayes (as promised by LHE developers 18 years ago), Education facilities (given that MOE agree)</p> | <p>Inadequate solutions to traffic congestion and adding to the problem not fixing it. High rise accomodation options need to be close to exisiting amenities and commercial hubs. Commercial is not big enough to sustain live/work/play therefore Ladies Mile will become yet another commuter suburb. Destroying the iconic entrance to Queenstown - "We are the place the rest of the world cannot be" - you said it so don't replace beautiful views with traffic and high rises like parts of the rest of the world!! No direct commuter route for active travel. MOE have not endorsed education sites drawn on the plan. Where are the arts/creative centres? Green spaces - no specifics, hard to know that will</p> | <p>Distinct lack of trust that QLDC will be able to ensure that the developers follow the plan and that what we see in the pretty pictures will actually happen. This is based on previous experience in that marketing brochures and developer promises don't match the reality. What incentives/triggers will QLDC put in place to ensure that commercial and community facilities are built in conjunction with residential so we don't just end up with high rise residential and no amenities. Who is going to pay for the</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | actually be put in place? No assurance that Lake Hayes wont be affected by increase in users | continued upkeep on all proposed green spaces/tree plantings etc and the long term community amenities proposed, library etc - where is the budget for all of this? Please manage this via deferred zoning. I fully support the LHESC CA submission. |
| Wheeler | Oppose | Community facilities, sports ground | traffic congestion will only get worse at peak work times, lots of tradies live in this area they can't take bus or bike and still need to park workvans, need off street car parking. Don;t like the idea of highrise view coming into Queenstown and if you don't have a vehicle its too far from supermarket/ pubs etc. | |
| Trineka Newton | Oppose | additional schooling for a growing popluation. | Traffic, Transport and roading issues. I can't see that these have been actioned?? Only made worse. | I am 100% backing the words of the LHCA on the following: Entrance to Queenstown “We are the place the rest of the world cannot be” quoted from QLDCs own Vision 2050. There are plenty of places in the world where we can sit in traffic jams and see high rises as the entrance to the town/city! How many places in the world can you drive into the town past a picturesque lake, look up to a mountain range on the left (with residential is set back from the main road) and look right to sloping hills, farmland and yet another mountain in the distance? The Ladies Mile is the entrance to Queenstown, providing high levels of visual amenity. While the quality of the views towards the Remarkables have been reduced because of the retirement |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>village, there still exists views towards Slope Hill, which is an outstanding natural feature. Locating dense, high built form at the foot of Slope Hill will adversely affect the qualities of this landscape. Little has been said about the landscape effects of this proposal in terms of those important views and the impact this will have on visitors who come to our region for all the views in the area.</p> <p>“Welcome to Queenstown - it is unclear how long it will take you to reach your destination after you pass Lake Hayes, but sit in traffic and enjoy the welcoming view of highrise apartment blocks from your crawling vehicle!” Councillors - do you want this to be your legacy??</p> |
| Sammy | Oppose | Nothing | Traffic will be out of control, need to put a traffic plan in place | |
| Stephen Dalley | Neutral | The need for schooling and community spaces. It is a convenient location that is somewhat suited for new housing in the basin. I don't look forward to more people being here but we need to be realistic and plan for it still. | <p>Traffic will be bad, bad, bad. I've been involved (for a different city) in council planning for traffic initiatives in the past. Here experts were sure their intricate modelling of traffic flows according to 'international best practise' work. Common sense said it wouldn't work and, of course, the project was a massive and expensive failure.</p> <p>If there is not a four lane Shotover bridge and four lanes leading to at least the Arrowtown turn-off there will be more congestion, an incredible amount of cost to the local economy in lost productivity, and a high potential for accidents, injury and death.</p> <p>Yes, encouraging people onto public transport is a great</p> | <p>We desperately need a built-for-purpose library complex for the area and I don't believe there is currently enough space allocated for this.</p> <p>There are some great examples of library/community centres around New Zealand. Design something beautiful and sustainable, incorporate a community garden, tool library / repair and restore workshop and small cafe. Then the surrounding neighbourhoods will have a desperately needed space that will provide a significant ROI while ensuring</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>approach. But there are simply far too many places and activities in the basin for this to be viable at an individual and community level. The town's budget simply cannot provide public transport with enough convenience for many who live here.</p> <p>We will need the four lanes, at least two pedestrian bridges spanning the road for safe school travel and, last but not least, a far greater emphasis and support for better bike travel and active travel in the area. People need to be able to bike safely! There will be at least one significant accident at the intersection leading on to Glenda Drive within the next year. I'm sure of it.</p> | <p>stronger, healthier and more resilient communities.</p> <p>Ladies' Mile is ideal for this - but it needs more space than what is currently planned for.</p> |
| Patricia | Oppose | | <p>I don't think this whole plan is suitable for a place like Queenstown much less Ladies Mile. The idea of having a huge building and all that traffic taking away all the green space and nature (which is what makes Qstn beautiful) is just evidence of how this amazing town will become a grey city full of cars.</p> <p>This is not Queenstown. Don't take away the green space :(</p> | |
| Michelle | Oppose | | Bridge and roading | Bridge must be replaced with 4 lane prior to development |
| Lisa Anderson | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Anna McCarthy | Oppose | Assessing the requirement for further housing options is positive. Further housing options are needed | I think the intention of the development plan overshoots the mark and seems to be an exercise in driving revenue as opposed to effectively considering the existing conditions and environment. I believe that current residents of the area will be adversely affected by traffic conditions, access to education and services, detracting from the reason many people choose to live here, namely environs and lifestyle. Furthermore greater emphasis is required for public transport infrastructure and schedules, especially considering the current level of parking requirements outlined in the plan for new dwellings. | |
| Wendy Banks | Oppose | | | |
| Ian Scott | Oppose | nothing, you are just beating the community down so we have no energy to fight any longer | the roads are to fill already and your modelling is wrong, you have only picked at bits of information to support your views. | you care only about the developers and not about the people who have to leave here now |
| Anna Clarkson | Oppose | Transport hub and sports fields | Planning for high density housing without the roading infrastructure to manage traffic from proposed residences. You can't guarantee where these people are going to work (Queenstown, frankton) so where do you plan to send busses to? Most busses currently empty. Will need a culture change in how we commute. | |
| Lara Kirk | Oppose | Schools and community spaces | Density Solutions to the single bridge. | I'd be supportive of the bridge was changed or another bridge added. It's already incredibly frustrating at rush hours. Buses are great and I use the one to go |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | into Queenstown often but adding more stops will slow this down |
| Rachel KaneSmith | Oppose | | No high/medium density areas | Fix road congestion issues before even thinking about developing more housing |
| James Wallis | Oppose | Considering rezoning of the area. | <p>Proposing high density residential without first addressing the obvious traffic issues.</p> <p>The key premise that peoples preferred modes of transport will be walking, biking and buses is based on an academic exercise rather than reality.</p> <p>The communities affected by the proposed development are overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>The community feedback meeting at Shotover Primary School was structured in a way to force people to choose the option that they most like/dislike, rather than addressing the actual issue, which is that people DO NOT want this development to proceed. The structure of the entire meeting was almost a fait accompli, as the main concerns of the community were literally swept under the carpet.</p> <p>The consultants engaged to complete the study and concept do not appear to have considered the community views, have obviously not experienced the current traffic issues, are not a part of the community, and have very little thought for the character of the area.</p> | <p>Before proceeding with any further work on this project, Council should undertake a door to door survey of Shotover Country, Lake Hayes Estate (including Bridesdale Farm), the Queenstown Country Club and other dwellings in the area to get a real metric on how the community views the proposal. I doubt that this will be undertaken, as Council will not like the response (you are clearly trying to force this proposal through, regardless of how the communities most affected feel). Should the survey go ahead, it should consist of questions that are open to all views - not forcing people to choose their most preferred option, when they clearly don't like any of them.</p> <p>If the development goes ahead, traffic infrastructure should be upgraded PRIO to any development.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Tyron Smith | Oppose | | No high density housing | |
| Samuel Sharp | Oppose | A need to make land available for housing and also cafes, bars and light retail. | Completely missed impact on traffic, without significant improvements to infrastructure traffic will be an unbelievable mess. I cannot believe that anyone could look at developing as proposed and not see the glaring elephant in the room that is massive traffic congestion. Lack of parking for additional residents also means roads will be littered with vehicles. | |
| Peter Thompson | Oppose | Very little | Over populating Queenstown, not taking into consideration locals views | |
| Jayna Mackley | Oppose | Public Spaces? | There can be NO new development until the traffic congestion issues are addressed in a BIG way | This whole process leaves the community wondering what the council doesn't understand about our community. We can not have cars backed up to the first roundabout in Lake Hayes Estate without the council taking notice and making a plan. I am not opposed to more development - it just needs to come AFTER a new bridge, wider road, and easing the transport issues. We also need WAY more community spaces and public transport options. and, every house MUST have parking. No one is going to live here without transport. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Ibrahim | Oppose | Basically nothing on the master draftplan. | That the land there is suitable for high density development. | There is already enough congestion on the roads basically all day long especially during the morning and afternoon rush hours. We really dont need more of it & are looking for solutions, whereas council planners think its a good idea to proceed to re zone it to cram in residents. |
| Linda Hill | Oppose | Yes, development is needed for more residents | A new shotover bridge to ease traffic issues now and in the future. | |
| Marie irvine | Oppose | Not much at all | Infrastructure ..address traffic flow now ..it will only escalate with more residents , the Shotover bridge has to be made into 4 lanes | |
| Carolyn Williams | Oppose | | Developing rural land in this location without proper infrastructure is lunacy. | |
| Annmarie | Oppose | Nothing- it is irresponsible and downright dangerous to add more traffic to ladies mile without offering a proper solution to congestion. Which I'm you seem both unable and uninterested in supplying | A viable solution to traffic congestion | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Becks Caswell | Oppose | Not much - you are NOT listening to the community. | <p>Transport assumptions and not addressing the situation with the congestion at present. A four lane shot over bridge, with 2 lanes either side will significantly reduce congestion. At present it is congested beyond acceptable standards. This solution should be considered with the level of traffic we have now. Adding in density development without addressing the infrastructure will result in grid lock. The assumption that many people will move to Public Transport is deeply flawed. NZ'ers will always use their cars, it is in our DNA. Design for the circumstances we are in, not the ones you want to see. High density housing with no parking is a recipe for disaster, how can you even consider this?</p> <p>7 storey apartment blocks will be a disgusting blight on our landscape.</p> <p>Vehemently oppose rezoning of this land to medium or high density.</p> | <p>You should be ashamed for pushing this agenda. Developers aside there would not be one community member that would support your suggestions. Greed is winning and common sense is out the window.</p> <p>We are Kaitiaki of our beautiful lands and you are proposing to decimate our natural beauty. Shame on you!</p> |
| Brian Marquand | Oppose | Nothing | Changing the zoning | You will kill the town center. No development in this area should go ahead. The infrastructure cannot Cope with the increase in population |
| Alana | Oppose | Communal green spaces and the underpass walkway | The buildings are too tall, there isn't enough parking. | For the development of 516 Ladies Mile to be described as "organic" is not good enough. |
| Shane Tell | Oppose | Not a lot. Infrastructure needs to be the first thing that needs to be looked at before any changes are made to any of the current zoning | Not a lot. Infrastructure needs to be the first thing that needs to be looked at before any changes are made to any of the current zoning | The company I work for is in the construction industry and we are hindered now with moving our vehicles around the area to supply sites with our product. Without thought going into fixing the congestion we have now it's inconceivable to think of the delays and |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | restraints that this proposal would have on our business. |
| Krista Strode | Oppose | Need for more housing | The roads will get busier and more traffic jams will occur, not ideal for anyone living nearby or visiting. More roads should be upgraded before the housing. | Please hear the community out when they strongly disagree with anything you propose. |
| Chelsea Gawron | Oppose | Affordable housing is needed in the basin | Some areas should be kept beautiful without development, or at least without high rise buildings | Please consider redeveloping other areas! |
| Tania Hurndell | Oppose | | Lack of commitment to transport to accommodate this amount of new houses | The feedback is clear, sort the transport problem that everyone knows exists and then people won't oppose the development |
| Cherene | Oppose | Wanting to develop the area but in a terrible manner. | Your travel assumptions are ridiculous. Do any of you drive from lake Hayes/SC at the moment? It's already heavily congested and you guys are happy to build an area and have 0 plans to decongest this other than hope people will start to bike and walk more? Let's hope we all survive frostbite over the winter months! The bus either gets us to work late or way too early. It shouldn't have to be like that. You need another bridge or a 4 lane bridge and possibly a 4 lane highway from ladies mile with proper and early signage to what lane you need to be in. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Carol Gardner | Oppose | Nothing | Can't think of anything | The concept is disastrous |
| Blair Wilkins | Oppose | High density in the area | Traffic congestion is going to be grid lock. We need another Shotover river crossing for traffic. | |
| Peter Thompson | Oppose | | Lack of reality when considering transport. | |
| Amanda | Oppose | | It's too much, the amount of people that would be living in such a small area with traffic backed up for miles | |
| Helen | Oppose | Nothing | I feel there should be no further development especially high density housing. Building up is causing road chaos school chaos and removing the vibe of the town. It has lost what made Queenstown special. We don't need more housing. There has been plenty of empty houses after covid. We need to stop them all being used for air bnb. This extra sub division is not needed, especially without road structure | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Laura Brown | Oppose | Green space and increased amenities that side of the shotover bridge | <p>Far too much intense development- an eyesore as the entry to Queenstown but more importantly Shotover Bridge CANNOT handle any more traffic. It is terrible already, especially in Winter, and to even contemplate more housing, especially to this degree, is outrageous.</p> <p>Yes you have added a few small amenities but the majority of these residents would work in Frankton or Queenstown and need to cross the Shotover Bridge regardless.</p> <p>I understand Queenstown needs development but on that side of the Shotover bridge, on the main highway into the town, without the bridge being first expanded into a 4 lane, is not the answer.</p> | See above. Strongly oppose whilst the Shotover Bridge stands as it is. |
| Tess | Oppose | Including a "town center" | Expanding shotover bridge to be 4 lanes | |
| Zsuzsi Toth | Oppose | | Need more roads, wider roads. Not more houses, specially not flats at all. | We do not need more houses without proper infrastrucutor. Promote more bus routes. |
| Camiller Joshua | Oppose | Nothing ! | Road Infrastrucure to accommodate the already inadequate houses within the area. | Stop fill green spaces with houses and spend more money on upgrading the road infrastructure first !! |
| Greg Large. | Oppose | | | This will be another development that will ruin Queenstown. This towns beauty is built around it's small, friendly community. However, some of that beauty had already been lost and this |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | development will only ruin Queenstown further |
| Liane ingberman | Oppose | | Too many people and no road structures | |
| Rebecca Nilsen | Oppose | Reserve areas | NONE of this area should be high density. It is such a shame that the current area being proposed for high density isn't being considered for a large private hospital. | |
| Anonymous | Oppose | NA | Not taking in consideration the opinion of the residents of the area. | Please consider all proposals against a higher density apartment's that will bring immense amount of issues with the traffic if not infrastructure is proposed for the area. Thanks! |
| Helen | Oppose | Green spaces. Facilities | Too many houses. No improvement in traffic/roading etc in an already clogged congested and I safe roading area | |
| Brigitte Schurr | Oppose | actually nothing | the whole layout is absolutely ridiculous, considering the traffic, the roads and the whole area is not made for such a big development. We already having trouble with traffic and you even push it. Don't you see what's happening???? listening to the residence here, but that's not what you want. Money counts. You ruin the whole environment here. | I am disappointed |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| AbbeMoffatt | Oppose | Nothing | Too many houses, not enough roading. | |
| Hannah | Oppose | Nothing. I work in strategy and programme design. I'm usually pretty good at seeing something from multiple angles and perspectives, I cannot see a positive in this. | Massively missed the need for better roading. The congestion on these roads is already disgusting. Missed that queenstown is loved for its gorgeous landscape, untouched, unblemished, clean. Stop building high density housing for air bnb or young temporary staff. Surely covid has taught qtn to focus on sustainable and diverse economies such as tech and banking. Encourage those companies down here, with permanent staff, and more families. | Stop building. Definitely stop building high density. |
| Alan Spencer. | Oppose | Nothing. | Listening to the community and not your purse strings | Roll on election time. This plan is an outrageous money earner for developers and council. The word corrupt says it all. |
| Gerard Hyland | Oppose | High density housing | Wrong place for more people, no supporting infrastructure for utilities, and most particularly transportation infrastructure. The roads are FULL already! | |
| Steph Burbidge | Oppose | Nothing | There's not enough infrastructure to support such an expansion. With such an increase in population density there must be better infrastructure. Where's the parking?! People live here for a lifestyle which includes going up the mountains or visiting the local area, with an already poor and expensive public transport system of course people need and want cars. These days most people have 1 per person. Where are the spaces for people. You need to meet peoples needs not think that you will change peoples lifestyles by not creating spaces. | There is such an issue in queenstown of a lack of support which comes with a lack of community. How is this development going to foster community connection. The area has such a problem with mental health and social welfare which is going completely ignored and one of the most contributing factors behind this is social isolation. Where is the community |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | The area for granted needs better social housing and more affordable places for people to live but its ridiculous to populate one area so densely when it already cannot support the amount of people who currently live here! How on such a high volumn road can you support more people without widening it for safety and traffic? | connection going to be built in such a vast complex that is so dense? |
