

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Rezoning Hearing Stream
12 - Upper Clutha

**REVISED SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CRAIG ALAN
BARR ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

DWELLING CAPACITY

2 May 2017

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE	1
3. SCOPE OF THIS EVIDENCE	2
4. PREVIOUS EVIDENCE ON DWELLING CAPACITY	3
5. POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND USE OF HOUSING	5
6. SUMMARY OF UPDATED DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY MODEL OUTPUTS FOR UPPER CLUTHA	7
7. ANALYSIS	8
8. NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY 2016.....	15
9. CONCLUSIONS	23

Appendix 1 – Population Growth Projections

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Craig Alan Barr. I am a Senior Planner and have been employed by the Queenstown Lakes District Council (**Council**) since 2012.
- 1.2 My qualifications and experience are set out in my first, strategic statement of evidence in chief dated 17 March 2017.
- 1.3 This supplementary statement of evidence relates to the outputs of the dwelling capacity model (**DCM**) recently updated by Council, specifically in relation to the Upper Clutha¹ component of the Queenstown Lakes District (**District**).
- 1.4 Although this is a Council hearing I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.
- 1.5 The Council, as my employer, has agreed for me to give expert evidence on its behalf in accordance with my duties under the Code of Conduct.

2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 The updated DCM shows there is sufficient capacity for urban development available within the Upper Clutha. There is no need to amend the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**) and/or rezone additional land for residential purposes to meet estimated demand.
- 2.2 Therefore, I do not consider that any amendments are required to my 17 March 2017 recommendations on the rezonings and mapping annotations sought by submissions. This includes my

¹ The Upper Clutha Area for the purposes of the Hearings on rezonings and mapping annotations, and this evidence is identified in Figure 1 of my Strategic statement of evidence in chief dated 17 March 2017.

recommendations to reject "down zoning" submissions seeking reductions of Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**). MDRZ land is an important part of the overall dwelling capacity for the Wanaka Urban Environment, and it offers an alternative density option and choice of housing.

2.3 I also consider that the evidence of Mr Osborne and the outputs of the updated DCM, rebut several cases from submitters² who are arguing that additional capacity is required within the Upper Clutha, or that further land needs to be released to ensure the Council is giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (**NPS** or **NPS UDC**).

3. SCOPE OF THIS EVIDENCE

3.1 In my first strategic statement of evidence at paragraph 10.3, I noted that the Council's DCM was being updated and would contribute to a statement of supplementary evidence. The Panel gave leave to file this supplementary evidence between the filing of evidence from Council and submitters and the filing of rebuttal evidence.

3.2 The purpose of this evidence is to consider, from a planning perspective, the outputs of the updated DCM for the notified PDP for the Upper Clutha area and provide my views on whether any of the recommendations in my evidence in chief need to be amended in light of the outputs.

3.3 I wish to clarify that the Council and Property Economics have focused on updating and refining the DCM as it relates to residential dwelling capacity in the PDP for the Upper Clutha area. The DCM has been completed for the Queenstown and Wakatipu Basin however the equivalent level of refinement, specifically relating to operative Rural Visitor Zones has not been completed at this point in time. Evidence on dwelling capacity in the Wakatipu Basin and Queenstown area will be provided in the context of these respective hearings.

² Including M Beresford (149), Hawthenden Ltd (776).

- 3.4** The DCM outputs as of 1 May 2017, are based on the Stage 1 PDP zones, and where land has not been notified in Stage 1, on the Operative District Plan zones. As subsequent stages are notified and land is therefore subject to a PDP zone, the DCM will need to be revisited. Further evidence will be filed by the Council through this district plan review process.
- 3.5** In addition, this supplementary evidence does not address land supply for industrial and other classes of business land (defined in the NPS as 'Business Land'). The Council have undertaken to review the Operative and PDP industrial zones as part of Stage 2³ and the supply and capacity of Business Land will be investigated as part of that review.
- 3.6** The Council has included the business zones (Wanaka Town Centre, Town Centre Transition Overlay, Business Mixed Use Zone (**BMUZ**), Local Shopping Centre Zone (**LSCZ**) and Airport Zone) in Stage 1 of the PDP. In the case of the Upper Clutha, any review of the Three Parks Special Zone as part of Stage 2 of the District Plan Review and its commercial and retail activities will also include a review of the overall business land supply and capacity.
- 3.7** If any investigations as part of the Stage 2 review of industrial and Three Parks zoned land identify a shortage of business land development capacity (and therefore failure to give effect to the NPS UDC) the Council has the option of initiating a variation to address this matter.

4. PREVIOUS EVIDENCE ON DWELLING CAPACITY

- 4.1** The Council has previously provided the following information and evidence to the Panel on dwelling capacity.

³ With the exception of the Rural Industrial Sub-Zone located at Church Road, Luggate (which was notified in Stage 1), and as required by the assessment of any submissions as part of Stage 1.

Council's response to the Panel's request for information dated 18 March 2016 (RFI)

4.2 Mr Matthew Paetz provided evidence on residential development capacity for the Strategic Direction Hearing Stream 01. In Schedule 1 of the Council's response to the RFI, Mr Paetz's evidence stated that based on a high level desk-top analysis, the PDP was estimated to enable between 20,000 to 22,000 additional dwellings within the urban area of the District (in this instance, this 'urban area' refers to the area defined by the proposed UGBs rather than an 'urban area' defined by Statistics New Zealand).

4.3 Section 7 of Mr Paetz's planning reply for Strategic Direction Hearing Stream 01 [CB39] further explained these figures:

- (a) the PDP provides capacity for some 3,000 to 5,000 additional dwellings over and above the capacity of approximately 17,000 currently enabled by the ODP (this includes the capacity of 1,500 dwellings at the Northlake Special Zone, which was not factored into the 2015 DCM revision, as the plan change was proceeding through the Environment Court at the time);⁴
- (b) after further consideration since the RFI given more time, Mr Paetz confirmed a figure of **21,973** dwellings⁵ that are enabled within the proposed UGBs;
- (c) in terms of the additional urban dwelling capacity enabled in the PDP, this is enabled through the HDRZ, BMUZ, Medium Density (including up-zoning of a greenfield property known as Scurr Heights), and Low Density zones;⁶
- (d) an explanation of the additional estimated (realistic) dwelling capacity enabled by zone type;⁷ and

4 At paragraph 7.2.

5 At paragraph 7.3: 17,000 (dwelling capacity of the ODP) + 4.973 (additional capacity enabled by zone and rule changes in the PDP).

