

**QLDC Council  
17 April 2014**

**Report for Agenda Item**

**Planning and Development**

**Title District Plan Review**

**Purpose**

- 1 This paper outlines a proposed approach to the District Plan review for consideration and includes a recommendation that the District Plan review is formally commenced.

**Executive Summary**

- 2 The District Plan is a critical document in terms of the District's economic, social and environmental future. It is perhaps the most effective lever the Council has at its disposal to promote sustainable growth and effectively manage economic development.
- 3 A review is required under the Resource Management Act, but is also required to deliver a more transparent and accessible District Plan which enables better integrated planning and which better articulates a strategic direction for the District.
- 4 Substantial policy investigations and extensive consultation has already been undertaken. The policy work undertaken to date is in varying states of completeness and of variable quality. Significant additional work is required.
- 5 This report recommends that the District Plan Review proceed in two stages. A more strategic first stage is proposed to be notified in May 2015. A second stage will commence later in 2015. Several areas of the existing Plan are excluded from the review.
- 6 It is proposed that the new District Plan is led by a Strategic Direction chapter, and that chapter rules are structured around activity lists. This is a departure from the current effects based plan which is complex and difficult to interpret. The goal is a streamlined District Plan that is easier to understand, provides for greater certainty and better planning outcomes.

## **Recommendation**

### *7 That Council*

- a. **Notes** the contents of this paper, and in particular:
- i. The intended structure of the proposed District Plan lead by a Strategic Directions chapter;
  - ii. That the District Plan review is generally progressed in two stages generally in accordance with the programme at **Attachment D**, with the first stage targeted for public notification in May 2015.
  - iii. That an 'activity-based' District Plan is progressed;
  - iv. The general community-wide consultation undertaken to date is used as a platform for the District Plan review, with further targeted consultation undertaken as required.
- b. **Resolves** pursuant to section 79(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to commence a review of its Operative District Plan. The provisions that will be excluded from the review and will not be the subject of a public notice under Clause 5 of schedule 1 to the RMA when the review is completed are:
- Frankton Flats A
  - Frankton Flats B (once operative)
  - Remarkables Park Zone
  - Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone
  - Three Parks Zone
  - Kingston Village Special Zone
  - Registered Holiday Homes Appendix
  - Open Space Zone
  - Affordable housing provisions
  - Signs
- c. **Notes** – whilst appreciating its duties to consider plan change requests under Clause 25 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991- that applicants are discouraged from making private plan change requests during the period following the commencement of the District Plan review until the review has been made partially or fully operative, and expresses a preference that any issues that might be pursued through such requests are raised through the District Plan review process.
- d. **Agrees** that the following QLDC Strategies are not formally reviewed, but that the relevant components are incorporated into the District Plan as a means of achieving statutory weight:
- i. Growth Management Strategy

- ii. Wanaka Structure Plan
  - iii. Cardrona Valley Structure Plan
  - iv. Queenstown Town Centre Strategy
  - v. Wanaka Town Centre Strategy
  - vi. Urban Design Strategy
- e. **Agrees** that this agenda item can be publicly released (with the exception of legal advice & modified to remove indicative consultant spend) following a resolution and that the Mayor and the General Manager Planning & Development are authorised to prepare a media release and comment publicly on the resolution and the proposed District Plan review.

Prepared by: Matthew Paetz



District Plan Manager

2/04/2014

Reviewed and Authorised by:  
Marc Bretherton



General Manager Planning and  
Development

2/04/2014

## **Background**

- 8 Council formally signalled a District Plan review in the Long Term Plan 2012 and noted that a 'comprehensive review of the District Plan over the next three years' would be undertaken.
- 9 The approach to the District Plan review was considered at a Strategy Committee Workshop in May 2013. A 'chapter by chapter' approach to the review was supported, as was a rollover of the existing District Plan format and effects based philosophy.
- 10 No formal resolution was passed by Council to commence a review under s.79 of the RMA.
- 11 Whilst the review has not formally commenced, a substantial amount of monitoring, policy development and community consultation has occurred since 2012. This provides a useful platform for the District Plan review.
- 12 Monitoring reports on a range of issues have been prepared and have served to identify key issues to be addressed. Comprehensive community consultation has included preparation of a series of brochures on specific issues and/or locations and substantial written feedback has been received and recorded.
- 13 A number of defined stakeholder and wider community meetings have been conducted. Council has most recently undertaken consultation on the draft proposed Strategic Directions chapter.