| Becky Imber | Oppose | Retail | Housing, current road can't handle the additional numbers. Just look at what Upper Hutt has done to SH2 in Wellington. Exact same issue. Increased housing using original roaring infrastructure equals awful traffic jams at peak times. | Get waka kotahi on board to change the shot over bridge to 4 lanes. |
| Claire | Oppose | Not alot that I can see. | Significant and realistic transport solutions. This is what I am most concerned with. Happy for growth and development but you will need a significant change in road structure all the way to Frankton atleast. With this type of growth we will always have traffic issues going into Queenstown as Frankton Rd is obviously hard to expand to a 2 lane road but at the very least another double lane Bridge from Shotover to Frankton is required or 2 lanes going into Frankton on current road. With this type of population density proposed 100km/hr is also not safe or reasonable so that would need changing along Frankton - lake Hayes Rd and improvements to intersection entering into lake Hayes estate. This all happens before construction on ladies mile plan begins! | |
| Pete Whittaker | Oppose | | There needs to be a plan for traffic across the bridge. The plan needs to be for a double lane. It's the only solution. The traffic is already a nightmare. Stop repeating past mistakes and plan infrastructure pro actively in this town. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Kimberley Proctor | Oppose | Not a lot | A traffic plan, including having a 4 lane bridge. | This can not go ahead without the already congested and extremely bad roading issues being sorted first |
| Amanda Viana | Oppose | | There is a total lack of consideration for increased traffic congestion, which will no doubt occur. We live in a cold climate, people don't want to bike or catch a bus in the middle of winter. Also people need places to park their cars so as not to have roads narrowed. The 'entrance' to Queenstown will no longer be the picturesque drive that it is. | |
| Jason Smith | Oppose | There is no option to disagree | Development without two extra lanes across the Shotover is not on. | Offices, industrial and commercial buildings need to be built on the Lake Hayside side if the bridge isn't being fixed which would stop the need to cross the river |
| Caleb Macdonald | Oppose | Another school is needed | It's all about the roading, unless it is fixed to handle the increased traffic at peak times it should not go ahead! | Please, don't go ahead with this plan until the infrastructure that supports it properly is put into place... |
| Claudia Richardson | Oppose | community and service centre | Impact /increase on already existing traffic | I believe the affordable housing is the way forward if done with the infrastructure in mind. Current increased traffic is only going to get worse if nothing is done before thousands of new residents move to the area |
| Jay berriman | Oppose | Additional walkways/cycleways Native plantings Use existing road entry points onto main road | This should not be high or medium but rural zoned - the traffic is already dangerous and congested on ladies mile - please do not add the the existing problem. If you build more houses we will need more people to build and service them which requires more housing - lets not ruin the Wakatipu. It's not a rite to be able to live where ever | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | u want at the expense of social and environmental negative impacts. We still do not have a descent Hospital or retirement hospital - -can we please have some infrastructure before piling in in more people into the district. | |
| Euan Whiteley | Oppose | | I don't think this is workable with a large increase in people that will supposedly rely on public transport. The congestion it will create to local and through traffic will be very bad. | This area is more suited to low density housing. |
| Rachel | Oppose | Absolutely nothing | Everything. | This is all about greed. Absolutely no thought has been put into this plan whatsoever other than milking it for all it's worth at the expense of residents of the area. Where are the jobs and the space at the local schools for all these new residents never mind the car parks, new roads and other infrastructure. |
| Amanda ODonoghue | Oppose | | high density housing as a gateway to Queenstown is appalling, no planned good upgrade of traffic management which will put existing routes under severe strain | don't do this to Queenstown! |
| Ashley robb | Oppose | | Major infrastructure is needed before any zoning changes can be made | I oppose any large scale development along ladies mile. There is insufficient infrastructure, and it takes away from the beautiful landscape we have. High density housing and tall buildings do not have their place along ladies mile |
| fumie | Oppose | | plan first/ properly about how to reduce the traffic. | we need more community buildings we can use for socializing with cheap cost to use. I used to see people using Arrowtown hall for adult dancing,kids dancing and more |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | but I don't see now.some people said it's expensive to use for small groups. |
| Jackie | Oppose | | Visual impact on entrance to Queenstown Lack of parking No consideration for additional traffic using already congested route into Frankton/Queenstown | |
| Phillip Bunn | Oppose | Not Much | Completely the wrong place for high density. | Low density - Fine. But not height density here |
| Kat | Oppose | Nothing | Don't ruin Queenstown | Proper plans to deal with increased traffic on the roads |
| Monique | Oppose | | No updated infrastructure in form of a multi lane bridge to cope with the increase of traffic has been planned. You must address this before cramming more traffic into this densely proposed area. This ladies mile area should not be rezoned into medium or high density. Rezoning while not allowing for the additional infrastructure will put too much pressure on on the current system. Building apartment blocks and not requiring more car parking that already proposed will cause additional pressure on the close by subdivisions. It is naive to think that everyone living here will use public transport and not have their own vehicles. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Cisca McNay | Oppose | Nothing | A four lane bridge, four lanes all the way to Five mile. | Without this it will be ridiculous. Please let someone who is for this project to exit Shotover country after 8.15 on a week day and see how they think that it'll all be right with another 10000 homes nearby. |
| Roger Somerville | Oppose | Absolutely f*** all. Shame on you. | It seems reckless and irresponsible to not plan for widening the shot over bridge to four lanes to mitigate the inevitable choke point the extra 10,000+ people you are trying to bring to ladies mile. You shouldn't be allowed to do this without planning for appropriate infrastructure to go with any expansion. | |
| Sara | Oppose | | Infrastructure for vehicles and community services High density housing is wrong oppose this strongly | |
| Fiona Stephenson | Oppose | | Im very worried about the traffic and the affect to lifetsyle of the population. The areas roads and parking arent set up for another huge increase in population. I'm opposed to further development here. | The infrastucture wont 'magically' cope with the increase in population. Do any of the developers live in this area, as they must be able to see what an impact to delay living the traffic issue has in the area. |
| Kate McRae | Oppose | | To high density, no plans for increased bridge lanes, adding traffic to already overloaded roads. | |
| Rebecca | Oppose | | No good options to alleviate our traffic | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Georgie | Oppose | Consulting the community before making this mistake. | This would be a traffic nightmare. It's a terrible idea. It would make getting into town extremely difficult, it's already bad enough! I can't believe this being proposed. | This would negatively impact a lot of people who live in the area. |
| Sara Clark | Oppose | | This is the wrong place for the development of additional housing - the geography and the infrastructure will not cope with this. The roading system is already struggling and failing to cope with the current usage levels - THIS WILL NOT WORK | |
| Jane Douglas | Oppose | Nothing. Yes we need more housing but we need the infra structure FIRST | Housing too intensive, not enough car parking. Most people NEED a car, not necessarily to use every day but it's NOT practice to expect people to rely on our very minimal public transport system. Need more green spaces . Residents want to enjoy where they live not just live! | You need to listen to what the population wants, you are elected to represent what the community wants! |
| Angela Maxwell-McRae | Oppose | Not alot. | The existing roading infrastructure is inadequate at peak times already. I cannot imagine how bad it will get with thousands more residents vying for space. Large multistory buildings with inadequate amounts of parking. I think it is ludicrous to think most people will use public transport as their main means of getting around and even if some people do most will still have a car for journeys to Wanaka/Cromwell etc. Where are the all going to park??? I hate that such a pretty area has already been spoiled with the relatively low density Queenstown Country club development. To suggest that this area is the right place for high density housing is ridiculous in my opinion. High rise apartments will ruin the serenity. | I think this development plan needs to be halted until a way to improve the roading infrastructure for existing residents can be found or you are going to make the lives of the existing residents much worse. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Abby | Oppose | Not a thing | Too populated | |
| Susan Weggery | Oppose | Some new housing does need to be developed | The scale of the development is too large and the traffic congestion created along ladies mile will be seriously detrimental. I also disagree with the high density zoning and the multi-storey apartment buildings this will allow | |
| Kate Russell | Oppose | The green space | High density housing (multiple stories) at the entrance to Queenstown will be an eyesore. The natural landscape is what makes Queenstown attractive and should remain rural/rural residential. I understand the need for more housing but unless there is significant upgrades to the roading network, which already struggles with backlogs of traffic with a lot of residents relying on their vehicles for work (tradies etc.) this will only serve to create more frustration with everyone needing to get to Frankton or into town. | |
| Jessica C | Oppose | More housing is needed | Infrastructure. The area is already too congested. Roding and Shotover Bridge need to be expanded to accommodate | |
| Luke Ashall | Oppose | Open / community spaces | 4 lane bridge over shotover river to alleviate traffic, parking, 7 storey high density too high for the area | Development needs to be consistent |
| Siobhan Early | Oppose | Nothing | 1) Traffic issues with all the additional population. If you think everyone there is going to get on a bus you're dreaming 2) eyesore on arriving into Queenstown. Put 7 storied | Please don't do it |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | accommodation around the back of 5 mile not right on the main road in | |
| Janet | Oppose | Maybe the sports fields and community centres that you will demolish in town then can be built out here, QPCT rooms etc | Four lane bridge first. Too close to road. No high density. Say no you are the council so you literally have the right to control what happens to the land. We are zoned rural and have done everything you asked but now you just go straight to high density. Why not fill in Frankton as it's already got houses on it so maybe make that all high density. This is rural. We came to live in Queenstown because it didn't have the big city issues and now you are giving us big city issues without having any infrastructure. Why not build everything in order, like hospitals and bridges first rather than more housing? | Do not let this go through the way it is. Listen to your community who live here. You will not change the habits of this community to buses, you have modelled it incorrectly, look at similar cities, you have tradies who need their cars/vans/4WD cars are not going to catch the bus. It will be spectacularly unsuccessful and will ruin our town and that will be your doing. You can stop this and that is your job. You don't have to do this at all |
| The Lightfoot Initiative | Oppose | House zoning, school zoning, some aspects of transport design. The intent of not building another bridge. Less parking provision. The desire for 40% mode shift enabled by high density residential. Bus lanes. | More retail/commercial to ensure self sufficiency. Transport infrastructure to link the proposed development with the other adjacent suburbs and wider suburbs. In our opinion, there should be a plan that extends beyond bike/bus. Light rail could be considered. Consideration of how the development links in with the inevitable development of Dalefield (which will eventually be rezoned). | Thank you for trying to put rules in place so that developers have to create usable community spaces, develop basic infrastructure and transport planning. |
| Hefin Evans | Oppose | not much! | The high density in such a visible area of what is the natural beauty of our basin | Please listen to your residents who generally oppose the plan |
| Nicola price | Oppose | I believe we need apartment style living in cheaper areas than central Queenstown. | Car parks. Even if people can commute to work they'll still need to drive to the supermarket or to go away for the weekend so will still have cars. These apartments need carparks. And it's ridiculous to think people will suddenly stop owing cars when we live in such an | Traffic is another reason to reject this plan. The bridge needs to be replaced with a bigger capacity bridge before development is approved. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | isolated destination. You can't go to Riverton or the Catlins without a car, or to Glenorchy, or to any of the other holiday spots locals will travel to. And what about tradies who need their vehicles for work. So even if people commute for work they will still need a parking space. | |
| Melanie Elia | Oppose | | Way too many properties | |
| Justin Crane | Oppose | Amenities | Infrastructure and assumption that private land owners will sell into this | Includes a storm water area on Threepwood Farm which can not sell into the development |
| Sally Marriage | Oppose | Community hub and roundabout at the entrance to howards drive | You need to firstly widen the bridge. Leave zoning as low density. No high rise apartments. More parking, less houses. | Leave it as the beautiful entrance to Queenstown that it currently is. |
| Nico Negri | Oppose | The need for more low cost housing options. | Road infrastructure is already bad enough with frequent traffic and congestion issues. | |
| Dayna Simpsons | Oppose | | Traffic management, already heavily congested at peak hours. we need a new bridge before any new developments out this way. more traffic coming from Cromwell everyday too. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Alex McCrossin | Oppose | Consultation | High Density without the town traffic & road infrastructure to support these developments | |
| Jodie thompson | Oppose | | <p>It is our opinion that the proposal to change the zoning of the Ladies Mile area from rural to a master planned, high density development is flawed. This does not represent intensification; it represents greenfield, dispersed development.</p> <p>As outlined above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ladies Mile is a greenfields site and is physically separated from services and employment. Whether it provides 1100 homes or 2300 homes, it will increase traffic movements in an already congested environment. Traffic is already causing significant adverse effects to our community's wellbeing. Until such time as the existing traffic issues are resolved, then there should be no further development at Ladies Mile. - We have taken on board Mr Avery's concerns around existing zoning not being adequate to 'stop developers doing what they want'. We propose a deferred zoning. Any development must be deferred until such time that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues are resolved; there must be a workable public transport system in place, and the Shotover Bridge provides four lanes. If these actions are not taken then traffic congestion will only get worse. - The school sites are confirmed - Community facilities for the existing community are provided, and there is capacity for future development. - Existing centres are intensified to accommodate growth. <p>Until the traffic issues are resolved, the existing</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | community is provided for, and greater certainty provided that the master plan can be achieved, then we oppose the Ladies Mile proposal. | |
| Kati Mannisto | Oppose | | While I understand the 'increased bus services' by creating high density areas, are the people living there going to fit into the bus schedules or will they be requiring 24/7 bus transport to make it viable for them to get to work? | If QLDC is focused on getting cars out of the road, proper alternatives need to be in place ie. safe bike routes which do not add an extra 30 minutes to the commute. |
| Peter Warmington | Oppose | | Prefer to see trees, mountains and beauty, not development, we should be protecting the environment, not destroying it for greed! | |
| Liz Dickie | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Jenny Parkes | Oppose | Nothing! | To even consider changing the zoning of this area to high-density is ridiculous This area is a stunning rural space on the entry into our beautiful town. To replace this land with high-density apartments with no car parking (you cannot expect everyone to be able to bus to work) and to add even more traffic to the already heavily congested road into town is a joke. I lived in Shotover Country for five years and the morning and evening traffic rivaled that of a big city. | The development of our beautiful town needs a lot more consideration towards what makes it special and the environment than what the current council is giving. |
| Paz | Oppose | Just the problematic to get affordable houses | Missing a plan for traffic Get apartments changed the look of a rural and peaceful place | |
| erica | Oppose | it does need to be developed but not over developed with large buildings as is proposed. This will impact the look of this area and overpopulated which is pure greed | it does need to be developed but not over developed with large buildings as is proposed. This will impact the look of this area and overpopulated which is pure greed | |
| Janie Reese | Oppose | Trying to create a new community with high quality housing and great public spaces and community and educational facilities. | Cannot develop without more infrastructure. Shotover bridge already crammed at peak times. This part should stay rural. | You cannot take people out of their cars even though the plan is to develop public transport and cycling. So many people need a car to get around such as tradies And especially in winter! |
| Emily Dennison | Oppose | nothing | prediction of traffic numbers and behaviours of residents | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Anonymous | Support | Affordable housing | Bridge upgrade | Yes this development should go ahead |
| Melissa Read | Oppose | <p>I applaud the provision of community facilities in the plan for Ladies Mile - in particular the sports fields and community rooms, the high school and the additional primary school, and the shopping centre. Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country combined have a larger population than Arrowtown and we have almost no community facilities. This means we struggle to have a sense of community spirit, a sense of place. Such facilities on this side of the bridge would surely ease the traffic congestion by allowing residents (especially school children) to walk and bike to much of what they need, and decrease the number of people adding to the bottleneck caused by the merging of traffic on to the Shotover Bridge.</p> | <p>Creating a high density urban environment on Ladies Mile is just so very wrong. I spent the first half of my life living in urban centres, and never owned a vehicle. I was able to walk or bike to work and study. I purchased my first car to move to Queenstown, because even in the mid-nineties the town was too spread out to get around any other way. High density living belongs where people can access almost everything they need by foot, and this is never going to be at Ladies Mile, especially work. This plan relies on future residents using public or active transport, and I am 100% certain the targets will not be met. The weather is too inclement for consistent active travel, and the masterplan does not have any commuter routes to make cycling easier, but instead still relies on the existing recreational trails. There have been no studies on where people are going around the district. There are four people in our household, and on weekday mornings we all leave in separate forms of transport. Only one goes by public transport (school bus), and only one is going into town, and I believe we're a fairly typical family. Queenstown is not a city where the majority of people flow in to the centre for work in the morning, and back out to the suburbs at the end of the day. For public transport to be viable you would need a very complicated system that worked efficiently. Even then, you would not negate the need for cars entirely, and the lack of parking in the masterplan would cause very undesirable consequences for congestion and public amenity. Another consequence of creating this high</p> | <p>At the public meetings that I have attended the response to any criticism of the masterplan has been to suggest that if we don't accept the masterplan then the separate land owners will run carte blanche and do whatever they like in an ad hoc fashion, which will have even worse consequences for the Ladies Mile area. I would suggest that it is the Council's job to ensure this doesn't happen. I am very appreciative that some effort is being made to put right historic wrongs whereby developers were able to supply housing with little or no community facilities, but I strongly feel that the current masterplan is based on false premises, and if the plan goes ahead in it's current form it will have catastrophic consequences on the standard of living for the existing and future communities along Ladies Mile.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>density urban area will be more strain on an already overloaded roading network. The plan does nothing to mitigate the bottleneck caused by the merger into single lanes over the Shotover Bridge, and already if there is bad weather or roadworks or an accident the Ladies Mile highway is nearly impassible, and there are long queues and wait times to even exit Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country. The current masterplan will make this far worse.</p> | |
