



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSION
ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PLAN CHANGE



Clause 8 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991 – as amended 30 August 2010



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council



YOUR DETAILS // Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email** and **phone**.

Name:

Phone Numbers: Work:

Home:

Mobile:

Email Address:

Postal Address:

Post code:



THIS IS A FURTHER SUBMISSION // In support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following Plan Change:

I AM

☐

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

In this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or

☐

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.

In this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or

☐

The local authority for the relevant area.



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) THE SUBMISSION OF // Name the original submitter and submission number.



THE PARTICULAR PARTS OF THE SUBMISSION I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) ARE //

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal.



THE REASONS FOR MY SUPPORT (OR OPPOSITION) ARE //



I SEEK THAT THE WHOLE OR PART [DESCRIBE PART] OF THE SUBMISSION BE ALLOWED, OR DISALLOWED // Give precise details.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

I consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.



SIGNATURE

Signature (to be signed for or on behalf of submitter) **

Date

*** If this form is being completed on-line you may not be able, or required, to sign this form.*

NOTE TO PERSON MAKING FURTHER SUBMISSION

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within five working days after making the further submission to the Local Authority.



Proposed Plan Change 50 - Queenstown Town Centre Zone extension					
I make the following further submissions as a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has, because of my ownership of 34 Brecon St					
Submission No	Submitter	Submission content supported or opposed	Support	Oppose	Reasons for support or opposition
50/03/01	Reid Investment Trust	Supports the re-zoning of Isle Street subzone and beach Street Blocks	√		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/03/03	Reid Investment Trust	Opposes the rezoning of Lakeview sub-zone, and seeks deletion of Lakeview sub-zone (both in maps and reference to the Lakeview sub-zone in the text).		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/04/01	David Odell	Opposes the plan change for rezoning and high density development and seeks that Lakeview site should be excluded from high density development.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/04/04	David Odell	Considers that Lakeview site should be utilised as another park.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission, and is not an efficient or appropriate use of the land
50/04/05	David Odell	The idea that the town centre is at risk due to development at Frankton has no merit		√	We consider that there is a dissipation risk as outlined in the PC50 AEE
50/05/01	Daniela Bagozzi	Many of the cabins on this site have heritage value, represent a link with the past of Queenstown as a family holiday resort and represent a tourist attraction.		√	We do not consider that the cabins have sufficient heritage quality so as to outweigh the benefit of development of the site
50/05/04	Daniela Bagozzi	A moratorium be placed on new high rise buildings in Queenstown		√	Is inconsistent with the Resource Management Act and the QLDC District Plan
50/06/01 and 50/07/01	David Stringer Tai Ward-Holmes	Is opposed to the removal of 'Kiwiana' cribs/batches on Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street and seeks Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street cribs/batches be retained by partial exclusion of zone extension over this part of Lakeview site.		√	We do not consider that an of the cabins have sufficient heritage quality so as to outweigh the benefit of development of the site
50/08/01	Robins Road Ltd	That plan change should have included the Gorge Road and Robins Road corridors and their ability to accommodate mixed use zoning		√	The Gorge Road and Robins Road areas are less suitable for extension of the Town Centre Zone than the PC50 area
50/11/03	Queenstown Chamber Of Commerce	Seeks to strategically stage the release of commercial capacity so it does not compete with the existing Queenstown CBD,	√		Because of the quantum of Town Centre Zoned land proposed by PC50 there is need to release it in stages prioritising land closest to the existing town centre