## **Why Review the District Plan?**

- 14 It is generally accepted that for a District of this size, the operative District Plan is too long, complex, and difficult to interpret.
- 15 This is part due to a lack of strategic planning and direction by Council, by the prevalence of private plan changes and accompanying Special Zones, and in part due to the insertion of multiple provisions by the Courts. The previous review dragged on for many years and many of the more unwieldy provisions are a compromise between competing interests.
- 16 Deciphering the operative District Plan is a challenge for experienced planners picking it up for the first time. For members of the public, it is in large part simply unintelligible.
- 17 A key objective of the District Plan review is to simplify the document and markedly improve its clarity. Less text and bulk do not come at the expense of addressing significant resource management and planning issues for the District. These attributes in fact support better outcomes because they introduce certainty as to expectations and outcomes.

- 18 A streamlined Plan is anticipated to significantly reduce volumes of the resource consent applications received by Council. This will reduce compliance costs and be of direct benefit to applicants. This overall move to less regulation will not be at the expense of safeguarding key environmental attributes in the District. In fact there may well be stronger regulation in critical areas.
- 19 The operative Plan adopts an 'effects-based' philosophy. That is, the effects on the environment are the determinant of whether an activity may proceed (or not). This is consistent with the philosophy of the RMA. However this approach fails to provide a necessary level of certainty to people wanting to understand what they can and cannot do with their property. For example, nowhere in the (68 page) Residential Chapter is it stated that a house is a permitted activity.
- 20 Under Section 79(1) of the RMA a review is mandatory for those District Plan provisions that are ten years old. A large number of the operative District Plan provisions are at least ten years old and therefore *must* be reviewed.
- 21 Whilst work has progressed over the last two years in terms of preparing for a District Plan review, there has been no formal Council resolution to commence the review. The RMA does not prescribe how a Council is to commence a review, however it is implicit in the RMA that Councils record commencement of the review via a clear formal resolution. Recommendation (a) of this paper proposes a resolution to achieve this.

### **Proposed District Plan Structure**

- 22 A Council Workshop on the District Plan Review was held on 3 December 2013. A simplified District Plan structure was presented as follows:



- 23 Under this proposed structure a 'Strategic Direction' chapter leads as the overarching framework. The Plan is further divided into two key streams – 'Urban' and 'Rural' – with areas that span all zones grouped together under 'District Wide Matters'. It is proposed to centralise Assessment Matters in one chapter rather than repeating these in every chapter of the Plan as is the current practice.
- 24 In addition to zone specific areas grouped under 'Urban' and 'Rural' are 'Urban Special' and 'Rural Special' chapters. It is anticipated that some of the existing Special Zones will be grouped within these categories. These may then have alternative zonings applied to them and ultimately be withdrawn from the Special Zone category.

### **Strategic Direction – A critical District Plan Review platform**

- 25 The 'Strategic Direction' chapter is fundamental to the shape of the proposed District Plan and a central driver of the review. This chapter proposes six goals designed to shape the way the District develops in the future. These are:
- 1) *To develop a prosperous, resilient and sustainable economy*
  - 2) *The strategic and integrated management of urban growth*
  - 3) *A quality built environment taking into account the character of individual communities*
  - 4) *The protection of our natural environment and ecosystems*
  - 5) *Our distinctive landscapes are protected from inappropriate development*

- 6) *To enable a safe and healthy community that is strong, diverse and inclusive for all people.*

- 26 A study by economic consultants McDermott Miller which assisted in formulating a 'Centres Hierarchy' approach was central in shaping the proposed Strategic Direction chapter. Targeted consultation on this suggested framework occurred late 2013.
- 27 A peer review of the McDermott Miller study was also commissioned in late 2013. The review confirms the fundamental constructs and assumptions of the analysis to be sound. However it questions whether a strict hierarchical approach to centres policy is suitable for this District, and has prompted reconsideration of a commercial hierarchy.
- 28 Particular aspects highlighted in the peer review include:
- Complex urban systems are better suited to a strict centres hierarchy approach. Queenstown (and the wider commercial framework of the District) is not a complex urban system.
  - It questions whether the threat posed to the Queenstown Town Centre by out-of-centre development is as significant as the original study suggested.
  - Rather than focusing on impacts between centres, a better policy response is to seek to recognise the functional purpose of each centre – driven by their locations, unique attributes and existing uses – through a combination of centre specific policy and other non-regulatory responses.
- 29 Typically implicit in a hierarchical centres approach is an emphasis on regulation designed to control inter-centre impacts (e.g. controls on the size and scale of activities within centres, land use activities etc).
- 30 Since the study was commissioned and completed, agreements have been reached in relation to development and planning policy at Frankton Flats, and Plan Change 19 has progressed significantly. Therefore even if Council wanted to impose increased regulatory controls on non-CBD developments its opportunities to do so are limited.
- 31 On balance it is considered that the McDermott Miller report provides very sound analysis with regard to growth in retail demand and implications. However given the advances described above, a stronger policy response which encourages and supports a strong CBD are preferred over a hierarchy that classifies – and ultimately seeks to impose restrictions on development in other areas.