| Sue Slee | Oppose | | <p>Youth facilities/activities need to be incorporated into the plan and also some offices so people can work this side of the bridge and don't need to travel over it.</p> | <p>Could this additional housing be located on the land near the jacks point end of town?</p> |
| Karen Ryall | Oppose | <p>Nothing . High density housing will only add more problems to our already struggling congested roads.</p> | <p>Please keep this area 'rural'</p> | |
| Jenna Sayer | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| jo cheifetz | Oppose | The thought that it is inevitable that it would be developed. | The gross underappreciation for the infrastructure that is required to sustain such an increase in dwellings/population. | Keep the zoning as it is and fix the infrastructure to account for the existing immediate need. Otherwise be prepared for more disgruntled locals and unhappy tourists who will not only think QT is expensive but more so, that it is more hassle that warrants a visit. |
| Annie Tapper | Oppose | Nothing of note. | The plan is a rehash of the original one. It has not taken into consideration the views of the community nor that of Government post COVID. Services will not sustain increase population forecast. | 'I oppose -the medium to high density housing planned for Ladies Mile. - using the free space / golf course at Frankton Corner for Emergency Services. |
| Melanie Seyfort | Oppose | | | |
| Annette Bashford | Oppose | Community facilities | Bridge congestion is not addressed. The road (SH6) is congestion now, during quiet times. The transport plan is not logical nor credible. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Emily Grace | Support | I like the community hub, commercial, and education areas. I think they will be really helpful in building a connected community, helping to join up the new community with the existing Lake Hayes and Shotover Country. | I would like the residential densities to be higher, so we get efficient use of the land resource. Flat, sunny, hazard-free land adjacent to a main transport route is rare in Queenstown, and we should get the most out of it that we can. This helps protect remaining rural land by reducing the sprawl effect. High density is needed if there is to be a chance of the public transport and mode shift that is sought. I think the Country Club development is an example of a very inefficient use of land that shouldn't be repeated. | I'd like Council to be bold and make a strong commitment to a well planned, high density urban development on Ladies Mile. I especially want Council to not be restricted by NZTA - Council should go for the outcome it wants, regardless of NZTA. Traffic effects are one of the tradeoffs for intensification, and an effect that is generally tolerated, to a point. NZTA has it's own drivers that appear to not line up with Council's drivers and obligations, and in that situation I think Council should pursue its own course. My understanding of economic assessments is that they favour short-term investments with quick returns - once a demand exists (through the high density development of Ladies Mile), then the economic assessment of a new bridge will be more favourable. We should also recognise that there are ways to manage traffic impacts outside of a master plan, such as the flexible working arrangements that are more common since Covid-19. I also think we should give weight to the views of the future residents of the Lades Mile area, and not be driven entirely by existing residents. Those existing residents have enjoyed the benefits of intensification, and should be willing to let others enjoy the same benefits. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Bhushan | Oppose | Nothing | Traffic situation is not being considered at all | This development will give houses to people in need, however its not considering the inconvenience that it will cause to people who already live around this area |
| Rebecca | Oppose | | | |
| Warren | Oppose | Nothing | No vision. Not caring. No planning consequences. | |
| Lana Beer | Oppose | | Roads are already severely congested, you need to address and fix this issue before going ahead with this plan that will only make things worse and create longer term issues. | |
| Kate Hill | Oppose | N/a | No solution to traffic or increase in people/ parking/ shotover bridge being jammed ewwryday as it is! | |
| Aftaab Sandhu | Oppose | The development of this area is a good idea. | The fact that you are proposing it to be high density. Whatever number of dwellings you are proposing, it should only be half that. No more than medium density should be allowed in this area. | Medium density, not high density, should only be allowed in this area. Thank you. |
| Rachel Sydney | Oppose | 'If development is to go ahead (see my concerns below in relation the significant adverse effects | Overarching concern is whether Ladies Mile is the right place within Queenstown district for urban intensification and whether the resulting significant adverse environmental, social, cultural and economic | '- Public parks and playgrounds should be designed collaboratively and in partnership with the local community to ensure they meet the community needs |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>not being adequately mitigated at this time), I support -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of social and community infrastructure (although this is not sufficient to significantly reduce the need for trips across Shotover Bridge). - Support the provision of quality public open spaces and community spaces and the integration of stormwater treatment into the masterplan. <p>Support mixed use development to maintain active, lively and vibrant spaces that create life between buildings (along with public spaces).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support improved connection between any development along Ladies Mile and the existing communities of LHE and SC - Support reduction in speed limit along Ladies Mile - Support improved public transport connections on this side of the Shotover Bridge to connect with Frankton, the Queenstown CBD and Arrowtown | <p>effects can be appropriately and adequately mitigated. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant concerns around impacts on the transport network from the proposed development of up to 2400 dwellings and whether such significant adverse effects will be able to be appropriately mitigated. - The proposal relies on a large modal shift but there is no evidence within NZ or a comparable overseas location of this being achieved. While public transport and the provision for active transport modes needs to be much improved, LHE and SC are home to a large number of trades people who rely on work vehicles or private vehicles to carry tools to work sites and for whom it is not practicable to take public transport, along with young families where travel by private car is a necessity in order to enable daycare and school drop offs on the way to work and then transport children to after school activities, the majority of which are on the other side of the bridge. Queenstown's alpine climate will also add further challenges in achieving the required modal shift. - Growth within surrounding areas (Cromwell, Gibbson etc), along with the existing development in Arrowtown, Wakatipu Basin, LHE and SC is placing the existing SH6 transport network under increasing strain. Council and Waka Kotahi must work collaboratively and collectively to improve traffic congestion though adding additional capacity to the Shotover Bridge and improving public transport. - Ladies Mile is a rural location that is physically separated from Queenstown's key town centre areas, associated social and community infrastructure and employment. The proposed town centre development within the Ladies Mile masterplan is such that it will not provide sufficient employment opportunities or services | <p>and bring the local community together - evidenced by the lack of appropriate public spaces and playgrounds in the wider LHE and SC. This has resulted in excellent community outcomes in other locations (the Waterview Connection Project for example in the design of the Waterview Reserve Playground - a concept design was developed following a series of interactive consultation and design workshops with members of the local community)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the specific open space zoning of the stormwater management areas - informal recreation? This should further inform the purpose of these spaces and how they may be designed and used. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>such as supermarkets, core everyday business/commercial services and amenities such as cafes and restaurants to reduce the requirement for travel across the Shotover bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Ladies Mile development will result in urban sprawl of Queenstown rather than urban intensification - do we want to become another Auckland? Furthermore, there is not adequate infrastructure to support development of the land and the creation of self sustainable communities as per the masterplan design principles. High density development should be accommodated within the Queenstown CBD area and more appropriate locations such as Frankton where employment is concentrated and there are commercial/business and social infrastructure already in place so service future population growth. - Strongly opposed to the proposed walking trail through Threeewood Farm/slopehill area. This will result in significant health and safety impacts given the operation of Threeewood Farm - how will the public and dogs be kept out of the farm so as not to interfere with its operation and enable the farm to remain commercially viable? The commercial viability of the farm enables the amenity of the western shores of Lake Hayes and the area of the farm fronting Ladies Mile to be maintained and enhanced, which would be adversely impacted through the provision of the proposed walking track. - Do not support the stormwater management areas and open space areas being shown as high density residential on the zoning plan (page 98) - these should be zoned open space only to ensure any development gives effect and implements such spaces which are critical social infrastructure - Similarly, the building heights plan on page 105 - | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>buildings within open spaces that are for the purpose of informal recreation (as I assume the public spaces would be?) should not allow buildings greater than 1 storey (6m as per the proposed district plan provisions) or buildings (other than associated facilities such as toilets) should not be provided for in such spaces (should be a non-complying activity)</p> <p>- Do not support sub-development area G as this is within Threepwood Farm - this should not accommodate medium density development but should be maintained as open space or an ecological corridor to connect through to Lake Hayes / landscape buffer against the adjacent rural environment</p> | |
| Kristel | Oppose | Keeping green, community spaces | High density residential with lack of carparkimg. Roads not equipped to handle this additional traffic. | We cannot keep adding more housing and cars without increasing the roads accordingly. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Danny van Beek | Oppose | Nothing, traffic out of Shotover Country and LHE is congested as it is already at certain times!! Adding more residential properties to it, will only increase the the problem already existing. | A proper plan or a 4 lane bridge to prevent more problems regarding traffic coming with more development. | Families and locals will need much more travel time as it is already, if this goes thru |
| DAVID TAYLOR | Oppose | Nothing. Please leave this green area alone. | You're wanting to build more houses to house builders to build more houses. | |
| Marcia Meagher | Oppose | Not a lot | The high density zoning at Te Putahi Ladies Mile and lack of consideration for traffic management. | Be honest ... not driven by greed. Care about everyone in Queenstown & our desired lifestyles. |
| Naomi | Oppose | Providing cycleways and walkways | Putting in medium and high density housing | How on earth is the area going to cope with the demands of this many extra people living in the area?? Ladies mile is already a nightmare during rush hours, it would be hours of waiting to get anywhere with all the extra. And not widening the shotover bridge? Daft. And if it is to go ahead, at least build plenty of carparking (underground?) |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Diana Baker | Oppose | Absolutely nothing | <p>No thought about how the traffic will be. It's bad enough right now and will get a whole heap worse if this goes ahead. You are wrong about everyone getting buses or cycling. Have you ever tried doing a weekly shop for a family by bus or by bike??? Or taking kids to after school activities in the rain by bike. Or walking from home in the rain to wait for the buses that are always late so the kids will miss their dance class. It's all nice in theory but it won't actually happen. People will use their cars just like they do now. And there's no parking for the people in these new units so they will park on the streets. That will look nice to all the visitors as they drive into town! If there was an emergency in peak traffic at LHE the road is so congested an ambulance would struggle to get through now, so imagine what it will be like if this goes ahead? This will put peoples lives in danger. Having 2 kids, the thought of that really scares me. The Shotover bridge needs to be widened before you can even consider anything else. Please do not let this go ahead. It is just ridiculous.</p> | |
| Terri | Oppose | | | |
| Yasin Tekinkaya | Oppose | Nothing is right. | <p>I do not think the council is assessing which problems this plan is going to make; this being extra traffic in peak times (mornings, nights 4:30pm-7:30pm). The Lake Hayes, LHE, Shotover Country area is already congested with enough cars and houses. This is only going to make things worse. I do not support high-density housing, nor extra housing in the Wakatipu basin.</p> | <p>It's extremely frustrating the council being unable to see the the problems which will definitely impact that area, and Queenstown in general. The bridge won't even be upgraded with the draft proposal so how is this new "subdivision" going to carry the extras? The council, ("QLDC") hasn't opened its ears to NZTA as they had suggested having only 1100 newly</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | built houses but QLDC reckons that they need double when this project shouldn't even go forward. |
| Lance Cunningham | Oppose | We need more houses | We need a better road | Build some more infrastructure first |
| Grant Jackson | Oppose | Nothing | Too much development for the area without the necessary infrastructure to support it | Please slow down and think about the future of our beautiful area |
| Sarah Broderick | Oppose | Nothing | Everything | This is not Queenstown...protect this town |
| Michelle | Oppose | Extra ammenities and proposed school | High density housing and no thought into infrastructure to support existing and all of this extra housing. | Surely you people see that there will be huge traffic problems once this commences. Where is the thought for the commuters? Everyone is not going to just get the bus like you think when the bus is stuck in the traffic along with everyone else. |
| mark | Oppose | I find some a very few aspects of the plan right, however the planning and implementation and staging of the works to not be in line with the current status of the district. I think in | The High density zone needs to be on the frankton side of the Shotover bridge. having this on the Shotover our Even Kawarau side of the bridge creates much greater problems with infrastructure | I feel that this High density housing "solution" is not a solution. We need this to be in Frankton central where facilities, existing school, healthcare, airport etc... are an easy walk or bike. The in ground services are there and the frankton hub is set up for this type of urban living. Trying |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | general it is too excessive and is not solving a problem but creating a bigger problem for the district | | to bring this to a rural location will not work. you are trying to solve a housing crisis by attracting much more workers to the area that will be needed to construct the facility. once built you will have attracted another group of workers that then need more housing - creating an even bigger problem. |
| Ben White | Oppose | Looking for ways to add high density housing | Traffic infrastructure not supportive for the population | Can't expect public transport to be the only way to ease congestion in a town with hospo and trades workers as such big components. It's not a case of all workers go to a central cbd hub for work so public transport can only have limited use. |
| Nick McKillop | Oppose | Creating plans for more housing. | Lack of solutions to ease traffic congestion. Multi story apartment buildings will ruin landscape. | |
| Sophie | Oppose | | | |
| Kellie | Oppose | Schooling here seems like a viable option | This must sound like a broken record but for a high density housing plan the roading plan is way out | I recently read the QLDC article in the mountain scene that high density housing shouldn't bring more traffic as people will use public transport. Do u have a plan in place then for if the traffic is much more congested? Is there a plan for that option in place.. I don't see one. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Aimee Prendergast | Oppose | Nothing | Everything. You say this council is about protecting our environment and land and keeping the area green, pristine and for everyone to enjoy although you are now letting a bunch of dirty developers in who just want to tear apart our beautiful landscapes in order to make a quick buck. We live here because we enjoy the lifestyle Queenstown offers but if you jam us in like sardines and create enormous ugly high rises then this is no longer a town I want to live in. If I wanted to live in a place like this I would move to Auckland. Get it right QLDC and stop being greedy. | |
| Robyn Francis | Oppose | Consultation | Focussing on growth. We need to focus on protecting our environment and the quality of life of those that already live here. | We should consider working toward making this area a national park and stopping further commercial and population growth. |
| Mackenzie Ravenwood | Oppose | More affordable house | | |
| Richard Mcleod | Oppose | | No provision for four lane bridge makes this plan entirely unworkable. | |
| Adam browell | Oppose | Nothing | Queenstown is turning into a s*** place to live and is being ruined by needless expansion | Its only developers that want queensyown to expand |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Emily Wills | Oppose | | Not thinking about the significant increase in traffic when its already congested | |
| Kirsty Morrison | Oppose | At the moment, nothing! | Improved roading to facilitate the extra people/ cars along ladies mile / through the already congested shotover roundabout and crawl over the single lane bridge. We struggle everyday already! Limited resident Parking! Even if (although you are dreaming) many of the residents took public transport, this is a town where people need their cars, will have them either way and will park them wherever they can creating on street parking issues, more congestion and a suburb of discontent | |
| Rachel Burt | Oppose | | Provision to address the current traffic congestion issues Provision of services for the current community | I strongly oppose any rezoning Ir development and think the land should remain rural |
| Simon | Oppose | Very little | Current traffic issues leaving shotover and lake Hayes and going to get far worse, the shotover bridge needs to be expanded | |
| Rebekah Hensman | Oppose | I think more development is a good thing in the district as it promotes growth | I think the sheer amount of houses that is proposed to be put in that area versus the traffic management is not going to work. There needs to be a 4 lane bridge put in before the development goes ahead to manage the traffic between there and Frankton. | Please seriously consider the happiness and why people want to live in Queenstown over money/ find a happy medium between the two. I'm not against development I just believe it needs to be sustainable and supported by the infrastructure to work correctly |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Ashlee Lyford | Oppose | N/a | Plan for 4 lane bridge to alleviate existing traffic congestion in order to cope with additional residents in the area | I oppose the rezoning to high density |