50/11/05	Queenstown Chamber Of Commerce	Support the well-resourced provision of quality connections and the use of urban design techniques to ensure the connections between the PC50 area and the existing CBD, however, ensure that adequate resources are afforded to the development of quality urban design and attractive and safe pedestrian linkages to the existing town centre from the site	√		The PC50 will only be an effective extension of the Town Centre Zone if the pedestrian linkages from the existing town centre are convenient, safe and present an attractive public realm. This matter relates to the preceding item insofar as it can not be expected that the walk between the existing town centre and the convention centre will be an attractive proposition if the land nearest the existing town centre is not developed first
50/12/01	Alan Bunting	Objects to the proposed height limits proposed within the Isle Street sub-zone, seeks the retention of the existing High Density Residential Zone height limit (7 metre height limit		√	Height limit proposed is not efficient or appropriate for land so well connected to the existing town centre
50/13/02	Louise Wright	Grant Plan Change 50, however amend Site Standards as follows: 1. Consider qualitative volumetric controls as opposed to maximum height limits, setbacks and recession planes. Qualitative volumetric controls should allow for higher height limits for developments that provide lower site coverage and quality forms that afford sunlight access and quality built form; or 2. Remove sunlight recession plane restrictions, 3. Provide for a variation over proposed height limits for quality developments, 4. Provide Appendix 4 diagrams.	√		We support the principle that better urban design outcomes should earn higher site utilisation bonuses
50/15/03	NZIA Southern Branch	There appears to be no analysis of existing empty office space or land in the town centre. The town centre has taken a very long time to reach the density it is today and we query the need for such a significant expansion of the town centre. Our concern is that the expanded area of the town centre is too large as proposed and will grossly undermine the existing town centre	√		We too are concerned that the area proposed for PC50 is perhaps too large and consideration should be given to staged release of land, prioritising that which is closest to the existing town centre
50/15/04	NZIA Southern Branch	The submitter considers that the location of the conference centre is too far from the town centre for walking and the associated	√		We consider that the convention centre would ideally be located at the eastern end of the PC50 area, closer to the existing town centre.

		commercial activity will struggle.			
50/16/01 and 50/16/05	Maximum Mojo Holdings	Whilst a rigorous planning, architectural and urban design analysis has been given to the Lakeview Sub-Zone, the submitter considers that the same level of detailed assessment (from the same disciplines prescribed above) should occur for the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The Isle Street Sub-Zone has to be controlled and developed in a matter befitting its important location next to, and overlooking the QTCZ.	√		The Lakeside Urban Design Framework should be extended to cover the Isle Street blocks, to achieve a consistent and thorough analysis and conclusion
50/16/04	Maximum Mojo Holdings	The submitter believes that the recession planes should either be scrapped and another design solution put forward, or the angle/height of the recession planes are relaxed.	√ in part		We consider that development controls that create sloping walls or step backs at upper levels can create very unfortunate built outcome
50/18/01	Marjory Pack & John Allan	The submitters oppose the rezoning of their land to Isle Street sub-zone given the residential character of the area and the level of amenity they currently enjoy.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct.
50/20/03	Heritage New Zealand	The submitter requests that the effects of adjoining development on the setting of the cemetery should be taken into consideration as part of the change and considers it important that the cemetery is not marginalised by overly dominant buildings and lack of connection to the wider zone. The concerns raised about the marginalisation of the cemetery will be of particular concern if Cemetery Road is stopped in the future and this location becomes available for development.		√	We consider that the cemetery is bounded by open space on the north and east, there is in fact little prospect of domination by development of 34 Brecon St in those circumstances. View shafts will continue to be available via Brecon St. Further, the issue is not of such significance to warrant constraint on development of the adjoining site.

50/22/01	Skyline Enterprises Ltd	<p>The submitter supports the entire plan change provisions.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the Lakeview and Isle Street sub zones will provide a logical framing of the existing QTCZ and that activities such as commercial, visitor accommodation, commercial recreation, community facilities and a convention centre are appropriate for this location.</p> <p>The company considers that the Isle Street sub- zone will perform an important role in housing a range of activities, while linking the QTCZ to the Lakeview sub-zone and that the location of both sub-zones at roughly the base of the Ben Lomond Reserve provides an excellent opportunity to allow higher built form to be absorbed into this setting without creating adverse effects.</p>	√		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/23/01	Nigel Brown	<p>The submitter is opposed to the Isle Street sub zone (particularly the block bounded by Hay, Isle, Brecon and Man Streets) and raises specific objections relation to car parking, height limits, site coverage and the change of zoning</p>		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks from an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct.
50/23/03	Nigel Brown	<p>The submitter considers that the proposed height limits are totally out of scale for the area especially the 15.5 metres of sites over 2,000m². The submitters requests that the current high density height limits and rules for the entire block be retained.</p>		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks from an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct and accordingly the height proposed is appropriate