### **An Activity-Based versus Effects-Based District Plan?**

- 32 The principle of an effects-based plan is sound. It is based around the core philosophy of the RMA in terms of an approach that manages the effects of

activities and not necessarily the activities themselves. In theory it is an enabling approach that provides flexibility. However, in practice the experience in Queenstown Lakes District and throughout New Zealand is that effects-based District Plans provide neither the requisite degree of clarity or certainty that the community requires.

- 33 An activity-based District Plan differs in that it lists those activities that are envisaged in a zone as permitted activities subject to their compliance with performance standards. A breach of a performance standard triggers a resource consent. The Plan may make provision for additional activities that do require resource consent as controlled, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. It would typically include a 'catch all' rule stating that any activity not listed as permitted requires assessment as a discretionary or non-complying activity.
- 34 It is widely acknowledged that activity-based District Plans are generally easier to understand. Experience also suggests that applicants for resource consent tend to pay more because with effects-based plans consultants are often required to interpret the provisions and processing is more time intensive. Effects-based plans might be argued to satisfy the spirit of the RMA in theory, but they are not as clear in terms of intent and they are not as straight forward to administer.
- 35 The recent experience is that many Councils with effects-based District Plans are reviewing their plans and proceeding with an activity-based approach. An instructive example is Auckland Council. Following amalgamation, the Council developed its proposed Unitary Plan, which was notified in 2013. A key question for the Auckland Council was what was the best structure for the Unitary Plan, given the variety of approaches amongst the seven legacy Councils.
- 36 The Auckland Council considered two approaches – an effects-based Plan versus an 'outcomes-based' Plan. It opted for an outcomes-based Plan and the end result is essentially an activity-based plan structure. This option was considered to most effectively deliver the Council's objective for achieving its objective of 'simplicity, certainty and clarity'.
- 37 The current Queenstown Lakes District Plan could be considered a hybrid of the effects-based and activity-based District Plan approaches. It does in places use lists to classify activities, however this approach is intermeshed with an effects-based approach. This is considered to be one of the main problems with the current Plan, as this hybrid approach is confusing and unclear.
- 38 The pros and cons of activity-based plans and effects-based plans are summarised in the table below:

	Activity-Based Plan	Effects-Based Plan
<b>Pros</b>	<p>Provides greater certainty for community and developers</p> <p>More cost effective to administer</p> <p>More concise and easy to follow</p> <p>More readily allows for positive aspects of development to be considered</p>	<p><u>Potentially</u> greater flexibility</p> <p>More faithful to an RMA effects-based planning approach</p>
<b>Cons</b>	<p>Potentially less flexible (it is unequivocal as to what can and what cannot be done in any given zone)</p> <p>May trigger resource consent for activities which may otherwise be permitted in an effects-based plan (i.e. <u>potentially</u> less permissive)</p>	<p>Can be difficult to interpret for both laypeople and professionals</p> <p>Tendency to be bigger and more unwieldy</p> <p>Plan drafters need to be certain that all possible effects have been considered to avoid undesirable activities becoming permitted through oversight</p>

39 It is recommended that Council progress the District Plan review on the basis of an activity-based District Plan format. Strong evidence suggests that activity-based plans are more effective, and very few if any Councils appear to be seeking to continue with pure effects-based second generation plans.

40 This fundamental change in approach is required to deliver a shorter, more accessible and effective District Plan.

### **District Plan Options for Review**

41 Three options are presented in terms of rolling out the District Plan Review:

- Two Stage Review

Major policy work of strategic significance undertaken in Stage 1, followed by addressing the majority of Special Zones and some other discrete policy packages in Stage 2.

This option allows for the early notification of those chapters that can be readily isolated and progressed in advance where there is an immediate benefit. These 'low hanging fruit' such as Signs (already notified) and Earthworks chapters (drafted but not yet notified) mean that known issues within the Chapters can be addressed and reducing the overall volume of resource consents by 10%.

- Strategic Directions first

The Strategic Directions chapter notified in advance, with the balance of the review to follow in one or two stages.

· 'Incremental or Rolling Review'

Chapters are notified progressively as they are prepared.