| Maryann Bailey | Oppose | This development is not 'right' It should not go ahead due to traffic levels as they are & infrastructure is lacking | Provision to address the current traffic congestion issues Provision of services for the current community | Do not allow this development to go ahead! |
| Christina Vaughan | Oppose | | The essence of why people choose to reside and visit the area, the development and commercialisation in the past decade leaves little regard for the environment and landscape - the why that is the Queenstown Lakes area. | |
| Sam | Oppose | | Parking and traffic is already a struggle In the area, more roading infrastructure needs to be planned | |
| Shaun Kelly | Oppose | Whilst a pre-occupation with increasing housing volumes and encouraging public transport usage is on the right path, there is nothing about this proposal that is actually 'right' | This is an ill-considered development move. We have already understood the vast volumes of residential traffic and bottle-necks in the area this development is proposed. Current subdivisions in the area are already lacking in the appropriate infrastructure to service them, let alone adding to the issues. The region needs to concentrate on re-developing our current roading networks to ease congestion before adding more and dealing with the issue after the fact - we continually 'chase our tails', instead of actually considering the long term implications of our decisions. Encouraging 'active travel' is great, but if buses are stuck in the same traffic congestion, why would anybody use them? And asking residents to walk/ride is all well and good on certain | There is NO way current or future residents will use public transport options, if buses are hemmed in by the same traffic. Concentrate solely on how to release the buses from current congestion. Eg - consider redeveloping frankton track (widen, roof, lighting), and boardwalk over Frankton road at regular intervals. Take all foot/bike traffic off Frankton road, and widen existing roading to include bus lane/3+ person car lanes to encourage car pooling and public transport. Frankton road is only one current bottleneck, but FIXING the issue |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | days, but our weather and distance to travel makes this unreasonable on many days in a calendar year. | and making those 'active travel' networks the best option will encourage people out of cars, and alleviate congestion elsewhere as well. There is potential to then lengthen this system through from BP roundabout to Ladies Mile. |
| Graham Mills | Oppose | | To double the residential density with no car parking & then expect residents, young families to catch buses to work, school, sports in an alpine environment doesn't seem to be practical. | It has been reported with higher density housing allowed that this will create its own industry meaning less private trips across the bridge does this mean we will have a new high school built new supermarkets etc etc I don't think so. We need high density housing on the Frankton side of the bridge where the infrastructure is already there. Any further development of the ladies mile is going to cause congestion on state highway 6 this must be acknowledged even with the best efforts of the urban planners to get us into buses. |
| Robin spittle | Oppose | | | |
| Danny Luke | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Andrew Morris | Oppose | Concept of some densification in the district is valid. | Major transport issues. Need to create real transport solutions, ie 4 lane roading corridor and bridge or maybe yet another proper town centre, maybe they'll call it Queenstown Central 2! But another town centre will simply end up with Qtn losing more soul and appeal, so a no to that too. | Recommend further densification of town centres (ie Qtn & Frankton) and sorting long term transport solutions before further densification of satellite communities that already suffer transport issues. |
| Emma | Oppose | Nothing. Infrastructure needs to be sorted first before anything else is even discussed | Infrastructure - traffic is at its limit already! Keep it rural lifestyle | I moved to Shotover country because I thought there would be no more development. This decision is going to effect many people's lives in a negative way. |
| Rachel | Oppose | Community town | Shotover bridge expansion , roads and parking. Underground parking for all these apartment blocks?? Another entrance into lake Hayes. Too many apartments not enough 2-3 bed first homes for young families | |
| Mark Bain | Oppose | School & green areas | <p>Why ruin prime rural land and over populate with housing. The appeal of living in Queenstown use to be the community feel of living in a town (not a city) without built up areas all around us. We already have 3 perfectly good shopping hubs, without adding another</p> <p>Council are also hell bent on pushing the public transport option- we don't have a built up industrial area or inner city office hub that people go to each day. Yes buses work for some (school groups, airport) but a high population of people need there vehicle to use to & from & for work each day i.e. tradies, Reps, Service people etc</p> | Please listen to the public, we want to stay a town not a city. Lets work on what we've got and look at ways to make this better (roading, infrastucture etc) not bigger |
| Stephen Farquharson | Oppose | Parks and sports grounds | <p>Your not Listening to the local that live here. Infrastructure is not there.</p> <p>You're not allowing that people will and always going to have two cars maybe more per house per unitThen fat mate I can't have the same thing and I'll go on and on.</p> | Why Cut this section of ladies mile be Large lifestyle block with higher rate . Think you need to focus on Kingston area.. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Yann lor | Oppose | | Transport infrastructure. Population increase | |
| Federico Gandolfi | Oppose | Nothing so far. | The whole plan is not sustainable and does not seemed to be at all connected with the actual needs and necessities of the area and its residents. Building high density residential areas in a location already afflicted by high traffic congestion without first addressing and fixing the existing problem its simply not a viable option. For the Qldc to green light to such atrocity would be a clear demonstration of how the council is not looking after the citizens interest but its simply being driven by the pursue of economical gain while completely disregarding the residents well being. | Queenstown does not need this |
| Marcus Fung | Oppose | Recognising the fact 96% of households owns at least 1 car. | Assuming building a town centre will reduce the need to go to frankton or town. Adding a bus lane will not promote the usage of public transport. Reducing the speed limits on lady mile will further delay traffic. | |
| LucilA | Oppose | You need to think about the nature and the impact | How are you managing the traffic and there is not a sustainable proyect. Why you don't build green houses, with solar energy? | Please think about the impact thAt this proyect have on the earth |
| Kaspian Sutherland | Oppose | Nothing, so out of touch with everything | Not everyone wants to or can use public transport so stop pushing for that. Also all the new houses will be brought by investors and then rented out for top dollar to struggling families or migrants. | Traffic from lake Hayes/Shotover is already bad enough. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Barry Pick | Oppose | The Vision Aspirations & Objectives - great ideas but not realistic at this location at this time | No future development at LM until the infrastructure can cope with what we currently have, especially roading/Shotover bridge restrictions. | |
| Timothy Finlay | Support | Pushing public transport and cycling is good for the environment and general wellbeing. Apartments are more efficient than | | |
| Nicole Robinson | Oppose | Nothing | Better road plan. We don't want anymore houses. We want community centres and family friendly facilities only | |
| Gareth Edwards | Oppose | | | |
| Rachel | Oppose | | A firm plan for dealing with traffic congestion before any development goes ahead. | |
| Laura Moore | Oppose | | There does not appear to be any consideration for the increase in residents in this area and how our infrastructure will support that. | |
| Debbie Bergin | Oppose | Nothing. | There is so much wrong with this plan - rather than repeating - my thoughts are totally in line with the submission Lake Hayes Estate & Shotover Community Group have done. | I don't believe the communities feedback and submissions will influence how the council proceeds. It hasn't in the past. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Dylan | Oppose | nothing | roads need to be fixed first | |
| Jane McCurdy | Oppose | | Too many houses, too many people, not enough space, not enough roads. | Its rubbish to think that more houses/ higher density will be less cars.... check out the streets of shotover country esp in the higher density areas. There is still at least one car per house if not 3,4,5 if its rented to a group not family. |
| Jason | Oppose | Nothing. Its a stupid idea made by money hungry developers, get the bloody roading and infastructure right before adding another 5-10k homea there. I cant afford to buy here and i think having this development will force me to move out due to traffic. Sort your b***** s*** out qldc | You cant tell me, that you agree to this development without fixing the road network into queenstown. Your heads must be so far up each others a**** if you think everyone will take buses. Why can we not just slow the growth down, fix the problems and they are major problems first. Then continue. Stop being money greedy for god sakes | Sort it out! |
| Guy | Oppose | | Need to fully sort existing traffic issues before creating more and making it worse. | Oppose till traffic is sorted |
| Alejandro Dellacanonica | Oppose | Keep the building industry moving | Poor planning of the infrastructure around the development. Road planning, zero. Access to and from development, zero. 7 storey building, not looking attractive as "first thing you see upon arrival to Queenstown". | Please, review all of the above. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | Car parking space for the residents of the new development, zero. | |
| Michelle Warrens | Oppose | | | |
| Sarah McCammon | Oppose | Definitely not. There's already long queues of traffic every morning out of Shotover Country and more housing will only increase that as there's going to be high density housing areas. | You need to put more infrastructure in place if you're going to add more housing like a two lane bridge over the Shotover river but there are no plans for this at all. | |
| katie deans | Oppose | green spaces | traffic issues need to be priority cars will not be substituted for other transport and if people do...it will be a bonus ...so more lanes and wider bridges and roundabouts needed ..etc | redesign needed |
| Joe Zhang | Oppose | Traffic issue. Queenstown is too small to fit that much of people. | No more development.do not ruin the landscape of Queenstown. | No more development.do not ruin the landscape of Queenstown. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Wayne Stiven | Oppose | <p>Pretty well nothing is right, it needs to be binned and started again, its so far out that it cannot be recovered even if its moderated in a major way</p> <p>See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 42</p> | <p>Pretty well everything is wrong, in particular the assumptions that folk will live and work in the subdivision and not use cars or need to cross the bridge as often. There is no consideration given to the fact that the council have no idea how it would work with multiple landowners and the traffic assumptions are just plain wrong. The laurel hills area is proposed to utilise access that is a safety hazard and is in no way suitable for higher density. The whole master plan needs to be binned and started again, there is no way this can be allowed to go forward in anything like its current form.</p> | <p>I think the council planning staff and consultants need to have a serious reflection on what they have created here, the proposal looks like something that would be ideal in a city not a suburb where the people who live there will need to transit the bridge for many reasons. My question to you is, if this proposal is predicated on a transport mode shift of x% what if in reality your model is wrong and the mode shift is only half of that modeled? The result will be a complete mess of congestion for anyone living east of the bridge and that includes Wanaka and Cromwell residents who work in Queesntown. The reason people want to live here is to take advantage of the lifestyle opportunities which will involve private cars for many, public transport and living and working in a contained area and not driving is just a crazy pipe dream. Again, this might be fine in a city but is not appropriate in the Wakatip basin. Ladies mile and shotover country traffic is already too congested and cannot take anymore traffic until there is a multi lane bride established. (also see page 42 for emailed feedback)</p> |
| Wayne Dowman | Support | Housing but concerned about infrastructure | <p>We need a community club based at 5 mile which needs to allow for a covered in lawn bowls green , tennis courts, darts and other sports facilities that managed clubs have. Queenstown needs this community club. This would be a real community club !</p> | Please plan for this I'm sure you will have full community support |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Christy Brennan | Oppose | | <p>Changing the zoning to med and high density, not improving infrastructure to suit that many people, assuming the residents will not have cars they will want to park and use on the roads is ludicrous. The impact to traffic will be huge.</p> <p>The area is beautiful and carving it up to put so many buildings and with such tall height limits will ruin the aesthetic of our area of outstanding beauty.</p> | Don't. Keep the area rural. |
| Krista officer | Oppose | Absolutely nothing | Already congested roads with no solution for the current problem | |
| Michael Hanna | Oppose | Very little | <p>No consideration for infrastructure or transport to support this proposal.</p> <p>No option to scale it back substantially</p> <p>No consideration to traffic management both crossing the Shotover and further all the way to QT</p> | <p>This is a very based one sided option to further ruin our natural environment Council and councilors have once again proved their inability to get it right for everyone's benefit not just the developer's</p> <p>Wrong model and out of step with ratepayers.</p> <p>With the track record of the council, rate payers need to be extremely careful trusting them not to ruin this opportunity</p> |
| John Callaghan | Oppose | I agree that the area needs to settle extra residents. | I think the plan tries to settle too many residents in such a small place. The road and bridge are already maxed out. I can't see how the extra residents can live here without major traffic congestion issues. Also, I think the area should not have high density residential zones. It will kill what makes QLDC special. | Perhaps spread some of the proposed extra population southwards towards Jacks Point. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Rebecca marshall | Oppose | The community side of things. | Another area in Queenstown without car parking facilities is poor planning. The traffic is already awful on ladies mile highway towards shotover. | Why do QLDC keep building places without car parks for workers and locals in the area? It's driving people away from working and living here, and with the last year we've had , it's evident that locals are the people you need to keep here - not necessarily rely on tourists. |
| Louise | Oppose | | Infrastructure to deal with the already chaotic traffic | |
| O Brummer | Oppose | Potentially trying to reduce vehicle trips | Too much development, destroying an area of natural beauty, vehicles won't reduce, it's not possible to live here without a vehicle | |
| Marcia | Oppose | Some faculties | Lack of foresight as to how this will affect the test of us living here. You will ruin it for us all. We have to cap this sort of development without the right infrastructure to support it | Stop and think about your legacy |
| Erica Walker | Support | I think high density is the way to go, to reduce urban sprawl. The focus should be put on walkability and public transport for Queenstown. | The roading infrastructure is terrible in Queenstown, and I think QLDC should work with NZTA to upgrade the shotover bridge as traffic is horrific already. Emphasis needs to be put on a solid public transport system with appropriate cycleways and walkways to make it easier to get into town. | Queenstown has a huge bottleneck problem with traffic |
| Kathleen | Oppose | Doing a survey | Eyesore, traffic management and parking, too intensive, | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Anthony zsey | Oppose | Not much | Too many people in an area without the infrastructure to support it, especially roads. | Please don't ruin Queenstown completely. Changed so much in the 16 years I have been here, and mainly not for the better. |
| Olivia | Oppose | Not a lot. | Traffic is not catered for now, let alone having an extra 10,000 people. Traffic everyday workday of the week is crawling and bottlenecks along Ladies Mile most mornings. This would add to the already traffic nightmare. | Keep the land rural. Move residential areas away from already problematic areas. Solve the problem before throwing fuel into the fire. |
| Natalie | Oppose | | | |
| Gary Hall | Oppose | The need for more, hopefully cheaper, housing | Underestimating the impact of so many new residences on increased traffic congestion and parking on an already inadequate road infrastructure. Overestimating the expected use of public and active transport, which I'm sure will increase but won't counteract the increase in population and car use. | |
| Zoe | Oppose | | Big developments there aren't a good idea, will cause even more traffic problems than there already is. It is a lovely area to drive through because of the open space and this development will take that away. | |
| Mary Kate Kelly | Oppose | The need for more housing that is affordable and for expansion. | Infrastructure, planning, literally any operations or thought into how how this can be integrated and not a royal f*** up like the rest of the council plans. Just have some common sense for once in your lives. | Don't be greedy. Expansion is inevitable but don't sell out. Get infrastructure in place, have a plan, and then stick with it. Stop selling out and over developing for the short term gain. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Amber | Oppose | | No way would a 7 story building be good , to much traffic as it is and will be hectic! On environment! | As above |
| steve young | Oppose | | Too many buildings without the road network in place. Traffic is already an issue. | |
| Alastair Blakeley | Support | Open space and community facilities. Particularly the location of the sports hub, community centre and the location of schools. Shopping centre will be good for the community so we don't have to go to Frankton for everything. Agree this general area is the gateway to Queenstown, think that the true gateway should be Lake Hayes, then the urban gateway be the ladies mile. Will provide good housing options for people. | Internal connection to public transport could be improved. The state highway may be too far away for people to walk to the bus, especially for those who are less mobile and rely on the bus for transport. Would be good to include facilities for kids to hang out in, maybe a library or other social indoors space. Would be good to have an indoors bus hub/info centre including info on buses and a warm, safe place to sit and wait for a bus similar to what they do in Christchurch. | Retention of existing trees is very important to me, this is important for reducing the visual impacts of the development and maintaining how the area looks at the moment. I have been made aware of the comments made by the community association. While I am part of the community, the community association and the views of the association do not represent me or my view. The rural nature of the area has already disappeared with the Country Club development. Intensive development would help with improved public transport provision, there is currently a lot of people using the bus from Shotover Country to Frankton and town and more people will hopefully mean there is better bus provision. I would support intensive development on the ladies mile provided that the trees currently along the roadside are maintained in order to reduce the visual effects of the development from the road. There also needs to be some |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | certainty that the masterplan will come to fruition and that developers will not just do a plan change to get their own way as they did with the shopping area that was planned for Shotover country. |
| Anisha | Oppose | Nothing. | <p>Better roads for traffic!</p> <p>The whole reason people come to Queenstown/arrowtown and in between, is because of our beautiful scenery and how we are still have kept most of our areas original.</p> <p>You will ruin it with high rise buildings. Why don't you put that government money towards our children's schools, or I'm sure you can find something more appropriate then destroying our surroundings</p> | |
| Jodi currie | Oppose | Community facilities | <p>Far too many people with no supporting infrastructure. More congestion, more over priced housing which will only provide further investment opportunities rather than housing opportunities for families.</p> | |
