

# The Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan

SCHEDULE OF CHANGES FOR FINAL DRAFT

## Schedule of Changes for Final Draft

Changes to the Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan are summarised below. These were made following the feedback received through a formal consultation process in March-April 2021 and as recommended by the Hearing Panel Report. For more details and to read the Hearings Report and final version of the Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan in full go to [letstalk@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:letstalk@qldc.govt.nz)

THEME	CHANGE
<b>Population and Employment Projections</b>	
Greater clarity over the expected population growth of <b>Upper Clutha</b> versus <b>Queenstown/Wakatipu Basin</b> would assist in understanding the respective drivers of the Spatial Plan for these areas, along with <b>key demographic shifts</b> (such as towards an older age profile).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend graphs to identify growth split between Wakatipu and Upper Clutha</li> <li>• Update Part 1 to include wider growth forecast and trends</li> </ul>
<b>An appendix</b> or similar <b>explaining the assumptions</b> would be helpful, along with a discussion of uncertainties and <b>implications</b> for the Spatial Plan <b>if growth was faster or slower than that anticipated</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See attached – Appendix A</li> </ul>
It would be helpful to <b>explain that the Plan can be scaled ‘up or down’ according to the rate of growth</b> , and there would be trigger points for growth related infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update Part 1 to include wider growth forecast and trends</li> </ul>
The <b>review and monitoring process should be more fully outlined</b> . The <b>requirement to plan for growth under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)</b> should be explained. That is, the need to take a 30 year look at likely growth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend existing section in Part 1 to include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o requirement to plan for 30 years of growth plus margin</li> <li>o Other NPS UD requirements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Climate change</b>	
At a strategy level, we suggest that climate change needs <b>more visibility</b> in the plan. Adaptation to, and mitigation of, climate change and associated implications for urban growth needs its <b>own section</b> that highlights how climate change is addressed in the plan, such as drawing the linkages to <b>mode shift to public transport and more compact growth</b> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce new climate change information at front of plan, bringing together key messages:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Climate change is considered across the outcomes</li> <li>o Benefits of more compact urban form / mode shift</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
While many of the submitters we heard from did not directly address climate change, we consider that the issue influences many of the views about the future. This included changing living and working practices as the economy ‘decarbonises’, including for example, the implications for long haul tourism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See proposed new climate change section, as per above</li> </ul>

THEME	CHANGE
<b>Wakatipu Growth Pattern</b>	
<p>Having discussed the submissions raising the linkages between growth and airports, we note that <b>the Spatial Plan cannot and should not direct how the airports in the district are to be operated.</b> However, we consider that the <b>Plan should be clearer about the strategic importance of Frankton, the Five Mile corridor and the Queenstown to Frankton corridor for accommodating future growth in the Wakatipu Basin.</b> The plan should be more explicit about the key trade-offs between growth in these locations and airport operations. That is, <b>the Spatial Plan should set out the longer term urban context that QAC would need to work within.</b> While the Spatial Plan for Wakatipu Basin proposes extensions to the south and east, these corridors meet at Frankton where substantial intensification on land not currently encumbered by airport noise controls is clearly beneficial to long term aspirations for a compact, connected urban form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise Spatial Elements to be more explicit about trade-off being made between urban growth and future expansion of air noise boundaries at ZQN.</li> <li>• Add Air Transport paragraph to Part 3 – as a Challenge</li> </ul>
<p>We do not see the need at this stage to develop a ‘without airport’ scenario. <b>An airport icon could be added to the map to reflect the current use, while noting that any moves to decrease use of the airport (or to shift it in the long term) can be addressed in reviews of the Plan,</b> but this is not an outcome that the plan advocates for in the short to medium term.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add airport icon at ZQN to appropriate maps</li> </ul>
<p>In contrast, <b>Wānaka Airport has much less of an impact</b> on the current Spatial Plan layout for the Upper Clutha.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change required</li> </ul>
<b>Wānaka and Hāwea Growth Patterns</b>	
<p>Upper Clutha has a different spatial pattern to Wakatipu. Wānaka is to be contained within the boundaries of the two rivers. Rather than expand the settlement across the river, long term, growth was more likely to occur in the surrounding settlements like Hawea and Luggate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider signalling future growth in Luggate</li> </ul>
<p><b>Consolidation of Wānaka should occur first (such as expansion to the south and through infill and redevelopment),</b> but at some point growth pressures will unlikely be able to be contained within the two rivers unless alternative options were in place, such as measured expansion of Hawea.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend priority areas in Upper Clutha – remove Hāwea and replace with Southern Wānaka future urban area</li> </ul>
<p>The Plan should be more explicit as to the dependency on <b>public transport provision ahead of further growth of Lake Hāwea (beyond that provided for by the Proposed District Plan and Special Housing Area).</b> The draft plan indicates that public transport services may not be viable. <b>It would be helpful to establish what quantum of population is needed to support feasibility of public transport services in the Upper Clutha?</b> We understand from staff, that under traditional models, public transport is unlikely to be commercially feasible in the short to medium term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasise this requirement in Spatial Elements – Upper Clutha section (page 55)</li> <li>• Consider adding a future urban investigation for Luggate too [project team suggest this is for the next SP]</li> </ul>
<p>We would suggest that the <b>maps be amended to reflect</b> these two issues: That <b>the area to the immediate west of the Special Housing Area in Hawea be identified as an expansion area, providing for incremental growth, but otherwise further expansion of the settlement be noted as being dependent upon resolution of transport and infrastructure issues, as well staging with regard to the on-going growth of Wanaka.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised future urban area in Hawea</li> <li>• Update map</li> </ul>