6 At paragraphs 7.4 to 7.13.

7 At paragraphs 7.14 to 7.30.

- (e) a summary conclusion that there is more than sufficient dwelling capacity enabled by the PDP to cater for projected demand for housing over the next 15 years. Mr Paetz reiterates that he has taken a realistic approach to capacity, rather than a theoretical one, and applied significant 'discounts' to plan enabled capacity to account for a range of potential development barriers.

5. POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND USE OF HOUSING

- 5.1 The District is one of the highest growth areas in New Zealand in relation to the percentage increase in population growth, and has also become one of the least affordable in terms of the cost of housing.
- 5.2 In August 2016 the Council contracted Rationale Limited (**Rationale**) to produce fine grained population growth and visitor growth projections for the next 40 years (to 2058) to use for its 10 Year Long Term Plan, 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy and other strategic planning work from the more granular data from Statistics New Zealand. These projections forecast a higher growth rate than what had been previously forecast by Statistics New Zealand. The population growth projections are attached at **Appendix 1**.
- 5.3 For example, Rationale has estimated the peak number of visitor's district wide will increase from 79,300 in 2018 to 126,375 in 2048, which is annual growth of approximately 1,570 visitors per annum.
- 5.4 Updated information has also been made available to the Council from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment,⁸ which also indicates much greater visitor number than previously projected.
- 5.5 Rationale's updated projections are showing a district wide population growth of 2.6% per annum increase to 2028 (representing a possible increase in population in 2015 from 32,410 to approximately 66,355 in

8 <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/sectors-industries/tourism/tourism-research-data/international-tourism-forecasts/documents-image-library/tourism-forecasts-2016-2022.pdf>.

2048). These projections are indicating that the District will double in size within the next 30 years.

- 5.6** It is projected that in the Wanaka Ward⁹ population growth will be slightly higher in percentage terms with an approximately 2.9% per annum increase to 2028, representing a possible increase in the 2015 population from 10,340 to approximately 22,509 in 2048.
- 5.7** In terms of dwelling numbers, residential growth plays a significant but not complete role in relation to demand for housing within the District. Mr Osborne identified in his evidence on the Residential Chapters¹⁰ that holiday homes and usually 'empty' dwellings are an increasing proportion of the QLDC housing market with an estimated 20% of the housing stock being usually empty in 2001, rising by nearly 1,500 houses to 24% in 2013.
- 5.8** In terms of Wanaka, it is estimated that in 2018 approximately 32% of the housing stock will be usually empty, however the forecast is that this is likely to decrease to approximately 16% by 2048. This is because the amount of housing will have increased, while the demand for housing to be used for visitor accommodation will also have decreased.
- 5.9** Increases in both the holiday home market and tourism have an impact upon the PDP's capacity to cater for the District's usually resident population. This is through properties either remaining empty for the majority of the year or being utilised for visitor accommodation purposes rather than for residential activity, including the growing online house rental market through websites such as BookaBach and AirBnB.
- 5.10** In October 2015 the Council resolved to formally withdraw provisions relating to visitor accommodation within the Low, Medium and High Residential Zones from the PDP due to concerns with the popularity of using housing for visitor accommodation activities and its potential

9 The Wanaka Ward is a term derived from Census data and includes the Wanaka, Hāwea, Matukituki and Wanaka overflow areas. Collectively these areas are all within the Upper Clutha area.

10 Evidence of Philip Osborne Hearing Stream 6 Residential Chapters dated 14 September 2016, at paragraph 3.4.

impacts on available housing supply. The Council intends to address this through notification of provisions specifically addressing visitor accommodation in an additional stage of the District Plan Review. The Council will need to be cognisant of how visitor accommodation rules could affect the DCM and feasibility.

5.11 The use of housing for visitor accommodation (including projected increases in visitor accommodation) has been included as part of the DCM.

5.12 In addition to the projected number of occupied and unoccupied dwellings, the population projections have also investigated household size and any changes over time. **Table 1** illustrates the projected change in the number of people per household in the Upper Clutha area.

Table 1. Projected change in household occupant size.

	2015	2018	2028	2038	2048
Usually Resident Population	10,340	12,491	16,650	19,736	22,509
Occupied Dwellings	4279	5181	6949	8289	9517
Household size	2.42	2.41	2.40	2.38	2.37

6. SUMMARY OF UPDATED DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY MODEL OUTPUTS FOR UPPER CLUTHA

6.1 **Table 2** below is taken from Mr Osborne’s evidence (his Table 2) and illustrates the ‘plan enabled’ dwelling capacity, identified as ‘Theoretical Capacity’ and the feasibility factors and realisable factor applied. As set out in Mr Osborne’s evidence the ‘realisable’ capacity removes a further 50% from the outputs of the ‘feasible’ (or theoretical) capacity.

Table 2. DCM enabled and realised capacity outputs

Enabled Capacity	DCM	Special Zones	Total
Queenstown Wakatipu Ward	14,557	14,369	28,926
Wanaka Ward	12,107	2,098	14,205
Total	26,664	16,467	43,131

Realisable Capacity	DCM	Special Zones	Total
Queenstown Wakatipu Ward	4,013	14,369	18,382
Wanaka Ward	3,318	2,098	5,416
Total	7,331	16,467	23,798

7. ANALYSIS

7.1 The data inputs, assumptions and findings of the updated DCM are described in the evidence of Mr Osborne dated 1 May 2017.

7.2 The projected dwelling demand¹¹ shows that in the Upper Clutha area 4,922 additional dwellings will be required (2015-2048), and realisable dwelling capacity is 5,416. The DCM output shows there is adequate dwelling capacity available within the Upper Clutha area to meet these demands. I also refer to Mr Osborne's evidence at paragraph 7.14 where he concludes that the 5,416 dwellings identified as realisable capacity is sufficient to accommodate projected growth over the 30 years.

7.3 On the basis of the DCM output I consider the PDP Strategic Directions (Chapters 3 – 6) and the spatial application of zonings and overlays in terms of the Stage 1 PDP zones and the Wanaka UGB is appropriate and do not consider any alternative response is required to address the findings of the DCM as it relates to the Upper Clutha.

7.4 I refer to paragraphs 7.1 – 8.7 of my Strategic evidence where I explain the development, strategic direction and zoning structure of the PDP. I also refer in particular to paragraphs 11.2 and 11.3 where I state that the PDP Strategic Direction Chapter gives effect to the

¹¹ Refer to Table 1 of Mr Osborne's evidence and Appendix 1 of this evidence illustrating Rationale's estimated population and dwelling demand 2048.