| Vivienne Smith | Support | people friendly development | <p>too 'high rise' plus looks crowded with appartments - may end up creating problem areas?</p> | <p>greatly appreciate the effort and thought that's gone into the documents, however I'm concerned too much development and not enough open space. Lower story - maximum two or three stories per unit I think:)</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Jane Bamford | Oppose | Not a lot. Queenstown does not currently have the infrastructure to support this much development. | Infrastructure | <p>Having lived in Queenstown for the last 21 years we have seen rapid growth combined with poor investment into infrastructure. Consistently developments have not delivered what they promised (affordability) and QLDC (ratepayers) have had to pay to pick up the pieces. Aside from the extremely obvious problems such as traffic we are also putting our community at risk. Lack of infrastructure means our community becomes exceedingly disconnected. With no community centres, no easy access to events/sports/festivals etc, high traffic volumes, poor public transport and ever increasing pressure on the facilities we do have people drop out of community activities.</p> <p>For instance in kids sports alone - access to sports fields is becoming exceedingly difficult - not just having lack of sports fields but the ability to access the fields in the first place. I recommend you all go to the events centre on a Saturday where netball and rugby are both on.</p> <p>The "hope" that people will use public transport is just that - a hope. There are no statistics to back it up and there is not any work in the immediate area that could support the residents who choose to walk. No bus lanes means commutes are still timew asters and as such, inconvenient and poorly used. The high school is not confirmed nor are the sports</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>fields or anything else that is on the plan. NZTA have already said they will not increase the bridge and so we will have more bottlenecks</p> <p>The fact that QLDC is supporting the draft plan because they feel that they have no other option means that you don't have faith in your ability to do your job. I have no confidence that the developers won't change the plans anyway (and experience of developers shows me they would).</p> <p>I support the submission by the Lake Hayes Community Group who suggests a deferred plan. Until certain major infrastructure agenda items are met - do not proceed.</p> <p>The job of the QLDC is to listen to its community - and so far the community has very strongly said no. We have become disenfranchised with the agenda of the QLDC and feel that our voices are not heard - I would suggest that a lot of people won't even submit because they believe they will not be listened to. QLDC has a LONG way to go for the community to have its faith restored.</p> |
| tom adams | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| James & Sara Waggett | Oppose | Not keeping this land zoned 'Rural, Rural Lifestyle, or Large Lot Residential'. We oppose the rezoning of this land to medium and high density. | Allowing 10,000 new residents without first putting in place suitable infrastructure such as a new 4 lane Shotover Bridge. How will SH6 cope ? | This medium / high density development & associated traffic will further undermine the key reasons why living in the Whakatipu Valley so special. STOP !! |
| Jo Rewi | Oppose | Nothing | Traffic congestion. It won't go away fix the problem now before creating a bigger problem. There is no need for more housing in this area. Leave the beautiful open spaces. | Would like to know who is going to benefit from this its certainly is not the local resident. |
| Anonymous | Oppose | Nothing | No point in planning more housing without a new bridge or hospital Traffic will be impossible Need infrastructure before housing | Dont do it ! This plan should not even be discussed before a new bridge is budgeted and approved and a large hospital is built |
| Anna Boulton | Oppose | Need for more (affordable) housing | The road infrastructure. You cannot possibly increase the number of occupants in this land area without a better road infrastructure. It barely copes as it is (without extra residents AND reduced visitors). DO NOT GO AHEAD WITHOUT MORE ROADS AND BRIDGES. | DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH LADIES MILE WITHOUT MORE ROADS AND BRIDGES |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Sam Lees | Oppose | Very little. The fact that there is a demand for more housing in Queenstown. | <p>The transport report and plan is ridiculous and fundamentally flawed. It assumes that people want to take a bus but that the facilities just aren't up top scratch which puts people off using them.</p> <p>In reality people don't like to take buses because they limit your freedom of movement and are a painful experience. In cities they work only because of sheer volume of people (much larger than Queenstown can hope to achieve in our lifetimes) and even then well developed cities quickly move away from buses to trains due to their efficiencies and the fact that people like taking the train more than a bus. Developing an extra 2500 residences in Ladies Mile is not going to change this for people. The only thing it is going to do is increase congestion on the main road and the bridge.</p> <p>While I agree that higher density residential areas are needed to meet the demands of the growing population, I think the proposal for Ladies mile flies in the face of common sense and shows how little thought has actually gone into what people want the future Queenstown to look like. Apartments have no place in ladies mile. Apartments belong in Frankton, 5 mile and the centre of town. These are the areas where people can walk and bike to work and may be able to live without a car. The fact of the matter is that people aren't going to be giving up their cars any time soon.</p> <p>Queenstown is not a city. It is a mountain adventure town. The whole appeal and reason people come here is for the mountains and the natural landscapes of the district. You can't take a bus to Moke lake, Wye Creek or the Routeburn. Realistically people will keep having their cars because these are the things they live here for. By allowing development without parking requirements you're just creating problems for the people who end up</p> | Get your b***** act together and actually talk to the community. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>living there. You already see this effect in Shotover Country. The narrow roads with defined parking bays means people park up on the footpath, verges or just take up some of the road.</p> <p>During my time living in Queenstown its easy to see that the council takes a very piecemeal approach to the planning and development of the region. There is no vision for what Queenstown could be. The ladies mile proposal is just another reactionary idea that attempts to ease a problem and in doing so poses several more. It will create more of the same hodgepodge unconnected c*** which risks ruining the appeal and lure that Queenstown has.</p> | |
| Nick Endean | Oppose | | Too much traffic. Too much greed. | |
| Kristy | Oppose | Nothing | Too many houses, too many cars, bridge too small. Traffic already horrendous. People will not use the buses when they have a car. | Something needs to be done about traffic/ shotover bridge before any more cars added to the road. |
| Leon | Oppose | Nothing your ruining a great area in the Whakatipi basin by proposing to over populating it. | To many houses and to much congestion (the traffic is already so bad) planned for the ladies mile area which will affect existing residents in lake hayes and shotover country and others. You should be building a new development at malaghans road where there is lots of | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | space and no traffic issues. With the future gibbston development you will wreck the main road into Queenstown. The proposed bus uptake will not work people will use cars and you will make a current problem worse. From a 35 year plus local please proceed with minimum impact on on our area (ladies mile etc), keep it beautiful and don't over populate it!!! Thanks | |
| emily spicer | Oppose | nothing | I don't think that we should develop any more buildings around that area as we cannot hold 10,000 more people around that area, it also would ruin the views that we luckily have and spoils the gorgeous drive into queenstown that travellers get to witness. people come here to experience the nature and how beautiful queenstown is not to look at ugly buildings everywhere. we are not a city | think about saving the looks of queenstown and the logistics of us locals getting around |
| Jan rae | Oppose | Keep this area rural. It is our entrance to our beautiful town. | Robust Transport systems should be built first before any further development this side of the shotover bridge | Development for developments sake is just wrong. It's not sustainable, it ruins our fragile backyard. It is shortsighted. Someone speak up and tell the emperor he is naked!!! |
| Polly Caldwell | Oppose | Recreation field | High density housing | |
| Alex Boyes | Oppose | Nothing. Leave it alone | There is nothing to protect this beautiful avenue. First impressions are powerful. Transport routes better than current need to come first or else traffic will just back up to Cromwell. We have an option to get this right. Pause. Breathe. Proceed | We don't have to cover every piece of flat land with ugly high rises and giant grey roofed mushroom. Slow down |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Emilie Bean | Oppose | | A complete disregard for infrastructure required in order to support this development considering the already constrained movement around the area due to traffic and construction supporting the already swollen residential areas | The council seems adamant on going ahead with this development despite a resounding sentiment that opposes it. Given the planning is incomplete, evidenced by a lack of thought around infrastructure development and the burden this will be on current residents, I find this unconscionable. |
| Patricia linhares | Oppose | Not much. | You should fix the issue with traffic first before thinking of start building more houses. No one will stop driving their cars to be in a bus, this will not happen. New roads need to be built first. | |
| E Murphy | Oppose | You spent a lot of time on it, well done. I still oppose the plan. | You've a lot more work to do. Back to the drawing board. Things are not looking that exciting at the moment for future generations. The environmental impact of endless overpriced developments will be a massive headache. | Have a break. No more ridiculous development for a wee while. Work on making QLDC an affordable and enjoyable place for its residents and visitors. |
| Amy | Oppose | Nothing | Do not build at high or even moderate density in this area. It is already too populated | Please consider the major impact on current residents and future road infrastructure. So many are against this. |
| Molly Powers | Support | Use of cycle trails, shared bus lane, integration of green space around the higher density areas. Fully support that the land should not be zoned rural residential. Prefer medium to high density, however prefer both to rural residential. | SH6 is a major road and simply can't have pedestrian crossings on it; needs to be more under or over passes to allow safe crossing. When the school day ends and all the kids try to cross the road to Lake Hayes/lower Shotover, SH6 will turn into a parking lot. Additionally, it is already a long wait to get out of Shotover during the morning rush hour, the impact on lower shotover commuters needs to be considered. Lastly in considering views from SH6, trees should not be cut down to give a view of Lake Hayes; rather, Lake | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | Hayes should continue to be sheltered/shielded from the roads wherever possible. | |
| Lo | Oppose | | <p>Traffic and congestion considerations - the current levels are already an issue without adding to this problem</p> <p>Parking requirements - is there enough parking provided for new development?</p> <p>Development of existing community spaces should be actioned before building new communities</p> | |
| Caroline Lane | Oppose | I'm not opposed to a subdivision in the future but not until traffic issues are addressed | Not addressing the traffic issues, I would like to see a 4 lane bridge over the Shotover before any more subdivisions are allowed. | Expecting all residents to catch buses is unrealistic people like the freedom of cars |
| Ben kent | Oppose | | <p>Infrastructure first, we need a bigger bridge.</p> <p>Parking, just because it's high density doesn't mean we don't need parking. All cars need to be parked off the road. Look at shotover country, you let the developer get a way with murder by not enforcing wider roads and more parking. If you want high density housing with small section sizes you need to make extra allowances for additional parking close by. No point relying on the bus system they can't even fit down the roads you allowed. QLDC dictates what the developers can get a way with, they will always take profit over outcome as they don't have to live there.</p> <p>We don't need to develop everything ASAP, slow down and do it properly with a better quality outcome or we will ruin this beautiful town.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Jorja Lane | Neutral | turning ladies mile into a subdivision is not a bad idea. | It would be much better if a four lane bridge was added over the Shotover river to ease congestion in the Shotover/Lake Hayes/Ladies mile area. I also feel that buses are great for transport but not all people are able to take a bus (like tradies etc...)so plenty of parking outside buildings is still necessary. Making sure not to aim accommodation at students is important because there are no universities in Queenstown. | |
| Jorge Contreras | Oppose | Nothing | Everything | We don't want this |
| Micaiah Neale | Oppose | For as long as nothing is done to address the traffic choke point of the Shotover bridge, then you have done nothing right at all. | Failure to appropriately address the effect that this development will have on the already loaded peak hour traffic congestion. | Appropriate infrastructure must precede any significant development on the eastern side of the Shotover river. |
| Fraser Maclachlan | Oppose | Forsight to see that we need my appropriate housing | The obvious one, infrastructure. Roads/ traffic are terrible as is. | |
| Jo | Oppose | To be honest, I don't feel there was much right as I disagree with having more houses in this area. | This area is too congested already. It's losing its charm and is growing into a big city. | I disagree with this proposal. |
| Vanessa koch | Oppose | | The infrastructure issue of increased traffic To the Shotover bridge area. It is already too busy and with no tourists. And ruining the landscape we call Queenstown with high rises as you enter the city. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Irshaad sayed | Oppose | Not much | Infrastructure, planning | Don't build it until the roads can handle it |
| Arrowtown Village Association | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 44 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Jane Hamilton | Oppose | <p>I think it is good to try and front-foot development and get a plan and some guiding principles in place for future development.</p> <p>Looking at proposed locations for new primary and secondary schools in this direction is good</p> | <p>There are many better places to look at developing before developing Ladies Mile. Ladies Mile is a greenfield space that is separated from any urban amenities. Defer development until other areas, e.g. Remarkables Park, Gorge Rd, Frankton, Arrowtown are fully developed.</p> <p>Why allow development in this beautiful rural area when other areas are already urban?</p> <p>The proposed intensity of development does not suit the environment, traffic congestion or needs of the residents. While it is understood that behaviour changes are required, as can be demonstrated by Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country, parking and space are required for residents. Apartments separated from any sizable urban precinct are not desirable, especially for the majority of people choosing to live in Queenstown.</p> <p>People in apartments still require vehicles, and adequate parking has not been allowed. The height of the proposed buildings will cause a significant negative shift in the outstanding natural landscape. As this is the gateway to Queenstown, should this area not be protected from further intensive development?</p> <p>Traffic congestion is a problem already. With a population of only half a small city Queenstown already has traffic congestion to rival many larger urban areas.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>Until a real plan that addresses the current and future traffic needs is developed the Ladies Mile development should be deferred. While it is clear that behaviour needs to change, the Council needs to be realistic that there are many barriers to using alternative or public transport, and simply creating bus lanes is not going to solve these underlying drivers of behaviour. The types of occupation, location of schools, location of shops and amenities and location of workplaces mean that a multi-layered approach is required, plus a realisation that just by making it less comfortable for people to use vehicles doesn't mean they will come off the road.</p> | |
| Hugh Clark | Oppose | Providing community facilities | No scope for low or medium density housing, an incorrect assumption that everyone will utilise public transport, not dealing with current traffic issues first. | |
| Chris Seymour | Oppose | Nothing | The amount of density and lack of infrastructure planning is appalling. | This plan is short sighted and seems to be nothing but a cash grab for developers. It will sully the natural landscape and cause more congestion to an already congested area. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Innis Hamilton | Oppose | <p>Good to be thinking about planning / development in the future</p> <p>Good to be planning for schools</p> | <p>There are many better places to look at developing before developing Ladies Mile. Ladies Mile is a greenfield space that is separated from any urban amenities. Defer development until other areas, e.g. Remarkables Park, Gorge Rd, Frankton, Arrowtown are fully developed. Why allow development in this beautiful rural area when other areas are already urban?</p> <p>The proposed intensity of development does not suit the environment, traffic congestion or needs of the residents. While it is understood that behaviour changes are required, as can be demonstrated by Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country, parking and space are required for residents. Apartments separated from any sizable urban precinct are not desirable, especially for the majority of people choosing to live in Queenstown. People in apartments still require vehicles, and adequate parking has not been allowed. The height of the proposed buildings will cause a significant negative shift in the outstanding natural landscape. As this is the gateway to Queenstown, should this area not be protected from further intensive development?</p> <p>Traffic congestion is a problem already. With a population of only half a small city Queenstown already has traffic congestion to rival many larger urban areas. Until a real plan that addresses the current and future traffic needs is developed the Ladies Mile development should be deferred. While it is clear that behaviour needs to change, the Council needs to be realistic that there are many barriers to using alternative or public transport, and simply creating bus lanes is not going to solve these underlying drivers of behaviour. The types of occupation, location of schools, location of shops and amenities and location of workplaces mean that a multi-layered approach is required, plus a realisation that just</p> | <p>Despite the constant narrative of needing a shift towards public transport, there seems to be no desire to admit that even in a place like Melbourne which has one of the most effective and well used public transport systems in Australasia the use of the system is still only by 19% of the population. With the population volume of the proposed development the existing Shotover bridge will still be running at over capacity until another bridge has been provided by the MoT.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>by making it less comfortable for people to use vehicles doesn't mean they will come off the road.</p> <p>There is a lack of local amenities to service such a proposed development and recent developments reflect a misalignment between developing residential properties before having the local amenities in place.</p> <p>The proposed commercial and recreational amenities need developed before more residential is developed, and doesn't appear to be any provision for this in the masterplan.</p> <p>Schools are needed in the area, especially if more residential development occurs, however as far as I am aware there has been no undertaking from the MoE to site schools along Ladies Mile. Until such undertakings are confirmed the Masterplan for Ladies Mils should be deferred.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Kerryn Boniface | Oppose | <p>I like the provision for greenspaces and the community/social/recreation facilities provided for at the Council-owned property 516 Ladies Mile-Frankton Highway is positive. Some of the planning considerations are sensible, especially the Stormwater Strategy Key Features.