42 The table below outlines the pros and cons of each of the options:

	<b>Two Stage Review</b>	<b>Strategic directions first</b>	<b>Incremental or rolling review</b>
<b>Pros</b>	<p>More integrated approach, and allows community and stakeholders to see connections between different policy strands</p> <p>Minimises number of notification processes Helps avoid 'consultation fatigue'</p> <p>Prioritises substantial urgent policy matters to an earlier first stage. Achieves meaningful policy progress in a manageable and realistic manner</p>	<p>Signals direction upfront.</p> <p>Allows Council to 'test' that direction in advance and recalibrate overall policy direction if necessary</p> <p>Demonstrates progress</p>	<p>Spaces out workload more evenly</p> <p>More manageable "bites" for the public, chapter by chapter</p> <p>Delivers more 'public' progress sooner</p>
<b>Cons</b>	<p>Notification of two large policy packages will include a substantial amount of revised policy across significant strategic issues.</p>	<p>Draft chapter has been consulted on, so direction has already been signaled. Some valid submissions were made and need to be considered, however it is not considered that the fundamental overall direction was challenged.</p> <p>It is difficult to comment on strategic direction without knowing the detail of how the strategic direction drives into and informs the balance of District Plan policy and rules.</p> <p>If challenged, the ultimate shape of the chapter could change, and impact on a consistent strategic direction for the balance of the Plan.</p>	<p>Consultation fatigue and apathy</p> <p>Loses sight of bigger picture, less integrated, could become piecemeal</p> <p>Chapter by chapter submissions on policy could disrupt focus on other chapters.</p> <p>Less efficient.</p>

43 A 'Full Package Review' was also considered, where notification of the entire District Plan occurs in one (rather than two) stages. Whilst this could be undertaken, it is unlikely that notification would be able to be achieved by the end of 2015 under this approach. Our view is that the Council needs to demonstrate progress on the review. This option has been discounted for this reason.

44 It is recommended that the 'Two Stage Review' approach be adopted. It is considered to be the most balanced option, providing for visible progress, does not preclude the option of identifying and notifying the 'low hanging fruit', and better supports integration between sections and chapters.

## **Integration of Council Strategies & Growth Modelling**

- 45 Consideration has been given to whether, or how, existing non-statutory Council strategies should be reviewed and aligned with the District Plan review. Of particular note is the Growth Management Strategy for the District that was finalised in 2007 and which was due for review in 2013.
- 46 Growth Management Strategies can be useful and important strategic documents, which can help guide growth and coordinate infrastructure provision. However such strategies are of greatest utility in large cities / regions that are characterised both by strong growth pressures and complexity in terms of size, infrastructure provision, management and governance. Queenstown Lakes District has strong growth pressures but is of a small size and of relatively limited complexity as both an urban system and administrative body.
- 47 The Growth Management Strategy identifies a number of non-District Plan initiatives, primarily economic tools. Most of these tools have not been adopted, and therefore it is questionable – based on track record to date – whether these non-statutory approaches add any real value over statutory policy contained within a District Plan.
- 48 Overall, it is recommended that the Growth Management Strategy should not be reviewed in parallel to the District Plan review, but that the most relevant aspects of the Strategy be adopted or modified for incorporation into the new District Plan. A further argument in favour of this approach is the amount of work involved in the District Plan review and the need to prioritise to set and achieve realistic goals. Incorporation will provide for continuity and also give the sound policy embedded in the Growth Management Strategy the statutory weight it currently lacks.
- 49 Other relevant planning strategies include:
- Queenstown Town Centre Strategy (adopted 2009)
  - Wanaka Town Centre Strategy (adopted 2009)
  - Wanaka 2020 and Wanaka Structure Plan (adopted 2007)
  - Urban Design Strategy (adopted 2009)
- 50 These strategies retain a certain amount of currency and relevance, although it is noted that they have not been reviewed annually to ensure they remain up to date. These strategies are largely consistent with and reflected in the proposed Strategic Direction chapter. The table below summarises the proposed actions in relation to each of these strategies:

Document Title	District Plan Review Action
Structure plans - Wanaka and Cardrona Valley	Wanaka Inner & Outer growth boundaries to be included
Growth Management Strategy	Urban Growth Boundaries to be included.
Queenstown Town Centre Strategy	Strengthening objectives and policies to provide for design and development outcomes. Allowing for appropriate growth of town centre.
Wanaka Town Centre Strategy	Strengthening objectives and policies to provide for design and development outcomes. Allowing for appropriate growth of town centre.
Urban Design Strategy	Include provisions for quality urban design outcomes in urban areas.