THEME	CHANGE
<b>Types of Growth</b>	
<p>The <b>plan could communicate / illustrate the intensification options more clearly – the vertical dimension.</b> We suggest additional content to illustrate the anticipated height and built form when the plan refers to low, medium or high density. This could be linked to the centres definitions further to the front of the document, and cross referenced to the <b>requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add new diagram illustrating built form</li> <li>• Restructure Part 4 - the Spatial Elements – Queenstown Lakes section of the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Change title to “The consolidated approach to growth”</li> <li>o Introduce new section on existing urban area that discusses intensification outcomes</li> <li>o Introduce new section to address rural / non urban areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Greater <b>clarity on future industrial and commercial areas</b> would assist in retaining opportunities for such activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update maps</li> </ul>
<p>The plan is fairly silent on the rural areas. While the focus is on urban growth and development, it would be useful to acknowledge the demand/popularity of rural lifestyle in the district, including resort activities (Millbrook and Gibbston), and hence the role that these areas play in accommodating growth pressures including activities such as commercial tourism.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Part 4 with new section to address rural / non-urban areas</li> </ul>
<b>Specific areas</b>	
<p><b>Sunshine Bay</b> – the constraints map should be updated to reflect the new ONL line, but otherwise the area west of Sunshine Bay should be retained as rural, given the focus on Frankton.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Amend map</li> </ul>
<p><b>Eastern Corridor - Lower Shotover.</b> We do not see any advantages from including the area in the Eastern corridor and are concerned about the potential landscape issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>
<p><b>Southern corridor</b> – no adjustments are necessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>
<p><b>South West Wānaka area</b> – we suggest that Riverbank Rd defines the edge of the urban area, rather than the ONL. This reflects the entry experience into the township from the south.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Amend map</li> </ul>

THEME	CHANGE
<b>General points</b>	
Provide <b>more detail on the priority sectors</b> identified in the QLDC economic diversification strategy (which includes film), and link to spatial implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree – amend text of strategy 14, and add figures to graphs</li> </ul>
Show how <b>alignment with other planning documents</b> is to be achieved – in particular highlight the relationship with the <b>District Plan and Council's Long Term Plan and Climate Action Plan.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add planning hierarchy diagram to Part 1</li> </ul>

## Project Team Recommendations

The following recommendations were not identified by the hearings panel, but by the Project Team during the course of submissions and hearings

ISSUE	RESOLUTION
Consider rewording outcome 2	Suggest - "Public transport, walking and cycling is the preferred option for daily travel"