</p> | <p>The density of development is simply too much for the area, and the Ladies Mile Masterplan seems overly focused on the scale of the housing development - high-density housing needs to be scaled back to reflect the beautiful, unique landscape we have the privilege of using. The data and evidence-base for the transport problem is out-of-date, lacks validity and does not give confidence to enhancing the ability of a growing population to move freely with greater ease, comfort and pleasure. The significance and impact of the transport issues for what is a small town are not given the priority or focus they deserve - transport options and new infrastructure must be planned for now as the network is already at full capacity, or beyond - particularly at peak times. The assumptions made around creating such a modal shift in transport simply don't "stack up". Where's the evidence to support this in terms of prospective residents, car-loving Kiwis will be more difficult to shift into the required behaviour change and the climate is cold in winter - meaning cars will remain the preferred primary means of transport. If better data was used and applied for the modelling then I might have a higher degree of comfort - I am concerned the Ladies Mile Masterplan will move us backwards in relation to traffic congestions. More innovation is needed for additional transport routes in and around the Eastern Corridor - with one tributary running from SH6 to serve the south-west from the Shotover Bridge; and another tributary running from SH6 to serve the north-west from Shotover Bridge or joining Hansen Road as a means to relieve pressure on the network and "loop it" through to Arthurs Point Road and/or the northern section of Gorge Road. This need not be a traditional roadway, but the "one road in, one</p> | <p>Yes - looking at the Community Presentation Slides and slide 24 specifically, I am concerned why we have 'NEW INFRASTRUCTURE' as a Consider Last option. This ought to sit directly at the bottom - Consider First, alongside 'INTEGRATED PLANNING'. The infrastructure must be designed and delivered according to future needs, and this needs to happen before any housing development occurs. People will choose to live elsewhere if the LMC and Elected Members don't get this critical decision right - it needs to enhance outcomes for the community and the people who live here now need to be the most important consideration in that. Does it take us all forward? Or, are the costs or implications too great on the wellbeing of our communities and/or the special characteristics that define Ladies Mile as it is?</p> <p>There is some good work and thought that has gone into shaping up the Ladies Mile Masterplan to this point. Some final analysis is essential before we move into a phase that will commit our community/District to what will be a radical new direction/way of life. So, exploring and drawing from the right data is imperative to sufficiently test a number of assumptions behind the Masterplan. Similarly, testing the variable impact/s of</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>road out" transport infrastructure is no longer sufficient for our current population, let alone a future-proofed District that will be attractive to new residents and international visitors. What are the impacts on traffic congestion with the addition of the proposed roundabouts on SH6 along the Eastern Corridor?</p> <p>Regarding the proposed height and density of housing development (refer to the Community Presentation Slides and slide 19 specifically), the northern side of Ladies Mile-Frankton Highway ought to be limited to 8m max., the 3 red areas in the middle ought to be no more than 13m max. and the northern-most area only ought to provide for 24.5m max. height. Effectively, the housing would be in three progressive bands of low/medium/high density from south to north.</p> <p>Finally, the data needs to be better established, tested and applied specifically for the Ladies Mile Masterplan so that all implications re scale, size, transport impacts and amenity are clearly understood before a Masterplan is advanced for a decision by Council. Comparisons to Aspen, Colorado need to be taken with a "grain of salt" and variables like free buses there to \$2 buses here will render the necessary modelling inaccurate at best.</p> <p>- Commenting as a private individual/resident</p> | <p>all the proposed design elements interacting with one another in a "real world way" will be crucial. That should target and prioritise finding an optimal and cohesive balance out of this opportunity to elegantly shape a proactive, sustainable and responsible approach to urban development. I do not want to see the character, natural beauty or current level of enjoyment of the neighbourhoods that make up Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile eroded because of excessive housing scale or unbridled freedoms via the RMA/proposed Planning 'Variation' - whereby the Developers have the ability to focus solely on their commercial interests at the expense of fulfilling the design principles intended to benefit, uplift and serve our local residents.</p> |
| Jess Warren | Oppose | Attempting to preserve the entry and exit views of queenstown | missed the mark completely with transport. Already there is huge pressure and congestion across the bridge, until this is resolved high density you seeing should not go ahead. the practicalities of queenstown mean relying on bus transport is not viable now or in the next ten years. Given the types of people that live in queenstown households require cars. Any high density housing should be located in hubs such as five mile. public | please keep this zoned rural, rural residential. this is not the right place for another subdivision let alone high density that doesn't allow for parking |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | transport is currently prohibitive from shotover and lake Hayes estate. | |
| L. Boniface | Oppose | The greenspaces are nice, and there's need and value in Site 516 - giving a way for people to better connect. | <p>The traffic congestion on the Shotover Bridge, in Shotover Country and right along the main road to Frankton and Queenstown is already a problem we all encounter. Why are we proposing more people and 2,400 more units within an already jam-packed area? Two new schools and all of the people who will live here will detract from being able to enjoy life, live well and access other parts of the District with relative ease. Take a walk from Lake Hayes Estate to Lake Hayes - do we really want to sacrifice all of that beautiful scenery, enjoyment, rural character and freedom for dense residential/commercial development that doesn't belong here?</p> <p>Focus on getting the transport system right-sized and fully functional first, improving connections and ease of movement by more innovative choice. Multiple transport modes need to be thought about and there just isn't the capacity in this area to "house" such a large-scale mix of new housing and the like. The disruption to locals will likely be significant and the timeframes seem loose in terms of what, where and when things will happen.</p> <p>Who will control the proposed development? I'm gathering there are multiple land developers who may not share a common goal. This is not the right area to grow in, and more concentrated growth seems like a bad idea because it will take away from the best things about this special part of Queenstown, and NZ. I imagine international and domestic visitors will be disappointed</p> | We have a big District that has a lot of space available. There must be better locations for us to "grow out" instead of putting so many people into pretty much the same spot. Surely, that approach would make their lifestyles better, maintain the quality of life for Ladies Mile residents and be smarter for planning for the future as our population rises. The cons of the Ladies Mile Masterplan outweigh the pros. If we need to build more houses, why choose to do so in what's now "the middle" of Queenstown and on the main road that is the only throughway to Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cromwell, Dunedin and Invercargill for the thousands of people already inhabiting the area, or in close proximity. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | seeing a generic-looking housing development instead of the trees, rural farmland and greenery that makes the journey into/out of Queenstown so memorable. | |
| marina | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Shane Vallance | Oppose | Additional schooling and keeping green areas by greenhouse | Not fixing the infrastructure that is already causing major issues. | <p>' It is our opinion that the proposal to change the zoning of the Ladies Mile area from rural to a master planned, high density development is flawed. This does not represent intensification; it represents greenfield, dispersed development. As outlined above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ladies Mile is a greenfields site and is physically separated from services and employment. Whether it provides 1100 homes or 2300 homes, it will increase traffic movements in an already congested environment. Traffic is already causing significant adverse effects to our community's wellbeing. Until such time as the existing traffic issues are resolved, then there should be no further development at Ladies Mile. - We have taken on board Mr Avery's concerns around existing zoning not being adequate to 'stop developers doing what they want'. We propose a deferred zoning. Any development must be deferred until such time that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic issues are resolved; there must be a workable public transport system in place, and the Shotover Bridge provides four lanes. If these actions are not taken then traffic congestion will only get worse. - The school sites are confirmed - Community facilities for the existing community are provided, and there is capacity for future development. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>- Existing centres are intensified to accommodate growth.</p> <p>Until the traffic issues are resolved, the existing community is provided for, and greater certainty provided that the master plan can be achieved, then we oppose the Ladies Mile proposal.</p> |
| Cassie Dayman | Oppose | Happy to have quality low density housing | High density housing | Similar layout to bridesdale farm should be the aim... Quality living not cramming in as much as possible. Landowners and council aim to squeeze as much cash and use out of the land. This should not have priority over the environment and the rest of existing residents quality of life. |
| Deborah Palmer | Support | pleased you kept green open spaces, sports grounds, parks and views of mountains. Also the | | Please retain as much of the rural feel as possible and protect the outstanding natural landscape- the areas near lake and rivers, keep this for walking cycling so people have access to natural areas and |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | provision of cycle trails and walkways- important. | | can enjoy these places.(no other development) |
| Rachel Taylor | Oppose | Nothing | | This is just going to add more traffic to an already overloaded road system. More houses more cars more people travelling, no matter what they think about living and working there. |
| Darls | Oppose | Not too much | <p>Many things stand out, but a couple in particular. High density apartments that have no parking seems irresponsible for a start. New Zealanders, many with growing families are typically attracted to this area. You cant build assuming residents won't have cars. Each dwelling will have an average of 2 or 3 (plus caravans, boats, toys in general). Please imagine your own family life day to day without a car to gain perspective (then argue this point realistically and honestly). A person living in an apartment not located in the middle of a city block will expect access to their own personal transport. If not, they will need access to a reliable public transport. This is still adding to road/ bridge congestion and has potential to be unreliable for anyone hoping to get to work on time (for example)</p> <p>This development in general seems overly large and intense. This will ultimately add more stress and congestion to an already at capacity road system (and this is with our borders closed), during construction and ultimately permanent road users. The finished development itself is wrong for the area and the further disruption this will cause to the road system is unthinkable (think back to when it was just roundabouts going in). I don't agree with this development.</p> | This development will be entirely out of place and I can't think of this being good for anyone other than those who will benefit initially and then be able to walk away (to homes that enjoy views, peacefulness and roads without Auckland level traffic congestion). This is not future proofing with responsibility. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Matthew Parker | Oppose | No single family dwellings | <p>The location for the intensification. It makes no sense to build another town centre a couple of kilometres from Frankton, where all of the shops, services and other amenities have been located. There is plenty of available flat land for development, with existing infrastructure already in place, in a location where people actually won't need so many cars. Creating a new town centre around Ladies' Mile is going to require huge investment in new infrastructure, and place unreasonable demands on the transport corridor. It's naive to think that the majority of residents who live there won't want or need a car, and those that do have to travel to work will have to cross the Shotover bridge.</p> | <p>Why are we still looking at greenfield development? Intensify existing developed areas and leave greenfields undeveloped. The only people who win from more greenfield development are the developers, everyone else has to pay the price in providing infrastructure and dealing with more people in the area.</p> <p>Have a conversation as a community about whether we actually want more people living in this area.</p> |
| Sabrina Poulin | Oppose | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A new 4 lane Shotover Bridge is not even being considered to alleviate the already traffic-jammed Ladies Mile/SH6. This is fundamental infrastructure this development needs or it must not go ahead. On peak traffic hours, one line in the traffic direction should be for buses only/carpooling/taxis/scooters. No one wants to take the bus to be stuck in the same traffic as everyone else. 2) 10,000+ new residents will be crammed in to this densely populated area - doubling the current population of Lake Hayes & Shotover Country and likely doubling the amount of traffic. 3) We are seeing ever increasing traffic on Ladies Mile/SH6 entering Frankton and Queenstown from Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cromwell, Alexandra, Dunedin. This road will become unusable if this development goes ahead and will prevent residents and visitors from getting around for work or leisure. 4) Huge 7 Story apartment buildings are planned to occupy most of the land located in the orange high density zones on the map below. Half of all apartments | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>will not have a car park, so cars will likely block streets. 5) Keep this land zoned 'Rural, Rural Lifestyle, or Large Lot Residential' – please state that you oppose the rezoning of this land to medium and high density.</p> | |
| Lynette Warmington | Oppose | Not much, doesn't look like you're listening to the wider community here :-) | <p>Placing high density housing in a rural area is somewhat flawed. There are no jobs in this locality, they are all in Frankton or Queenstown, therefore everyone will need to commute for work. Even though you are proposing public transport and no personal parking; people will always have/use cars. You cannot suppose that this will not be the case just by ignoring it.</p> <p>I am opposed to seeing the high-density apartments in this area which is out of town. Would it not be better to have these closer to where people work, like in Frankton on the north side of SH6 (opposite K-Mart shops area)??</p> <p>I oppose the development of this land to medium or high density zoning.</p> | |
| Ken Sommers | Oppose | I think the necessity to have a plan for this region is good, development is inevitable, and certain aspects are worth considering regarding residential use. | High/Medium density planning is not sustainable without a firm plan for infrastructure and traffic management. Without that, this plan cannot be acceptable to go ahead and would be plainly irresponsible. | I do not see how addressing the traffic and roading issue is even an "option". Every time a development goes in, where these aspects are not looked after, it turns into a disaster for everyone. Why is Council not doing this as MUST DO? |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Lynley Illingworth | Oppose | NA | Lack of serious consideration of and planning for significant increase in traffic in area. Inadequate planning on how to address impacts and ramifications of population growth, and impacts on wider community. | No |
| Karen Whittaker | Oppose | open spaces, recreation facilities, council purchasing 516 ladies mile (use for community facilities/sports fields not park n ride) | too high rise/houses too close together, no parking. Incorrect assumption that people will take public transport/bike to work - for any people ie tradies, people with non-set work patterns, people who attend out of work activities, people who are not fit enough to bike/walk to bus-stop etc. Not enough thought/future planning into widening bridge or new bridge to be built, more pressure on NZTA needed. | |
| Emily | Oppose | | I oppose the rezoning. The current problem with traffic must be addressed prior to increasing the QT population. Traffic along SH6/Ladies Mile is already a nightmare and will only get worse with the planned development not to mention once borders are open and tourists return. | |
| Threepwood Farm Residents Assoc/Threepwood Custodians Ltd | Oppose | | | Reserve open space and stormwater management requires the use of Threepwood Custodian land. - Part of the high density zoning |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>along the base of Slopehill is on Threepwood Custodian land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The walking/cycling trail at the base of Slopehill is through the most productive farmland and would cut through the only access between the farm and the farm buildings, including the woolshed, stock yards and heavy equipment sheds. - Compromises the farming operation with high density neighbouring the property in its ability to operate from a Health and Safety perspective and problems associated that greater population brings in the form of dogs and the ability to ensure public do not access same. - The combination of the above would result in reduced income from the farm lease but more likely the farm becoming unviable - An additional effect of the farm becoming unviable, beyond the loss of revenue from the farm lease, is the deterioration of Slopehill as an Outstanding Nature Feature, as it is currently maintained by the farm operations <p>Threepwood Farm Residents Assoc have suggested a possible solution but have had no response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a qui pro quo for not establishing the Walking/Cycling trail at the base of |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Slopehill and enabling farm operations to continue, Threepwood owners may consider</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing an easement for the Connected Bus Network and part of the Walking/Cycling trail on the Ladies Mile on Threepwood common land that adjoins the State Highway <p>Other more general comments:-</p> <p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congestion to be addressed prior to any development occurring - NZTA strategic model does not identify queue levels increasing traffic from 1800 to 2400 would increase the queue length by an additional 1km - No consideration for a 4 lane bridge to alleviate the already traffic jammed Ladies Mile/SH6 nor structural fatigue on current bridge - Melbourne is recognised as a city with good public transport yet only 7% use it - the figures given by the consultants at 40% by 2028 and 60% by 2048 are flawed <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7 story apartment buildings in the high density zoning with very little allowance for carparking .5 for 1 bedroom, 1 for 2 bedroom, 1.5 for 3 bedroom. - No allowance for parking of boats or caravans <p>Trail Network</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Not direct for commuters Covenants- 26 separate landowners - who would start and pay for what?- Covenants not enforceable by QLDC |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Tom Jordan | Neutral | The region needs more low-income and higher density housing. There is a national housing shortage and prices are too high as a result. | Not enough infrastructure planning. There are already fairly major congestion issues on ladies mile and coming out of Shotover Country and Lake Hayes. This will certainly exacerbate the issue. A new 4 lane Shotover Bridge is the minimum required to ease the issue. More car parking planning is required. Underground car parks are likely the best solution. There should also be over/underpasses built for pedestrians. A pedestrian crossing on a 100km/h road is not safe or practical. | |
| Trish | Neutral | Setbacks and green space to SH6. Retention of the ladies mile property as green space and community facilities. Retention of Threepwood and Lake Hayes frontage as rural. Inclusion of space allocation for additional educational facilities and some commercial opportunities to support the local residents. | Would prefer the high density housing being a terraced housing community rather than multi story apartment buildings - doesn't seem to be a natural fit with the rural setting. Would prefer multi-story apartment style living in Frankton or Queenstown CBD | |