Otago Regional Policy Statement (1998) and has regard to the decision version of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (**PRPS**). I maintain my opinion that Chapters 4 (Urban Development) and 6 (Landscapes) of the PDP operate in a complementary manner to each other to provide an appropriate framework to focus growth within the UGBs and to protect the District's valued landscapes, in terms of both their intrinsic value, and economic value to the region.

7.5 I am mindful of the Panel's Minute¹² where it asked the Council to address the Panel on whether the provisions of the PDP give effect to the recently gazetted NPS UDC, and "if so, the basis for that view. It would be helpful if this question is answered on the basis of a chapter by chapter summary". The Council's response to the Panel¹³ stated:

Whether the PDP has gone far enough, or has failed to go far enough, in enabling effective and efficient urban environments has been a key question throughout the preparation and hearing of Stage 1 of the PDP, and was a live issue for the Council prior to the gazettal of the NPS. The NPS now assists in prescribing how the Council should inform itself in making such decisions. It 'ups the ante' in this regard but the need to consider these relevant matters has not previously been overlooked. In the Council's view, giving effect to the NPS in making decisions on Stage 1 chapter text can be done with the evidence the Panel has already received.

7.6 I agree with and support the above statement.

7.7 Through my Strategic, Wanaka and Lake Hāwea urban (1A), Wanaka Fringe (2) and Rural (3) evidence in chief, and through Ms Jones' evidence for Wanaka and Lake Hāwea business (1B) rezonings,¹⁴ several rezoning requests are recommended to be accepted or accepted in part. These recommended rezonings are not included in the updated DCM. A summary of these rezonings and their possible

¹² Minute concerning the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, 8 February 2017, at paragraph 2.

¹³ Dated 3 March 2017, at paragraph 12.

¹⁴ Originally filed by Ms Amy Bowbyes but to be substituted by Ms Vicki Jones as per a Memorandum to be filed alongside the Council's rebuttal evidence.

yield in terms of plan enabled capacity for additional dwellings is therefore provided below:

- (a) Area 1A Wanaka and Lake Hāwea urban:
 - (i) rezone 1.8ha at Kellys Flat from Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**) to MDRZ (QLDC 790): approximately **22 additional allotments**;
 - (ii) rezone 1.93ha on corner of Golf Course Road from LDRZ to MDRZ (Gordon 395): approximately **23 additional allotments**;
 - (iii) rezone block of land at McDougall / Bronston St from LDRZ to MDRZ: (Varina Pty 591): approximately **11 additional allotments**.

- (b) Area 1B Wanaka urban and Lake Hāwea business:
 - (i) reducing the LSCZ at Cardrona Valley Road from 2.7 to 1ha and that 1.6ha being zoned LDRZ (Willowridge (249): approximately **25 additional allotments**.

- (c) Area 2 Wanaka Fringe:
 - (i) rezone from Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone (Hawthenden 776): approximately **17 additional allotments**;
 - (ii) rezone from Rural Zone to Rural Lifestyle Zone (Scurr et. al. 160): approximately **10 additional allotments**.

- (d) Report 3 Rural:
 - (i) rezone approximately 1,126 ha of Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone to Rural Zone (Forest and Bird 706). The notified PDP Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone has not been counted in the DCM due to potential land constraints from natural hazards and landscape sensitivity, therefore no reduction is

required to the DCM findings as a consequence of this recommendation;

- (ii) at Atkins Road, Luggate, rezone from Rural Zone to Rural Residential Zone (Lake McKay Station 483): approximately **10 additional** allotments;
- (iii) at south Hāwea, rezone the area referred to as 'Rekos Point' from Rural Residential to Rural Zone (Forest and Bird 706): **Reduction of** approximately **52 allotments**. The notified PDP Rural Residential Zone at Rekos point was not counted in the DCM due to the site history, which as explained in my Rural evidence in chief, makes subdivision and development of this zone as contemplated by the Rural Residential Zone unlikely.

7.8 Excluding the recommended reduction in plan enabled yield associated with the Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Rural Residential Zone at Rekos point, the overall new plan enabled yield recommended to the Panel in my evidence is in the order of 118 additional dwellings.

7.9 The Council's rebuttal for the Upper Clutha hearing will be filed on 5 May, after the filing of this supplementary evidence. As the author of the rebuttal for all areas, with the exception of Area 1B Wanaka Urban and Lake Hāwea business rezonings, and having reviewed the submitter evidence and Ms Jones' draft rebuttal evidence to date, any further recommendations to accept, or accept in part, rezoning submissions that could increase or decrease yield, are likely to be comparatively minor in the context of the overall capacity within the Upper Clutha area as illustrated in the DCM findings.

7.10 I note that the estimated yield from these rezonings recommended to be accepted or accepted in part is plan enabled yield, which has not been 'put through' the DCM and feasibility constraints. Therefore they are not part of the DCM findings as set out in Mr Osborne's evidence and illustrated in Section 6 above.

- 7.11** The findings of the DCM identify that there is adequate feasible residential development capacity within the Upper Clutha area to provide for projected growth in the short, medium and long term as defined in the NPS. I do not change my recommendations to support or support in part the rezoning submissions being considered in this hearing stream. I consider that for the reasons set out in the respective analysis and section 32AA evaluations the recommended rezonings are considered the most appropriate.
- 7.12** Compared to the overall capacity as illustrated in the DCM output, the rezonings that I support provide only a small increase to dwelling capacity. However, this increase will assist in terms of the variety of housing options available (noting that some of these options are rural living opportunities and are not located within the Wanaka UGB).
- 7.13** Mr Osborne has set out in his evidence the respective PDP and Operative zones the DCM has been applied to.
- 7.14** Four areas have been excluded from both the updated plan enabled capacity and the DCM. These are:
- (a) the operative Windermere Rural Visitor Zone near Wanaka Airport;¹⁵
 - (b) the PDP Rural Residential Zone at Rekos Point, South Hāwea;¹⁶
 - (c) the PDP Rural Lifestyle Zone at Makarora.¹⁷

ODP Windermere Rural Visitor Zone

- 7.15** The Windermere Rural Visitor Zone has been excluded because ODP Rule 12.4.3.4 makes residential activity in this zone a non-complying activity, except for one custodial residence, which requires resource consent as a discretionary activity (Operative Rule 12.4.3.3.iv). In addition, approximately half the zone is located within the Wanaka Airport Outer Control Boundary overlay.