50/23/04	Nigel Brown	The submitter states that the proposed site coverage is far too intensive and will lead to minimum setbacks between properties. This will take away views of Queenstown Bay and the downtown area from any properties without frontage on to Man Street. The Isle Street block is one of the few areas in town that have great views and are within easy walking distance of the town centre. The submitter requests that that a maximum site coverage of 55% be provided for, which would give more space between the buildings and perhaps encourage lanes and open spaces.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct and accordingly the site coverage proposed should not be reduced
50/23/06	Nigel Brown	The submitter request that for the Lakeview sub-zone, where this has a frontage to Isle Street and Hay Street there should be a generous setback of 50 metres or a 7 metre height restriction within 50 metres of the street boundary.		√	There is no sound town planning or urban design rationale for this
50/23/07	Nigel Brown	The submitter requests that the amalgamation of 2,000m2 sites should be a non-complying activity as this would mean amalgamating four sites from Isle Street to Man Street and the bulk and scale of this would be overpowering using the proposed heights and rules.		√	We consider that better urban design outcomes can arise from amalgamated sites.
50/24/02	John Thompson	The submitter requests that the maximum site coverage (under Rule 10.6.5.1.i.e) within the Isle Street Sub-Zone be increased to 80%, and any consequential changes.	√		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct and accordingly the site coverage proposed is appropriate subject to meeting specific urban design objectives

50/24/10	John Thompson	There is a sub set of assessment matters that are not appropriate for an area that is effectively destined to change in character, and that will be in transition for some time. The assessment matters of concern require that a building be designed so that it fits with its surroundings. This is not appropriate given the surroundings for the Isle Street Sub- Zone are single storey old houses, in a zone that contemplates new 12m plus tall buildings for mixed commercial use.	√		Assessment criteria that require that a building be designed so that it fits with its surroundings are not appropriate when the degree of change is as significant as is proposed
50/26/01 and 50/28/01	The Dairy Guesthouse 2003 Ltd and Any Old Fish Company	The Isle Street Sub-Zone is vitally important as it provides a logical expansion of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone and greatly assists in justifying the rezoning of the Lakeview site.	√ in part		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/29/01	Doug and Betty Brown	The submitters request that the plan change be amended as follows: 1. Amend provisions to leave Isle Street/Man Street blocks as they are; 2. Lakeview site to retain the green area used as children's playground on corner of Hay Street and Man Street; 3. Balance of Lakeview site to be High Density Residential zoning similar to Isle Street/Man Street blocks; 4. Oppose PC50 being extension of CBD.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/30/01	Doug Huntington	1. Lakeview to remain as HDRZ; 2. Withdraw the change to the QTCZ; 3. Withdraw the provision for convention centre on Lakeview; and 4. Modify the increase in height of the existing HDRZ on Lakeview to 10 metres plus a roof form bonus of 2.0 metres		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission

50/31/02	Gillian & Donald McDonald	The submitter seeks retention of the current high density limits and rules for the Isle Street Sub Zone. Given the sloping contours, alternatively a 5 metre height restriction on the Man Street rear boundaries and allow them a horizontal plane towards Man Street to a maximum of 12 metres.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct and accordingly the height proposed is appropriate
50/31/03	Gillian & Donald McDonald	The proposed site coverage of 70% is too intensive. The submitter requests that rather than have separate standards for residential and non-residential as is currently the case, the maximum site coverage for all should be 55%.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct and accordingly the site coverage proposed should not be reduced
50/31/04	Gillian & Donald McDonald	The proposal to allow the amalgamation of 2000 metre sites (four existing sites) should not be allowed.		√	We support the principle that better urban design outcomes can arise from amalgamated sites.
50/31/07	Gillian & Donald McDonald	The submitter request that for the Lakeview sub-zone, where this has a frontage to Isle Street and Hay Street there should be a generous setback of 50 metres or a 7 metre height restriction within 50 metres of the street boundary.		√	There is no sound town planning or urban design rationale for this
50/35/01	Kelso Investments Ltd and Chengs Capital Investments Ltd	The submitter generally support the case set out in PC50 that there is a need to extend the QTCZ (although the submitter is not necessarily convinced that scale of the extension proposed under PC50 is justifiable).	√ in part		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/38/01	Queenstown Gold	The submitter seeks that the area on Brecon Street currently zoned High Density Residential with a 'Commercial Precinct' overlay be rezoned to Town Centre Zone.		√	To the extent that this submission is inconsistent with our primary submission