| N Allen | Oppose | | Far too intense housing without proper infrastructure-bridge and traffic congestion. Not to mention ruin the rural aspect. | Intensify within the town peninsula: over the Shotover river. Spreading the population out over the Basin makes transport and services expensive and difficult. Workers do want cheaper accommodation, apartments can be great, but they should be in town areas where infrastructure is able to support them. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Rob Lee | Oppose | Nothing - the plan is fundamentally flawed - see below. | <p>The plan is fundamentally flawed because development in this area should not occur, so there should be no plan. Pre-Covid 19 Queenstown complained of over-tourism and over-development. Post-Covid 19 calls have been made to re-evaluate what Queenstown should be. We have a unique opportunity to preserve the incredible natural wonderland we live in. That opportunity will be lost forever if it is not taken now. We should be aiming for less development, less growth and much higher value, environmentally sustainable tourism to sustain the integrity of the area. The question that should be being asked is what is the ideal size of the Queenstown population and restrict future growth to that. Why is growth necessary? Take a stand Queenstown and preserve the area for future generations and, in doing so, help prevent further climate and environmental degradation.</p> | <p>'Should the plan become a reality, there are multiple issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing should be allowed to proceed until long-term, realistic solutions are found to reduce current traffic congestion issues. People are not going to get rid of their cars in droves. - The consultants' estimates of uptake of public transport look ridiculously optimistic. The climate here makes it unlikely people will cycle or walk much during autumn, winter or much of spring. Maybe ok in summer, but the rest of the year won't work. - Car use for many is to move around the district, not simply from home to work or school and back - tradespeople, retired people, sports activities, recreation, visiting our beautiful outdoors, touring the area - very little of which could be satisfied by public transport - Inadequate parking - again, the estimates of car ownership look extremely low. - No parking allowance for boats and caravans. - Coordinating developers, managing multiple ownerships of land, and enforcing rules to obtain the original planned outcome seems unlikely to be possible. - Covenants are not enforceable. - If Threepwood Farm becomes unviable due to development, Slopehill, an |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Outstanding Natural Feature will deteriorate as it is currently maintained by farm operations. |
| Kelly Saxton | Oppose | | Traffic management Not the place for so many houses | |
| Dominic Hazell | Oppose | | | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Colin Sydney | Oppose | <p>Not much. It feels like the planning team and QLDC are prioritising the interests of people who don't even live in the area yet ahead of people who DO live here. IF you can get a school located there that would be great as well as additional retail and other services. If this has to happen it has to feel like a community, like a lovely city, and feels the same as queenstown (not some cheap knockoff sprawl built down the road).</p> | <p>My family lives in Threepwood and we have a number of concerns. First - thanks to the operation of our operating farm we are able to maintain Slopehill which is classed as an Outstanding Nature Feature. Your team has repeatedly and willfully ignored our concerns around the impact of unnecessarily threading a track through the middle of our farm which will reduce our farm revenue to the point where it might not be able to function. You are planning to cut our farm in two, with the track through the most productive part of our farm, it creates numerous health and safety issues, lead to loss of stock and difficulty of operating machinery, and impede on privacy of the private community.</p> <p>Slopehill is maintained by Threepwood for the benefit of everyone in the community - it is an iconic and prominent point on Lake Hayes and Ladies mile. The operating farm front paddocks are attractive and add rural character and compliment the lack. Don't put all this at risk when you can simply extend the track that already partially exists on ladies mile.</p> <p>Lastly, I think you are nuts for assuming you can dramatically increase public transport and modal shift to the extent you have hung your hat on. It was flipping -3 degrees yesterday. Its dark, wet and cold, and kiwis are stubborn. Get this wrong and you will have crushed Queenstown and it will forever be your legacy.</p> <p>Lower the apartments, lower the density, invest more in infrastructure and you could be on to something. We will not willingly go along with this plan.</p> | |
| Melanie | Oppose | | Please don't rezone rural land to medium or high density | The infrastructure cant cope with this influx of high density. It ruins the landscape and is further urban sprawl. Think of 5 mile. How many shopping |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | centers are lucky enough to have a paddock of sheep across the road. |
| Poppy Simpson-Wells | Oppose | I like the idea of the community playing fields and the potential for new school sites this side of the bridge. | <p>High rise apartment blocks and high density living. I am not against these in Queenstown, but they need to be in central areas such as Queenstown CDB and Frankton at the centre of business to avoid urban sprawl.</p> <p>No consideration for the new levels of traffic. There is already an issue here and this masterplan only adds to that. It is naïve to believe that all the new residents will take the bus and cycle. I am a keen cyclist and refuse to cycle in less than 6 degrees...which can even happen in the middle of summer. Further, the bus is a great service but not everyone will adopt this. Look at the bus user numbers when the service was free last year.</p> <p>The street layouts look very narrow in the designs. These should be widened and lessons learnt from narrow streets used in Shotover Country development.</p> <p>The adverse amenity effects on the entrance into Queenstown. Changing a beautiful rural setting into high rise apartment blocks will have considerable effects on amenity.</p> | I do not think that this masterplan, its current form will increase the wellbeing of our community. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Kiri Rasmussen | Oppose | <p>The need for additional low-cost housing in the Wakatipu basin. I just don't believe the Ladies Mile as the gateway to Queenstown is the correct location at the density proposed.</p> <p>The public spaces and additional public transport proposed are a positive.</p> | <p>Continued development along the gateway road to arguably the most beautiful town in NZ is difficult to understand from a tourism welcome experience, town and traffic management or local resident's perspective. Most people's current quality of life and visitor experience will be decreased from this development and that seems to contradict the role of Local Government in management of the district's resources and improving all resident's quality of life.</p> <p>The need for low cost housing is very important, but developments of this scale and density should happen in</p> | <p>Yes. We are residents of Threepwood Farm Development, on the Slopehill Road side. There are several elements of this proposal that will significantly effect the current arrangements for land management of the wider Threepwood Farm, that in itself are land areas of significance in the context of the current visual gateway to Queenstown surrounding Lake Hayes and Slope Hill. I am repeating key points from our Threepwood Residents Association</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>areas closer to where the jobs are so walking to work is an option, or in a location that the added impact of people and vehicles will not have such a great impact on an already stressed transport route. I would expect around Five Mile, Frankton (behind the High School), or towards Arthurs Point would be much more suitable options for high density housing developments. These locations are not on major arterial routes, but are still well serviced by public transport or walking distance to areas of employment.</p> <p>Changing signature rural land to 7 storey residential apartments is a significant and irreversible change to the local landscape. The environmental impacts will be significant for such a beautiful and untouched area, and I think will be one that will be regretted if this plan continues.</p> | <p>submission below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reserve open space and stormwater management requires the use of Threepwood Custodian land. - Part of the high density zoning along the base of Slopehill is on Threepwood Custodian land - The walking/cycling trail at the base of Slopehill is through the most productive farmland and would cut through the only access between the farm and the farm buildings, including the woolshed, stock yards and heavy equipment sheds. - Compromises the farming operation with high density neighbouring the property in its ability to operate from a Health and Safety perspective and problems associated that greater population brings in the form of dogs and the ability to ensure public do not access same. - The combination of the above would result in reduced income from the farm lease but more likely the farm becoming unviable - An additional effect of the farm becoming unviable, beyond the loss of revenue from the farm lease, is the deterioration of Slopehill as an Outstanding Nature Feature, as it is currently maintained by the farm operations <p>Threepwood Farm Residents Assoc have suggested a possible solution but have</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>had no response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a qui pro quo for not establishing the Walking/Cycling trail at the base of Slopehill and enabling farm operations to continue, Threepwood owners may consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing an easement for the Connected Bus Network and part of the Walking/Cycling trail on the Ladies Mile on Threepwood common land that adjoins the State Highway <p>Other more general comments:-</p> <p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congestion to be addressed prior to any development occurring - NZTA strategic model does not identify queue levels increasing traffic from 1800 to 2400 would increase the queue length by an additional 1km - No consideration for a 4 lane bridge to alleviate the already traffic jammed Ladies Mile/SH6 nor structural fatigue on current bridge - Melbourne is recognised as a city with good public transport yet only 7% use it the figures given by the consultants at 40% by 2028 and 60% by 2048 are flawed - Public transport works when doing one trip per outing. When you factor in work, school pick ups, activity drop-offs etc, public transport just doesn't meet the needs of most working families in a timely |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>or efficient manner.</p> <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 7 story apartment buildings in the high density zoning with very little allowance for carparking .5 for 1 bedroom, 1 for 2 bedroom, 1.5 for 3 bedroom.- No allowance for parking of boats or caravans <p>Trail Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Not direct for commuters <p>Covenants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 26 separate landowners - who would start and pay for what?- Covenants not enforceable by QLDC |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Marie-Claire Henderson | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leading the development with a plan for the area rather than letting than leaving the area to develop ad-hoc. -High density - this area is a great opportunity to provide housing and amenity to the growing population -Emphasis on sustainable transport networks (supported by the higher density living) -Emphasis on quality of the urban environment -Emphasis on quality and liveability of housing | <p>The plan should be more ambitious in addressing the transition to sustainable transport networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Shared carparking and the reduction of reliance on the private car is a great ideal but many desirable destinations in our region are not sufficiently serviced by public transport and transitional options need to be considered. Shuttles, car-share co-operatives, electric bike hire schemes etc. could support increases in bus services to help bridge that gap. -Consider wider sustainable connections ie. links to ferries or to a larger train network for intercity travel in the longer term future -Prioritising pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport is referenced in the masterplan but the provision of a 'safe crossing via underpass' suggests that this may not be followed through. Landscaped over-passes like New York's highline, slow landscaped shared spaces and underground vehicle tunnels are all different methods of prioritising cyclists and pedestrians over cars, while underpasses prioritise cars. -Similarly its worth noting that the current development around Frankton shows a half-hearted effort to cater to parties other than motorised vehicle users. Cycleways are provided but take more convoluted routes and are diverted off to the sides around intersections to streamline the flow of cars. Pedestrian routes are incidental to roads and carparking and the pedestrian experience generally goes unconsidered (except perhaps when pedestrians get close enough to shops to be considered consumers). There are limited safe options for crossing busy roads. The new masterplan intends to do better but is at risk of being watered down to give us the same unhealthy and unsustainable urban environment. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>An additional point under density and shared amenity is that all units should be provided with service and storage spaces appropriate for long-term accommodation.</p> | |
| Tim Stevens | Oppose | I'm get really fine with the layout and density of the development. | Realistic traffic solutions. | Ladies mile does not function efficiently. As I read NZTA's report even with a change of behaviour and increased use of public transport, there will still be capacity issues. It does not make sense to add to the existing issues with further development. I dare say there is another bridge that should be completed before Ladies Mile is developed. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Paul Anderson | Oppose | The need for more room for housing and the fact that this corridor provides good flat land. | <p>You only get one chance to make this right so there's no need to cut corners now.</p> <p>The provision for infrastructure is inadequate to carry the amount of traffic required either now or into the future. Ladies Mile and the Shotover bridge requires four-laning now so to proceed with this plan without any firm plan to do this work is myopic.</p> <p>There is also the issue with Threepwood Farm; it is proposed to put a walking and cycling track through a working farm. The walking/cycling trail at the base of Slopehill is through the most productive farmland and would cut through the only access between the farm and the farm buildings, including the woolshed, stock yards and heavy equipment sheds. This raises fundamental health and safety issues for users of this track as well as operational issues for the farm which ultimately reduces the land's efficiency. Also, it is possible that the farm will suffer from the introduction of domesticated dogs, which pose a threat to the stock. This track is unnecessary because it would be attractive to build an excellent access for walkers and bikers alongside Ladies Mile. This could be planted in trees hence improving the aesthetics of this key approach to Queenstown.</p> <p>Threepwood Farm Residents Association have suggested a possible solution but have had no response. As a <i>qui pro quo</i> for not establishing the Walking/Cycling trail at the base of Slopehill and enabling farm operations to continue, Threepwood owners may consider providing an easement for the Connected Bus Network and part of the Walking/Cycling trail on the Ladies Mile on Threepwood common land that adjoins the State Highway.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Justin Ralston | Oppose | Taller building to back. | Density is to high, building are to big and the traffic stratergy is un likely to work.High Scholl is on wrong side of road and should be at 516. | |
| Joann | Oppose | Community facilities and schools | Shouldn't include High density housing | |
| AJ Mason | Oppose | The "walkable village" concepts within the masterplan should, of course, be a minimum requirement for any new development, and a priority remedy for existing developments. | It is in entirely the wrong place. "Walkable village" concepts, including public transport, are a mitigation against the embedded evils of urban sprawl, not a goal in and of itself - is must not be our goal to sprawl, merely so that we can enjoy a mitigation. That would wrongheaded to the same degree as deliberately giving ourselves diabetes, so that we can enjoy giving ourselves insulin shots. Prior to any considerations of mitigations within a proposed development must be a foundational and essential requirement for the most compact and energy efficient overall urban forms possible. In this specific case, Ladies Mile must be off the table until and unless the Frankton Flats are infilled. (and yes, of course, that infill should follow the forms and functions of walkable villages). | Pre-emptively resiling from decisions based on merit, merely because you are afraid those decisions may be overturned, is - to say the least - disappointing. The dictionary is full of far less flattering terms for such behavior. To the contrary, I urge QLDC to have the courage not to abdicate its ultimate responsibility of being our community champion, deferring instead to developer lawyers: I strongly urge QLDC to oppose bad ideas, requiring no more justification than that they are bad: That should be enough to demand your opposition. |
| Ada Cheung | Oppose | School and community services facilities | Oppose to high density housing | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Monika Fry | Oppose | | | |
| Glenpanel LP | Neutral | <p>If Council were to form a strategic partnership around delivery of services, specifically the collector road and potentially stormwater, then the development of Ladies Mile is more likely to eventuate as envisioned by the re-zoning, and the masterplan objectives realised.</p> <p>See attachment A containing the emailed submissions – page 47</p> | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| LHESC Community Association | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 51 | Please see attached our submission based on feedback from residents of LHE and SC | Please see attached our submission based on feedback from residents of LHE and SC |
| Fraser Sanderson | Support | Please see attachment A – page 63 | Please see attachment A | Please see attachment A |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Alessia Bibby | Oppose | N/A | <p>Ladies Mile is not the place for high density housing and therefore I strongly oppose this proposed change in zoning.</p> <p>Frankton or central Queenstown is where there should be a push for more housing to be built as this is where people can walk/bike easily to amenities that are exist along with being close to the majority employment hubs. If you want people to get out of their cars don't build more houses away from our main centres.</p> <p>The traffic is appalling. It is extremely unrealistic to think that new homeowners will not have cars. Until CURRENT traffic issues are resolved and a convenient, usable, high frequency public transport is in place any further housing developments on this side of the bridge should not even be considered.</p> <p>It is also ridiculous to justify this type of housing by saying there will be a school and a four square. Neither of these are guaranteed - we are still waiting for some sort of cafe/store option in Shotover Country and we have been living here for YEARS. There should be no further development until such things are confirmed rather than just pie in the sky drawings QLDC has mocked up.</p> <p>The park and ride is unlikely to be utilised and that space would be best served for the local community to provide some sport/recreation options - arts centre or studio for dance/drama classes etc.</p> | <p>If you want people to get out of their cars you need to incentivise them to do so. Subsidise e-bike schemes, make the buses free, provide more amenities close to established housing so people don't need to drive everywhere</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Suzannah Dowling | Oppose | Importance of community space. | <p>No requirement by developer to upgrade road, bridge, and utilities in order to approve.</p> <p>The high density development is isolated and out of touch. The idea of no cars only works for those that can walk to employment and the minor few die-hards.</p> <p>High density living needs to be approved with performance requirements for buildings, confirmed bus schedules that suit all workers and shifts.</p> <p>Too much traffic - double what is present currently, and nothing to support it. This is a paperwork dream, and a nightmare in reality.</p> <p>It gives developer better returns at the expense of the community and our tourists.</p> | The zoning needs to be retained Rural, Rural Lifestyle or Large Lot Residential. There are much better areas to encourage high density than here. |
| Fabíola Letieri | Oppose | | Understanding the needs of the community and not the corporations | Unreasonable proposal |
| Peter | Oppose | Not a lot. | Density of housing, traffic management. Green space. | |
| Dennis Dowling | Oppose | <p>The whole idea is great, but 100% in the wrong location. Anything that relies on public transport and personal transport (feet, bike) needs to be centred around an existing hub.</p> <p>Much of Frankton could benefit from the rule changes proposed.</p> | <p>You're not making any tough decisions. Taking land easy to develop, which could be developed in a way to maintain a rural boundary around Frankton & Queenstown, and making this land more valuable to the private developer, without retaining the wider benefits to the community surrounding.</p> <p>High density development is great for Queenstown and Frankton and surrounding Queenstown Central where there is no need to install new bridges.</p> <p>The existing amenity in Frankston & Queenstown Central areas will change by going high density, but not be</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | destroyed which is what this proposal does to the Ladies Mile area. | |