¹⁵ PDP Planning Map 18a.

¹⁶ PDP Planning Map 18a.

¹⁷ Planning Maps 2, 5 and 16.

- 7.16** Operative Rule 12.4.3.3.v requires resource consent for visitor accommodation within the Wanaka Airport Outer Control Boundary. I understand part of the focus of any such application would be on internal noise attenuation associated with the Wanaka Airport Outer Control Boundary, and whether the proposal would comply with the Zone Standards in ODP 12.4.5.2.
- 7.17** The remaining area of the Windermere Rural Visitor Zone that is not affected by the Wanaka Airport Outer Control Boundary has frontage to the Wanaka – Luggate State Highway 6 and Site Standard 12.4.5.2.vii requires a 20 metre setback of buildings from the road boundary. For these reasons I consider that from a planning perspective, the zone is not considered reasonably viable in terms of reliance upon it for housing supply.
- 7.18** I am also aware that Queenstown Airport Corporation (**QAC**) has bought the majority of the land affected by this zone and therefore, from the perspective of the protection of Wanaka Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, I consider it even more unlikely that an application for resource consent would be made for residential activity, now that QAC effectively have control over activities in this zone.

PDP Rural Residential Zone at Rekos Point

- 7.19** As stated in my section 42A report for the Upper Clutha Rural areas dated 17 March 2017 (**Group 3 report**), the Rural Residential Zone at Rekos Point is considered unlikely to be developed because there is a private covenant in favour of neighbouring landowners preventing the subdivision of the site. Although a consent was issued for 52 allotments, this was overturned as the result of an appeal to the High Court.

PDP Rural Lifestyle Zone at Makarora

- 7.20** The PDP Rural Lifestyle Zone at Makarora has also been excluded because of uncertainty and reasonable doubt as to the viability of the ability to develop to the extent as enabled by the PDP in relation to the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
- 7.21** Large parts of the zone are affected by natural hazards and while I consider that the specific provisions to manage natural hazards are reasonably enabling, in so far as the requirement is for a controlled activity resource consent, **[CB16]** (Rule 22.4.4 Controlled activity – Construction of a building within an approved building platform, and a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision **[CB18]** Rule 27.6.1) the take up of rural lifestyle residential activity has been low.
- 7.22** I refer to my Group 3 report at Appendix 1, where I discuss the level of development of the Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone as part of recommending the zone is reduced from 1,292ha to only 165ha. The 165ha represents the built or consented development activities and in my opinion illustrates the low take up of development in this zone over the last approximately 15 years under the ODP zoning regime.

Cardrona operative Rural Visitor Zone

- 7.23** The Rural Visitor Zone at Cardrona has been included in the DCM, however the capacity is derived from unimplemented resource consents approved for the zone.
- 7.24** The operative Rural Visitor Zone provisions¹⁸ make it difficult to anticipate the likely yield in terms of density because the provisions of the ODP Rural Visitor Zone, could allow as a controlled activity:
- (a) a visitor accommodation building of up to 12 metres in height at a minimum of 20 metres from the boundaries; or
 - (b) commercial recreation and residential activities of up to 8 metres in height outside a 10-metre boundary setback.

18 Operative District Plan. Part 12.4.1 Rural Visitor Zone Rules.

7.25 The matters of control are coverage, location, external building appearance, earthworks, access and landscaping.

7.26 While a larger amount of capacity could have been used, a conservative figure of 140 has been applied to this area. I consider this to be good practice and do not wish to have the DCM criticised for being propped up by zones where the development potential could not be realised.

8. NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY 2016

8.1 The Council provided a supplementary memorandum regarding the NPS UDC on 19 April 2017.

8.2 As set out in paragraph 6 of that memorandum, the Council's view is that the District contains two urban environments (Queenstown Urban Environment and Wanaka Urban Environment). The Wanaka Urban Environment comprises Wanaka, Albert Town, Luggate and Lake Hāwea Township.¹⁹

8.3 The Council noted at paragraph 2 that as Queenstown is a 'high growth urban area' under NPS UDC, the NPS-UDC applies to the District as a whole.

8.4 Therefore in the context of this hearing, Objectives OA1, OA2, OA3, OC1 and OC2, and OD1 and OD2 apply to the Wanaka Urban Environment, as do Policies PA1 to PA4. I provide the following analysis of Policies PA1 – PA4:

NPS Policy PA1:

PA1: Local authorities shall ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity according to the table below:

Short term	<i>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and serviced with development infrastructure.</i>
-------------------	---

¹⁹ Lake Hāwea Township does not include the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones located in Hāwea Flat, adjacent to Camphill and New Castle Roads. Refer to Planning Map 18.

Medium term	<p><i>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and either:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>serviced with development infrastructure, or</i> • <i>the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002.</i>
Long-term	<p><i>Development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it must be identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002.</i></p>

8.5 The following components of PA1 are relevant and defined in the NPS as set out below:

Development capacity means in relation to housing and business land, the capacity of land intended for urban development based on:

- (a) *the zoning, objectives, policies, rules and overlays that apply to the land, in the relevant proposed and operative regional policy statements, regional plans and district plans; and*
- (b) *the provision of adequate development infrastructure to support the development of the land.*

Short term means within the next three years.

Medium term means between three and ten years.

Long term means between ten and thirty years.

Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities.

8.6 I consider that the DCM outputs as illustrated in **Table 2** above, and in Mr Osborne's evidence illustrate that the Upper Clutha area has

sufficient realisable development capacity for residential development in the short, medium and long term.

8.7 In terms of the extent to which the realisable development is available for the provision of adequate development infrastructure, I refer to the strategic evidence of Council's Chief Engineer, Mr Ulrich Glasner [CB37] where he states that a critical part of Council's ongoing commitment to delivering on its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) is its ability to manage projected growth through integrated planning, and in particular:²⁰

- (g) the PDP's strategic approach to urban development is well aligned to QLDC's various non-RMA infrastructure plans and strategies, including in particular the 2015 – 2045 Infrastructure Strategy and the current Long Term Plan;*
- (h) based on the current provision of and planning for infrastructure, the strategic approach to urban development in the PDP is both appropriate and achievable provided that the general pattern and location of urban growth and development is consistent with that the strategic approach; and*
- (i) no major infrastructural constraints or issues exist that would prevent a more consolidated form and pattern of urban development from being realised.*

8.8 Mr Glasner also supports the implementation of the Wanaka UGB because it will be an effective way to support infrastructure provision, which will provide certainty to the Council and wider community to plan, fund and implement infrastructure and development.