50/39/02	Memorial Property Ltd	<p>The submitter has reservations about the overall rationale of Plan PC50, noting that it represents a significant departure from the policy framework established in the current District Plan and the preferred direction promoted by Council in recent years, including to contain the spatial extent of the town centre.</p> <p>The submitter considers that much of the proposed extension of the town centre is significantly separated by distance, elevation changes and street layouts and there is a risk of a competing rather than complementary retail and office precinct emerging, which could undermine the vitality</p>	√ in part		We too are concerned that the area proposed for PC50 is perhaps too large and consideration should be given to staged release of land, prioritising that which is closest to the existing town centre
50/39/05	Memorial Property Ltd	The submitter is concerned that the proposed building heights in the PC50 area could detract from the visual amenity and landscape qualities of Queenstown and its surrounds. The submitter seeks the reduction of the height limits enabled to align with other comparable zonings of the operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/39/07	Memorial Property Ltd	(ii) Raise the activity status of a convention centre to restricted discretionary, with a matter of discretion listed as "the suitability of the proposed location" with associated assessment matters included to address, amongst other matters, the consideration of the benefits that may be afforded to the existing town centre as a result of factors such as the walking distance for conference delegates to the existing town centre.	√ in part		We consider that an objective analysis of all planning and urban design factors may well indicate that there are better sites within the Lakeview subzone for the convention centre that is currently being planned

50/39/07	Memorial Property Ltd	The submitter seeks the deletion or reduction in size of the proposed Isle Street subzone.		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission and that the two Isle St blocks form an important link between the existing town Centre and the proposed Lakeview sub-precinct
50/40/01	Justin Wright	Section 16.6.5.1 Site Standards. Lake View Sub-Zone • Max Building Cover 80% 10.6.5.1-I (D)	√ In part		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/40/02	Justin Wright	The submitter considers that further densification of the Queenstown Centre and Surrounds will make for a more vibrant built environment, allowing for intensive development within and surrounding the existing town centre allows for development that does not require further subdivision of our open space. High density is a more sustainable development as it allows to leverage of existing infrastructure. High quality urban design creates good work and living environments. While the proposed plan change is on the right track, a more intensive development will have further benefits to the urban environment and the economy.	√		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/40/05	Justin Wright	The submitter wish to see all recessions plane rules be removed from the Isle Street sub zone. The implication on building form has not been tested and will likely lead to poor building forms that are a detriment to the urban form and environment.	√		We consider that development controls that create sloping walls or step backs at upper levels can create very unfortunate built outcome

50/40/06	Justin Wright	The submitter wishes to see adoption of volumetric design controls instead of maximum height plane controls. Volumetric controls allow for flexibility in building mass. They create the condition where buildings can be taller if they are thinner. The result is that a building form can be adjusted to accommodate the same area of occupation, while creating flexibility within the building lot to adjust for sun light access and view depending on the build form around the site.	√		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/40/06	Justin Wright	Isle St Sub zone The max building height allows for only 2 stories above. The height from ground floor to upper level likely require lift access to be attractive for a tenant. The rules impose additional costs of the extra volume on ground floor and the lift. Hence it may be that the proposed change imposes rules that adds cost to the building that means they are simply not feasible and thus will not be realized.	√		We agree with this concern
50/43/02	Queenstown Lakes Community Housing trust	No high rise buildings should be approved as it will impact on the natural landscape		√	For the reasons outlined in our primary submission
50/43/07 and 50/44/01 and 50/45/01 and 50/49/02	Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust & Douglas Veint & Janet Sarginson & Remarkables Jet Ltd	The extension of the town centre should be out Gorge Road, where there has been commercial development for the last 60 years. The development footprint is already there.		√	The Gorge Road area is less suitable for extension of the Town Centre Zone than the PC50 area

50/49/02	Remarkables Jet Ltd	The staging of the proposed Town Centre expansion has not been properly considered. Sound planning would suggest a staged development should occur whereby the land closest to the current CBD would be developed first, and only then would a further stage of development be considered. The Plan Change has failed to consider the sequencing of the Town Centre expansion to ensure consolidated development of the CBD takes place, as opposed to negative effects of sporadic development.	✓ In part		We too are concerned that the area proposed for PC50 is perhaps too large and consideration should be given to staged release of land, prioritising that which is closest to the existing town centre
50/54/01	Rebecca Richwhite	Considers that Council should aspire towards what has been achieved in some of the most admired lakeside and alpine towns of Europe, where condensed built environments nestle into the base of expansive mountainous landscapes. Highlights two such examples, being Lake Como and St Moritz. The proposed principal of 'upward not outward', 'quality not quantity', should be applied to future development in the broader Lakes District. Submitter sees the proposed Plan Change 50 as an opportunity to hone what has begun, and to address some of the urban challenges the region is facing.	✓		For the reasons outlined in our primary submission



.....On behalf of Brecon St Partnership Ltd

Date: 29 October 2014