| Rebecca Machej | Oppose | | <p>Effects on transport congestion.</p> <p>Effects of residential development in greenfields sites that is physically separated from urban centres (and the ongoing effects on traffic)</p> <p>The effects on intensification in existing centres by enabling further sprawl; i.e.enabling greenfields development reduces demand for intensifying within the existing centres)</p> <p>Use of prime agricultural land for residential development instead of intensifying existing urban centres Potential for residential development without the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for the existing community.</p> <p>We request that the Ladies Mile is managed via a deferred zoning. As such, any up-zoning will be deferred until such time as: -</p> <p>Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. -</p> <p>There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. -</p> <p>There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Sara Machej | Oppose | | <p>Effects on transport congestion.</p> <p>Effects of residential development in greenfields sites that is physically separated from urban centres (and the ongoing effects on traffic)</p> <p>The effects on intensification in existing centres by enabling further sprawl; i.e.enabling greenfields development reduces demand for intensifying within the existing centres)</p> <p>Use of prime agricultural land for residential development instead of intensifying existing urban centres</p> <p>Potential for residential development without the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for the existing community.</p> <p>We request that theLadies Mile is managed via a deferred zoning. As such, any up-zoning will be deferred until such time as: -</p> <p>Urban centres are intensified (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). -</p> <p>Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. -</p> <p>There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. -</p> <p>There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Konrad Machej | Oppose | | <p>Effects on transport congestion.</p> <p>Effects of residential development in greenfields sites that is physically separated from urban centres (and the ongoing effects on traffic)</p> <p>The effects on intensification in existing centres by enabling further sprawl; i.e.enabling greenfields development reduces demand for intensifying within the existing centres)</p> <p>Use of prime agricultural land for residential development instead of intensifying existing urban centres</p> <p>Potential for residential development without the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for the existing community.</p> <p>We request that theLadies Mile is managed via a deferred zoning. As such, any up-zoning will be deferred until such time as: -</p> <p>Urban centres are intensified (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). -</p> <p>Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. -</p> <p>There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. -</p> <p>There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed.</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Fiona Peat | Oppose | | <p>Effects on transport congestion.</p> <p>Effects of residential development in greenfields sites that is physically separated from urban centres (and the ongoing effects on traffic)</p> <p>The effects on intensification in existing centres by enabling further sprawl; i.e.enabling greenfields development reduces demand for intensifying within the existing centres)</p> <p>Use of prime agricultural land for residential development instead of intensifying existing urban centres</p> <p>Potential for residential development without the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for the existing community.</p> <p>We request that theLadies Mile is managed via a deferred zoning. As such, any up-zoning will be deferred until such time as: -</p> <p>Urban centres are intensified (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Frankton). -</p> <p>Traffic solutions are found that meet the needs of the existing community. -</p> <p>There are community facilities established that provide for the existing community and any future growth. -</p> <p>There is certainty that a high school and primary school will proceed.</p> | |
| Les & Lesley Huckins | Oppose | <p>Creation of a potentially *'self-contained' satellite community with good internal pedestrian circulation and community greenspace.</p> <p>*Whether or not this concept will work, as</p> | <p>Placing this kind of 'strip' development along Ladies Mile will bring a stretch of suburbia to what is currently a pleasant 'scenic' entry into Queenstown.</p> | <p>Despite efforts to provide a self-contained community and to encourage the use of buses/cycles, the number of residents this development is planned for will inevitably increase traffic congestion on the main road to Frankton/Queenstown.</p> <p>Will QLDC water supply and sewerage infrastructure have the capacity to service this development?</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | proposed, remains to be seen. | | |
| Jennifer Smart | Neutral | <p>The separated cycleways are great to see, but there needs to be a much larger network of them, rather than just on the Type A street. Residents of Shotover COuntry and LHE also need safe cycle access to the separated route.</p> <p>The underpass is an excellent idea but there will need to be more than one to ensure residents of Shotover Country and LHE don't have to travel too far to access the crossing point. To achieve the mode shift required (reducing car trips by 40%), active travel must be the easiest, safest and most efficient option.</p> | <p>The street network still prioritises cars as the main form of transport.</p> <p>There's no mention of a library in the community facilities but this is essential to any community. This growing community needs to be able to walk to a library.</p> <p>The high school site is unusually close to an existing one. How does the council propose to zone students for the two high schools?</p> | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Jo Stewart | Oppose | <p>I believe we definitely need a plan for the area to stop developers just doing as they please. Developers at the moment seem to be able to do and change their plans as they choose. Example Sanderson Group development sub dividing sections approved by council for 79 sections and will now go on the market 110 sections.</p> <p>We do need to look to the future for transport options. Option to have community centre Schools</p> | <p>A new subdivision as in the plan will not change the traffic congestion along SH6. Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country do not cause this congestion, it has many different traffic flows feeding into this area coming from Arrowtown, Wanaka and Cromwell directions and this will continue to increase every year.</p> <p>The Shotover bridge needs to be four lanes or another bridge installed. At this rate the traffic backup will be back to the bottom of the Crown Range before we know it. This is the cause of the congestion stopping the free flowing traffic.</p> <p>Adding the Sylvan Street link will be detrimental to the affected Sylvan Street Residents. Their privacy will be intruded upon and in some particular case will have no privacy, the constant added traffic flow and pedestrians encroaching on their property, noise pollution, light pollution and air pollution and unable to modify their homes in any way. Property boundaries decreased to make way for buses and pedestrians. This link is a last minute ditch effort by the council to rectify allowing developers over the past 8 years to subdivide properties into smaller sections without completing the paper road Alec Robin Road as was always part of the Lake Hayes Estate plan. Sylvan Street is not large enough for buses to turn in and out of and the new intersection will not adequately accomodate the buses or new traffic.</p> <p>Parking is already an issue along Sylvan Street which makes the Street a single lane street and buses damaging vehicles as they move along Sylvan Street.</p> <p>High Density housing will be a complete intrusion on our natural landscape and entry to the Wakatipu. As well as not accomodating vehicle parking, high density housing brings another diversification of people into the area.</p> <p>High density does not promote family living or our</p> | <p>Consultation for this development has been pushed by the Lake Hayes and Shotover Residents. QLDC have not been forth coming with consultations or information, listening to the actual communities it affect and will continue to affect. As rate payers in this area, we are the ones who pay their wages/salaries, they work for us. This has proven loud and clear to not be how QLDC is working and they are purely working in the interests of the developers who will not live here or have it affect their lifestyle, mental health and well being.</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>outdoor kiwi culture of gardens, lawns, areas to play in your back yard. Instead children are force to live in concrete jungles which creates problems. High density living create higher pollution in the area. How will the Wakatipu cope with the increase in landfill rubbish, recycling, sewage, waste water, the gas change over in years to come etc...</p> <p>By creating this new development with the idea that people will not need to travel across the Shotover Bridge is unrealistic. This hub will not provide enough jobs, shopping options, eateries, medical services, etc to cater for this development. There is no inclusion of emergency services to be based in the area. We need Police, Fire and Ambulance services to be based here to service this area.</p> <p>The council can put this forward and get it approved however individual developers can and will do what they want as they always do. It will not follow the plan and the council will allow it. There is no accountability for what happens now with developers and the changes they make seem to go un notified. The QLDC have said developers will be held to plan but cannot enforce specifically the development resource consent which means individual developers will develop their land to make it work for them which will not flow with the next developer. If QLDC want this to happen, they need to purchase all this land and develop it to plan.</p> | |
| Paul Bibby | Oppose | | High density housing on this side of the bridge is madness. Should be in QT or Frankton. | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| P J De La Mare | Oppose | <p>Development is inevitable so needs to be planned for.</p> <p>Also see attachment A containing an emailed submission page 69</p> | <p>This is too far from either Frankton or Queenstown for high density zoning. High density needs either a robust public transport system, or be within walking distance of workplaces/shopping centres/hotels, etc. See attached.</p> | See Attachment A |
| Karina Reid | Oppose | <p>The Queenstown Country Club development on the other side has been tastefully developed.</p> | <p>I am totally opposed to high density development in this beautiful area which until now has always been fiercely protected.</p> <p>I don't accept that most Kiwis actually want to live in high rise apartment buildings in communal areas. This isn't the Kiwi or the Queenstown way of life. Most continue to want the simple privilege of owning their own home and land and are entitled to it whether council considers it 'efficient' or not.</p> <p>To allow a 6 storey monstrosity here would be a complete blot on the landscape and should never have ever been contemplated.</p> <p>In terms of transport it is an idealistic, utopian notion to suggest that everyone can just bus, cycle or walk everywhere. This will never work for the bulk of the population i.e. mothers with toddlers/babies, elderly people, people with disabilities, tradies etc etc and it's not the role of council to manipulate people out of using or owning their own vehicles.</p> <p>As elected officials you need to listen to and respect the majority view and not impose other agendas.</p> | |
| Anne Hutchison | Oppose | <p>Sustainable, future forward green spaces. Community hub.</p> | <p>High rise, high density housing is not in keeping with the area or Queenstown. The idea that higher density population will encourage more to use public transport is a lovely idea but highly flawed. The restricted parking provision will only cause parking chaos. A lot of people</p> | <p>Protection of the farming activities on slope hill should be a priority too.</p> <p>Proposed recreation routes will jeopardise safety of both farm and public. This area</p> |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | will still want a car to access places out of town and off the bus routes, especially for recreation. People will still want to access shops and services not based in ladies mile. The traffic congestion will be worse than it already has been. | should maintain appropriate zoning to allow farming to continue here. |
| Pete Valentine | Oppose | Inclusion of Green Space, transport hub. | There is still too much development without any solution to traffic issues. The statistics quoted do not align with other centers. Multistory building is not in keeping with the environment and the gateway to queenstown. | Protection of Lake Hayes and farming in the immediate area. |
| Anna | Oppose | Too much medium and high density housing, not the infrastructure to support. Do we really need it? Is it in the right place? It's ruining the look of Queenstown. We have enough shopping centres, we don't need any more. | Wrong place. density of housing too many. Should be lifestyle blocks if anything that blend into the neighbourhood. Farm land is perfect! Transport is a nightmare now. People aren't going to use public transport as you propose. I think it will become more popular but not to the degree you're talking about. You have based your research on Aspen, it has a population of approx 7,500. It is a resort town but you're talking significantly different numbers and diversity. | There are 26 land owners, how are you going to get a consensus amongst them all? Do they all want what you have proposed? Currently we don't have ammenities to support the community, enough sports fields and facilities at them, Lower Shotover country has a field but no running water, parking or facilities to support any sports clubs. Let's get things right at other parts of Queenstown first. Schools use this ground and can't utilise it properly. Event the events centre fields don't have running water tap or fountain to refill or get water from (soccer fields but small airport). Let's get these things sorted and we'll start to plan for the future. |
| Nicole Fairweather | Oppose | Nothing - we don't want further development in Queenstown. Leave it the way it is. If we have to have development along Ladies | We don't want high density housing - this is not a city. It looks ugly on our beautiful landscape. You also got wrong the assumption you made about more people using public transport if areas are more densely populated. This doesn't happen, many people living in this area have kids and need to be in multiple places at | Please leave this beautiful area alone. We don't need more housing. Use/renovate the existing buildings we have. Stop allowing people to build more an more big businesses. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | <p>Mile it not the best location. There is already extensive congestion along this stretch from the current population</p> | <p>varying times. The bus routes do not link these places up.</p> | |
| Sarah OO'Donnell | Oppose | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ' Reserve open space and stormwater management requires the use of Threepwood Custodian land. - Part of the high density zoning along the base of Slopehill is on Threepwood Custodian land - The walking/cycling trail at the base of Slopehill is through the most productive farmland and would cut through the only access between the farm and the farm buildings, including the woolshed, stock yards and heavy equipment sheds. - Compromises the farming operation with high | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | <p>density neighbouring the property in its ability to operate from a Health and Safety perspective and problems associated that greater population brings in the form of dogs and the ability to ensure public do not access same.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The combination of the above would result in reduced income from the farm lease but more likely the farm becoming unviable - An additional effect of the farm becoming unviable, beyond the loss of revenue from the farm lease, is the deterioration of Slopehill as an Outstanding Nature Feature, as it is currently maintained by the farm operations <p>Threepwood Farm Residents Assoc have suggested a possible solution but have had no response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a qui pro quo for not establishing the Walking/Cycling trail at the base of Slopehill and enabling farm operations to continue, Threepwood owners may consider <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing an easement for the Connected Bus Network and part of the Walking/Cycling trail on the Ladies Mile on Threepwood common land that adjoins the State Highway <p>Other more general comments:-</p> <p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congestion to be addressed prior to any development occurring - NZTA strategic model does not identify queue levels increasing traffic from 1800 to 2400 would increase the queue length by an additional 1km - No consideration for a 4 lane bridge to alleviate the already traffic jammed Ladies Mile/SH6 nor structural fatigue on current bridge - Melbourne is recognised as a city with good public | |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|----------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>transport yet only 7% use it - the figures given by the consultants at 40% by 2028 and 60% by 2048 are flawed</p> <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7 story apartment buildings in the high density zoning with very little allowance for carparking .5 for 1 bedroom, 1 for 2 bedroom, 1.5 for 3 bedroom. - No allowance for parking of boats or caravans <p>Trail Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not direct for commuters <p>Covenants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 26 separate landowners - who would start and pay for what? - Covenants not enforceable by QLDC <p>Kind Regards</p> | |
| Melanie | Oppose | | Alternative land area to develop for example Dalefield | |
| Seng Lim | Oppose | | Traffic is so bad in the morning and evening working hours | |
| Jonathan | Oppose | Queenstown needs more housing so the idea itself isn't bad. | There is absolutely no way the road infrastructure could support doubling the population. Already traffic in Queenstown is a nightmare, especially getting out of shotover in the morning- I can't imagine having twice the amount of traffic. With all of the developments going on | Expand the roads please, this town is already busting at the seams. |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | it seems that roads have been severely sidelined, as if the future- or present- is being considered at all. Queenstown isn't a sleepy town anymore, we need two lane roads! The only way I would support this development is if highway 6 was expanded to 4 lanes and the bridge was widened or another bridge (with 4 lanes) was constructed elsewhere to ease traffic congestion. | |
| Hisato Ibe | Oppose | Traffic will gone worse unless alternate road to cbd | Same as above | Build house frankton flat |
| Samantha | Oppose | | Little consideration for traffic. I understand public transport is important, but with 2 young kids at two different childcare facilities and a job requiring me in different locations, public transport is not an option. | It all feels very irresponsible. |
| Jeana | Oppose | Nothing! | Leave the beautiful countryside! The drive into Frankton and Queenstown is turning into a concrete, overcrowded jungle. It's an eyesore. Shame on you all for allowing this to happen to such a magnificent area. | Greed. Pure and simple. It is such a shame that this is what motivates the councillors and developers in this once beautiful town. |
| Mike Bonn | Oppose | Nothing | Everything | |
| Hans and Dot Arnestedt | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 70 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Robert Eymann | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 71 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Michael Ramsay | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 72 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Anita Golden | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 73 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| GW Stalker Family Trust | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 78 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Grant and Sharyn Stalker | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 81 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Shotover Country No 2 Limited | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 85 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Corona Trust | Neutral | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 90 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |

| Name: | Position on the draft Masterplan | What do you think we got right? | What do you think we got wrong or is missing? | Do you have any further comments? |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Roman Catholic Diocese | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 56 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Southern District Health Board | Neutral | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 60 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Ladies Mile Property Syndicate & E&O Property Syndication Ltd | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 62 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Maryhill Limited | Oppose | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 68 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| Ministry of Education | Neutral | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 77 | See Attachment A | See Attachment A |
| FlightPlan2050 | | See attachment A containing the emailed submissions - page 80 | See attached. The SH6 landscape plan must specifically ensure the future potential use of this roadway as a runway for Hercules C130J aircraft during times of civil emergency. This would require the landscape plan to use only plants that could be restricted to 2 m height within 30 m of the road centreline, and to 4 m for the remainder up to 40 m from the road centreline. | See Attachment A |