8.9 Therefore, with regard to housing, I consider that the Council is well placed to give effect to Policy PA1 in the Upper Clutha area through

²⁰ See Mr Glasner's Executive Summary, at paragraph 2.

the PDP and the LGA, and the funding of water, wastewater and roading infrastructure.²¹

- 8.10** Policies PC1 to PC4 are the 'Responsive Planning' suite and are related to PA1 associated with factoring in the proportion of feasible development capacity that may not be developed. Policy PC1 requires an additional margin of 20% in the short term and 15% in the long term.
- 8.11** Mr Osborne's evidence analyses the feasibility and 'realised' development capacity and the expected rate of take-up of the development capacity. He concludes that there is enough feasible and realised urban development capacity in the Wanaka Urban Environment to provide for estimated population growth over the next 20 years.
- 8.12** Population projections for Wanaka from 2015 to 2028 estimate growth in demand for new dwellings will be approximately 3,008, and 4,922 from 2015-2048. The DCM outputs are predicting realisable capacity of 4,516 for the Upper Clutha area.
- 8.13** With regard to Policies PC2-PC4, further research will be undertaken if necessary as part of the overall response to determine whether or not a higher margin is more appropriate. This will form part of the housing and business assessments that the NPS requires be completed by 31 December 2017.

NPS Policy PA2:

PA2: Local authorities shall satisfy themselves that other infrastructure required to support urban development are likely to be available.

- 8.14** Key providers of community services and infrastructure including Aurora (electricity distribution), Chorus, Spark and Vodafone (Telecommunications), the Minister of Education, Minister of Police

21 Refer to Paragraph 3.6 with regard to business land development capacity.

and the Southern District Health Board have had the opportunity to submit, and have submitted, on the PDP.

- 8.15** These submitters have been involved with advancing their respective interests. However I am not aware of any of these submitters raising fundamental concerns associated with the provision of infrastructure or services to land in the Upper Clutha area enabled by the PDP for urban development. In addition, they have not raised any issues or constraints with providing infrastructure in the Wanaka UGB, Lake Hāwea and Luggate urban zones as identified in the notified PDP.
- 8.16** I also consider that there is adequate open space within, and adjacent to the Wanaka Urban Environment. An important component of the MDRZ areas in Wanaka (i.e. Scurr Heights and along Brownston Street) was that they are close to parks and schools. This is also one of the reasons for recommending accepting the upzoning of properties along Aubrey Road and Brownston Street as set out in my Wanaka and Lake Hāwea Urban rezoning and mapping evidence in chief.²²
- 8.17** I am satisfied that Other Infrastructure²³ required to support urban development is likely to be available in the areas identified in the Wanaka Urban Environment. I therefore consider that the Upper Clutha zonings in the PDP give effect to Policy PA2.

NPS Policy PA3:

PA3: When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:

- a) *Providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses;*

²² Submissions if Ian Weir (139) and QLDC (790), Gordon Family Trust (395) and Varina Propriety Ltd (591)

²³ As defined in the NPS UDC.

- b) Promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and*
- c) Limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets*

8.18 With regard to PA3 a) and housing, it is considered that the PDP provisions supported by the Council provide a variety of choices to meet the needs of people and communities and a range of dwelling types. In particular the Wanaka Urban Environment includes the following proposed zones with a range of densities:

- (a) the LDRZ provides for 450m² lots with the ability for infill housing to develop at a density of 300m², provided new buildings are limited to a height of 5.5m. land within the Wanaka UGB contains areas of greenfield land and a substantial portion of the existing housing supply is zoned LDRZ;
- (b) MDRZ anticipates townhouse type housing with a density of up to one residential unit per 250m²;
- (c) the HDRZ provides higher densities, including at 65-93 Lakeside Drive, which is not developed and holds a resource consent²⁴ for 44 apartments that could be used for both residential or visitor accommodation;
- (d) the Large Lot Residential Zone has two densities comprising 4,000m² and 2,000m² over both existing and greenfield locations;
- (e) the BMUZ and LSCZ enable residential activity above ground floor level; and
- (f) the Albert Town, Lake Hāwea and Luggate areas have ODP Township zoning that contemplate a density of 800m², except there are higher densities provided for within the Albert Town Riverside subdivision.

8.19 As set out in my Strategic evidence at paragraphs 7.1 – 7.4, the PDP focuses the majority of urban development within the Wanaka UGB. I

²⁴ RM140404 in addition to the 44 apartments includes a café, gym, swimming pool building, and car parking. The site also holds a resource consent for a more intensive 182 unit visitor accommodation and resort activity (RM050540).

consider this will provide efficiencies in terms of infrastructure and development investment and on this basis the PDP gives effect to PA3 b).

- 8.20** Policy PA3 c) seeks as much as possible to limit adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets. The majority of growth is anticipated within the Wanaka UGB. Substantial areas of LDRZ and MDRZ greenfield land have been zoned for urban development²⁵ and there are no constraints with sequencing the release of land in certain locations. Nor are there specific rules in the PDP that restrict the ability for land to be subdivided and developed on the basis that trunk infrastructure is installed. In this context, the PDP does not interfere with the competitive operation of land and development markets and I consider that the PDP gives effect to this policy.

NPS Policy PA4:

PA4: When considering the effects of urban development, decision-makers shall take into account:

- a) The benefits that urban development will provide with respect to the ability for people and communities and future generations to provide for their social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing; and*
- b) The benefits and costs of urban development at a national, inter-regional, regional and district scale, as well as the local effects.*

- 8.21** The Council's evidence in Stage 1 (to the Strategic Directions and Residential Hearings in particular) addressed the importance of providing sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of people and communities in the District and for its urban areas to have capacity to meet these expanding needs. More specifically, the Council has presented a case that does not rely only on greenfield

²⁵ For instance the Scurr heights MDRZ site (Planning Map 20), and large areas of LDRZ land located between Cardrona Valley Road, Orchard Road and Ballantyne Road (Planning Map 18).

developments. It also promotes increasing housing supply in existing urban locations to complement existing greenfield opportunities.²⁶

- 8.22** I also refer to paragraphs 6.1 – 6.5 and 17.1 – 17.15 of my Strategic evidence where I discuss the evolution of the Wanaka UGB applied in the PDP through the Wanaka 2020 and Structure Plan Review 2007. I consider that the future urban expansion of Wanaka as identified within the PDP is in the most appropriate locations with regard to the quality and character of the surrounding Rural Zoned land, and Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. Avoiding urban expansion into these areas or adjacent to these areas that are vulnerable to degradation is inherent as part of the overall spatial application of zoning and overlays in the notified PDP.
- 8.23** I consider therefore that the PDP gives effect to PA4.
- 8.24** Although the rest of the NPS applies to the Upper Clutha as a whole (given that the District is a high growth urban area), this evidence does not cover the outputs of a comprehensive housing and business development capacity assessment. I note in this regard that Policies PB1 to PB5 of the NPS are required to be completed by December 2017. Likewise PB6, PB7, PC3 relate to monitoring and are not immediately relevant to this supplementary evidence.
- 8.25** With regard to Policy PD1, the Council does not share jurisdiction over an urban area and this policy is not particularly relevant. The closest urban area to Wanaka within another jurisdiction is Cromwell, which is located approximately 50kms to the south of Wanaka, within the Central Otago District.
- 8.26** Policy PD2 seeks to achieve integrated land use and infrastructure planning, and requires local authorities to work with providers of development infrastructure, and other infrastructure to implement policies PA1 to PA3, PC1 and PC2. This policy is important but not particularly relevant to this supplementary evidence.

²⁶ Evidence of Matthew Paetz, Chapters 3 & 4, Strategic Direction dated 19 February 2016 [CB35].

8.27 The Council is currently initiating work with the Otago Regional Council (**ORC**) to give effect to PC5 to PC14, PD1 to PD4. A starting point is to share information and for the Council to understand the ORCs regional perspective.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 I consider that the Upper Clutha area has sufficient Development Capacity as defined by the NPS UDC. The DCM findings and Mr Osborne's evidence indicates that there is sufficient feasible and realisable capacity in the Upper Clutha area to provide for housing development capacity within the short, medium and long term, in appropriate locations.

9.2 I therefore do not consider that any further rezonings are needed to provide for future development. Consequently, in my view there is no need to amend any of my s42A reports' recommendations on the rezonings sought by submitters as a result of the updated DCM data.



Craig Barr
2 May 2017

APPENDIX 1
POPULATION GROWTH PROJECTIONS

Usually Resident Population

	2001	2006	2013	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043	2048	2053	2058
District	17,840	24,120	29,730	32,410	38,048	44,658	49,277	53,787	58,066	62,167	66,355	70,543	74,731
Wakatipu Ward	12,990	16,770	20,230	22,070	25,557	29,651	32,627	35,551	38,330	41,082	43,846	46,610	49,374
Queenstown Bay	1,725	1,980	2,070	2,360	2,540	2,765	2,902	3,034	3,149	3,269	3,386	3,503	3,620
Queenstown Hill	2,470	3,310	3,700	4,110	4,408	4,840	5,201	5,538	5,866	6,189	6,206	6,047	5,889
Sunshine Bay	1,970	2,380	2,480	2,590	2,785	3,049	3,282	3,493	3,698	3,910	3,991	3,992	3,995
Arthurs Point	295	430	860	950	1,122	1,293	1,437	1,588	1,738	1,888	2,038	2,188	2,338
Frankton	1,710	1,870	1,920	1,970	2,093	2,258	2,381	2,503	2,611	2,717	2,824	2,931	3,038
Frankton East	162	420	670	760	903	1,130	1,358	1,593	1,827	2,060	2,293	2,526	2,759
Kelvin Heights	820	1,010	1,080	1,160	1,328	1,531	1,664	1,782	1,897	2,005	2,117	2,229	2,341
Lake Hayes	200	260	340	310	370	439	493	545	595	634	679	724	769
Lake Hayes South	64	650	1,730	2,080	2,969	3,775	4,220	4,668	5,100	5,432	5,455	5,472	5,492
Jacks Point	60	100	320	470	1,008	1,624	2,047	2,467	2,859	3,239	3,625	4,011	4,397
Arrowtown	1,770	2,260	2,580	2,710	2,925	3,125	3,189	3,252	3,319	3,382	3,446	3,512	3,578
Glenorchy	281	280	380	410	481	571	638	701	761	821	881	941	1,001
Kingston South	139	210	250	250	284	331	354	373	381	398	410	422	434
Wakatipu Basin	886	1,010	1,160	1,200	1,466	1,788	2,023	2,254	2,351	2,307	2,264	2,224	2,182
Outer Wakatipu	438	590	690	740	875	1,036	1,153	1,267	1,360	1,445	1,534	1,623	1,712
Wakatipu Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	96	285	493	818	1,386	2,696	4,265	5,829
Wanaka Ward	4,850	7,350	9,500	10,340	12,491	15,007	16,650	18,236	19,736	21,085	22,509	23,933	25,357
Wanaka	3,450	5,280	6,820	7,390	9,139	11,073	12,194	13,246	14,200	14,996	15,871	16,746	17,621
Hawea	1,110	1,680	2,280	2,490	2,847	3,373	3,846	4,321	4,819	5,315	5,812	6,309	6,806
Matukituki	290	390	400	460	505	561	610	669	717	774	826	878	930
Wanaka Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Change (2001 - Average annual growth (14 years)	Annual average growth rate (14 years)	Change (2018 - Average annual growth (10 years)	Annual average growth rate (10 years)	Average annual growth (30 years)	Average annual growth (40 years)
14,570	1,041	4.4%	11,229	1,123	2.6%
9,080	649	3.9%	7,070	707	2.5%
635	45	2.3%	362	36	1.3%
1,640	117	3.7%	793	79	1.7%
620	44	2.0%	497	50	1.7%
655	47	8.7%	315	32	2.5%
260	19	1.0%	288	29	1.3%
598	43	11.7%	455	46	4.2%
340	24	2.5%	336	34	2.3%
110	8	3.2%	123	12	2.9%
2,016	144	28.3%	1,251	125	3.6%
410	29	15.8%	1,039	104	7.3%
940	67	3.1%	264	26	0.9%
129	9	2.7%	157	16	2.9%
111	8	4.3%	70	7	2.2%
314	22	2.2%	557	56	3.5%
302	22	3.8%	278	28	2.8%
0	0	n/a	285	28	n/a
5,490	392	5.6%	4,159	416	2.9%
3,940	281	5.6%	3,055	306	2.9%
1,380	99	5.9%	999	100	3.1%
170	12	3.4%	105	11	1.9%
0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a

Total Dwellings

	2001	2006	2013	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043	2048	2053	2058
District	10,322	13,121	15,780	17,043	19,718	22,731	24,674	26,538	28,267	29,904	31,595	33,300	35,030
Wakatipu Ward	6,903	8,389	9,794	10,631	12,128	13,936	15,254	16,552	17,784	19,011	20,261	21,526	22,813
Queenstown Bay	859	920	895	1,005	1,057	1,111	1,125	1,136	1,139	1,144	1,146	1,149	1,149
Queenstown Hill	1,412	1,779	2,091	2,344	2,549	2,865	3,153	3,440	3,734	4,039	4,154	4,154	4,154
Sunshine Bay	834	1,033	1,076	1,123	1,206	1,318	1,417	1,507	1,593	1,682	1,716	1,716	1,716
Arthurs Point	126	191	330	362	424	482	528	575	620	664	708	749	790
Frankton	818	877	894	918	975	1,055	1,114	1,174	1,228	1,281	1,336	1,391	1,447
Frankton East	74	175	294	335	401	507	618	734	854	978	1,105	1,239	1,380
Kelvin Heights	507	613	616	654	734	821	866	901	931	957	983	1,006	1,028
Lake Hayes	115	140	192	192	211	252	286	318	351	378	409	440	472
Lake Hayes South	21	223	538	646	920	1,166	1,298	1,431	1,557	1,652	1,652	1,652	1,652
Jacks Point	28	94	150	219	465	740	920	1,097	1,258	1,411	1,565	1,717	1,869
Arrowtown	1,029	1,263	1,355	1,411	1,504	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574
Glenorchy	201	184	222	238	277	326	359	390	419	447	476	504	532
Kingston South	211	199	197	197	215	240	248	253	253	253	253	253	253
Wakatipu Basin	395	439	581	605	747	926	1,066	1,209	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283
Outer Wakatipu	273	258	362	382	443	504	541	574	594	610	626	640	654
Wakatipu Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	49	141	239	396	657	1,275	2,059	2,860
Wanaka Ward	3,419	4,732	5,986	6,412	7,590	8,795	9,420	9,986	10,483	10,893	11,334	11,774	12,217
Wanaka	2,546	3,496	4,510	4,791	5,758	6,663	7,024	7,317	7,536	7,659	7,813	7,957	8,093
Hawea	731	1,033	1,247	1,350	1,524	1,767	1,975	2,175	2,380	2,576	2,766	2,950	3,129
Matukituki	143	202	230	271	308	365	421	494	567	658	755	867	995
Wanaka Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Change (2001 - Average annual growth (14 years)	Annual average growth rate (14 years)	Change (2018 - Average annual growth (10 years)	Annual average growth rate (10 years)	Average annual growth (30 years)	Average annual growth (40 years)
6,721	480	3.6%	4,956	496	2.3%
3,728	266	3.1%	3,126	313	2.3%
146	10	1.1%	68	7	0.6%
932	67	3.7%	604	60	2.1%
289	21	2.1%	211	21	1.6%
236	17	7.8%	104	10	2.2%
100	7	0.8%	139	14	1.3%
261	19	11.4%	217	22	4.4%
147	10	1.8%	132	13	1.7%
77	5	3.7%	75	8	3.1%
625	45	27.6%	378	38	3.5%
191	14	15.9%	455	46	7.1%
382	27	2.3%	70	7	0.5%
37	3	1.2%	82	8	2.6%
-14	-1	-0.5%	33	3	1.4%
210	15	3.1%	319	32	3.6%
109	8	2.4%	98	10	2.0%
0	0	n/a	141	14	n/a
2,993	214	4.6%	1,830	183	2.2%
2,245	160	4.6%	1,266	127	2.0%
619	44	4.5%	451	45	2.6%
128	9	4.7%	113	11	3.2%
0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a

Total Rating Units

	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043	2048	2053	2058
District	22,504	26,024	28,673	30,897	32,983	34,894	36,728	38,778	40,902	43,041
Wakatipu Ward	14,560	16,847	18,556	20,121	21,628	22,967	24,268	25,772	27,369	28,981
Queenstown Bay	1,523	1,854	2,008	2,117	2,224	2,322	2,419	2,511	2,602	2,690
Queenstown Hill	3,157	3,774	4,220	4,624	5,028	5,323	5,554	5,698	5,788	5,877
Sunshine Bay	1,138	1,206	1,309	1,403	1,495	1,554	1,595	1,612	1,615	1,617
Arthurs Point	431	519	579	631	682	732	780	828	873	918
Frankton	864	988	1,064	1,128	1,191	1,253	1,314	1,377	1,440	1,503
Frankton East	495	669	819	974	1,133	1,297	1,465	1,640	1,820	2,004
Kelvin Heights	1,217	1,526	1,672	1,774	1,867	1,954	2,035	2,113	2,187	2,260
Lake Hayes	290	290	290	321	352	385	417			

Total Visitors - Peak Day		2001	2006	2013	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043	2048	2053	2058
		District	42,838	53,031	63,879	66,892	79,301	92,041	99,747	107,041	113,805	120,099	126,374	132,540
Wakatipu Ward	26,254	31,065	36,491	37,995	44,854	52,031	56,759	61,327	65,650	69,849	73,946	77,964	81,946	
Queenstown Bay	6,970	7,893	8,963	9,136	10,867	12,492	13,427	14,306	15,126	15,910	16,651	17,361	18,035	
Queenstown Hill	7,402	8,815	10,397	10,847	12,678	14,626	15,977	17,283	18,563	19,828	20,698	21,320	21,916	
Sunshine Bay	2,022	2,466	2,639	2,725	3,016	3,352	3,614	3,855	4,085	4,318	4,441	4,498	4,553	
Arthurs Point	765	967	1,342	1,399	1,677	1,937	2,114	2,288	2,454	2,614	2,770	2,917	3,062	
Frankton	1,986	2,163	2,283	2,327	2,566	2,840	3,024	3,207	3,375	3,538	3,702	3,863	4,024	
Frankton East	212	416	659	736	883	1,106	1,330	1,563	1,802	2,049	2,301	2,567	2,844	
Kelvin Heights	1,230	1,471	1,532	1,603	1,836	2,077	2,208	2,317	2,414	2,502	2,588	2,666	2,742	
Lake Hayes	279	334	446	446	500	595	670	741	812	873	940	1,007	1,075	
Lake Hayes South	112	508	1,124	1,329	1,873	2,363	2,627	2,892	3,143	3,335	3,345	3,355	3,364	
Jacks Point	124	262	383	514	1,005	1,550	1,906	2,255	2,573	2,875	3,179	3,478	3,777	
Arrowtown	2,416	2,931	3,202	3,306	3,622	3,886	3,963	4,036	4,105	4,171	4,234	4,294	4,351	
Glenorchy	739	760	908	935	1,118	1,313	1,437	1,553	1,662	1,767	1,872	1,972	2,071	
Kingston South	581	583	618	616	705	803	849	887	914	940	965	988	1,010	
Wakatipu Basin	824	920	1,205	1,251	1,543	1,905	2,184	2,469	2,621	2,631	2,641	2,650	2,659	
Outer Wakatipu	592	574	789	825	964	1,100	1,183	1,257	1,307	1,347	1,388	1,424	1,460	
Wakatipu Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	85	246	417	692	1,150	2,231	3,603	5,005	
Wanaka Ward	16,584	21,966	27,389	28,897	34,448	40,010	42,988	45,714	48,155	50,250	52,428	54,576	56,712	
Wanaka	11,852	15,687	19,906	20,904	25,210	29,238	30,993	32,479	33,674	34,503	35,426	36,296	37,122	
Hawea	2,726	3,834	4,623	4,996	5,651	6,553	7,320	8,057	8,811	9,532	10,230	10,907	11,565	
Matukituki	2,006	2,445	2,859	2,997	3,587	4,218	4,675	5,179	5,670	6,215	6,772	7,374	8,025	
Wanaka Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Change (2001 - Average annual growth (14 years)	Annual average growth rate (14 years)	Change (2018 - Average annual growth (10 years)	Annual average growth rate (10 years)	Average annual growth (30 years)	Average annual growth (40 years)
24,054	1,718	3.2%	20,446	2,045	2.3%
11,741	839	2.7%	11,905	1,191	2.4%
2,166	155	2.0%	2,560	256	2.1%
3,444	246	2.8%	3,299	330	2.3%
703	50	2.2%	599	60	1.8%
634	45	4.4%	437	44	2.3%
340	24	1.1%	459	46	1.7%
524	37	9.3%	446	45	4.2%
373	27	1.9%	372	37	1.9%
167	12	3.4%	170	17	3.0%
1,217	87	19.3%	754	75	3.4%
390	28	10.7%	900	90	6.6%
890	64	2.3%	341	34	0.9%
196	14	1.7%	318	32	2.5%
36	3	0.4%	144	14	1.9%
426	30	3.6%	641	64	3.7%
233	17	2.4%	219	22	2.1%
0	0	n/a	246	25	n/a
12,314	880	4.0%	8,540	854	2.2%
9,053	647	4.1%	5,783	578	2.1%
2,270	162	4.4%	1,669	167	2.6%
991	71	2.9%	1,088	109	2.7%
0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a

Total Visitors - Average Day		2001	2006	2013	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043	2048	2053	2058
		District	14,691	17,649	17,982	20,368	24,861	29,203	31,488	33,598	35,549	37,358	39,037	40,600
Wakatipu Ward	10,358	12,258	12,236	13,851	16,915	19,760	21,360	22,942	24,444	25,876	27,229	28,506	29,729	
Queenstown Bay	2,876	3,128	3,305	3,771	4,611	5,339	5,735	6,111	6,466	6,801	7,123	7,426	7,715	
Queenstown Hill	2,848	3,499	3,705	4,228	5,189	6,020	6,531	7,081	7,628	8,186	8,723	9,134	9,478	
Sunshine Bay	774	902	780	854	1,004	1,126	1,176	1,239	1,294	1,346	1,387	1,400	1,399	
Arthurs Point	310	347	422	486	595	698	751	804	855	902	948	992	1,031	
Frankton	722	875	686	750	877	979	1,018	1,063	1,106	1,145	1,183	1,218	1,247	
Frankton East	73	119	183	215	270	332	384	443	500	556	612	661	709	
Kelvin Heights	515	596	511	561	674	778	822	861	893	922	950	975	994	
Lake Hayes	107	141	141	159	192	216	243	272	300	330	361	394	429	
Lake Hayes South	41	94	259	320	443	594	668	718	764	803	815	804	792	
Jacks Point	47	73	119	149	250	436	577	677	765	839	904	957	995	
Arrowtown	1,019	1,168	1,000	1,094	1,281	1,414	1,421	1,429	1,437	1,444	1,453	1,458	1,457	
Glenorchy	307	354	314	355	432	509	553	592	628	662	692	721	745	
Kingston South	262	312	228	248	292	333	352	367	378	388	394	400	404	
Wakatipu Basin	262	371	349	395	482	608	703	800	887	933	952	971	991	
Outer Wakatipu	197	279	235	267	321	379	404	428	447	460	474	486	495	
Wakatipu Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	58	95	156	258	509	849	
Wanaka Ward	4,333	5,391	5,746	6,517	7,945	9,443	10,129	10,656	11,105	11,482	11,809	12,094	12,325	
Wanaka	3,041	3,828	4,102	4,655	5,668	6,780	7,225	7,493	7,682	7,796	7,851	7,866	7,821	
Hawea	609	780	748	827	997	1,156	1,245	1,345	1,434	1,518	1,590	1,644	1,678	
Matukituki	683	783	896	1,035	1,280	1,507	1,658	1,818	1,989	2,168	2,368	2,583	2,826	
Wanaka Overflow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Change (2001 - Average annual growth (14 years)	Annual average growth rate (14 years)	Change (2018 - Average annual growth (10 years)	Annual average growth rate (10 years)	Average annual growth (30 years)	Average annual growth (40 years)
5,677	405	2.4%	6,628	663	2.4%
3,493	250	2.1%	4,445	444	2.4%
896	64	2.0%	1,124	112	2.2%
1,380	99	2.9%	1,342	134	2.3%
80	6	0.7%	172	17	1.6%
176	13	3.3%	156	16	2.4%
28	2	0.3%	141	14	1.5%
141	10	8.0%	113	11	3.6%
46	3	0.6%	148	15	2.0%
52	4	2.9%	50	5	2.4%
279	20	15.8%	225	23	4.2%
102	7	8.6%	327	33	8.7%
75	5	0.5%	140	14	1.0%
48	3	1.0%	121	12	2.5%
-14	-1	-0.4%	60	6	1.9%
133	9	3.0%	221	22	3.8%
70	5	2.2%	83	8	2.3%
0	0	n/a	21	2	n/a
2,184	156	3.0%	2,183	218	2.5%
1,614	115	3.1%	1,557	156	2.5%
218	16	2.2%	248	25	2.2%
352	25	3.0%	378	38	2.6%
0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a