- 51 It is recommended that these Strategy documents are not reviewed, but that the key elements are incorporated into the District Plan and accorded statutory weight. According these community driven strategies statutory weight achieves the frequently heard community expectations for the content of these documents.
- 52 The Dwelling Capacity Model (DCM) developed and held by Council is a key data platform for planning analysis. This model maps the urban area, provides a breakdown of spare capacity within each zone, and is informed by development (uptake) as it occurs.
- 53 Some work has been undertaken to review the assumptions underpinning the model. These were out of date. Staff continue to work on this matter, and it is recommended that significant effort continues in refining the DCM to inform policy around housing demand, density, location and affordability.

### **District Plan Review Scope and Priorities**

- 54 As discussed above, it is unrealistic to undertake a one-step review with notification of a full package mid-2015. A number of chapters are of less urgency and strategic importance and can be deferred.
- 55 There is a strong case for the Special Zones to be excluded from the first stage of the District Plan review, or excluded from the review altogether. A number of these zones are less than ten years old, and those that are developed or partially

developed generally appear to function satisfactorily from a policy perspective. Given there is no intention to down-zone or up-zone these areas there is no strategic urgency in reviewing the provisions.

- 56 In addition to the Special Zones, there are several other discrete policy areas which are considered to be less urgent in nature and of less immediate strategic importance are recommended to be addressed in Stage 2. These include Industrial, Townships, Transport and Hydro Generation.
- 57 Industrial land supply is being addressed in current plan changes (PC 19 and PC 46). Whilst limited change to existing Industrial Chapters would be beneficial, delay does not have a negative impact on supply.
- 58 The policy in the Transport chapter is fundamentally sound however does require a proper review and restructure. With regard to Townships, the changes that have been identified through monitoring and consultation are not of a strategic nature. The Hydro Generation policy needs addressing however is not urgent.
- 59 The recommended approach, in terms of inclusions and exclusions are included in three tables at **Attachment C**.
- 60 The first table outlines the work to be undertaken in Stage 1. The second table outlines the work to be undertaken in Stage 2 The third table outlines what is to be excluded from the review altogether.

### **District Plan Review program**

- 61 The draft program (**Attachment D**) has been developed having regard to the following matters:
- The size and capacity of the District Plan Policy team
  - Allocated consultancy budget
  - An assessment of the policy work and evidence base developed to date, and the extent to which it is 'fit for purpose'
- 62 The program that has been developed balances the need for ambitious timeframe goals with the need to develop robust policy. It is based on the approach that policy chapters are presented to Council on a regular basis over the next 12 months for endorsement. The chapters are then 'parked' until all chapters within the stage have been endorsed. At that point, the First Stage of the District Plan proceeds to public notification as a comprehensive package.
- 63 It is proposed that monthly workshops with Councillors will be held. Workshops are scheduled to occur by the midpoint of the planning investigations, taking place at least two months before the work is presented to Council for endorsement. Each workshop will have a single theme which is to be the main matter addressed in the workshop. There will also be opportunity towards the end

of each workshop to recap on previous workshop issues and introduce particular matters for comment pertaining to other themes / chapters.

64 The program builds on the extensive public consultation that has taken place to date and assumes only discrete and targeted consultation where necessary. Consultation is discussed further in the section below.

65 The program is ambitious and the proposed timeframes assume:

- Council substantively approves draft chapters at each Council meeting in the program (minor re-workings / amendments allowed for).
- Private plan changes accepted by Council are few (if any)
- The policy investigations that proceed do not reveal any major surprises or issues requiring substantial and time-consuming further investigations
- The final policy planner in the District Plan policy team is recruited by June 2014

### **Consultation**

66 Simpson Grierson's legal advice provides guidance in terms of what consultation is required in the preparation of a District Plan. This advice distinguishes between the mandatory consultation that must be undertaken (Clause 3(1) of the First Schedule of the RMA) and the discretionary consultation that Council may undertake (Clause 3(2) of the First Schedule of the RMA). Further consultation as per the mandatory requirement will be undertaken throughout 2014 to properly fulfil this requirement.

67 Given the substantial consultation undertaken to date, as well as the need to progress the District Plan review expeditiously, it is not proposed that any further general community-wide consultation occur.

68 However, it is acknowledged that there may be discrete requirements for further consultation on specific issues or in specific locations with particular stakeholders or groups. To a large extent, it cannot be precisely known what such consultation may entail until policy investigations are progressed further.

69 It is emphasised that the threads of the early visioning exercises have been carried through the work and proposed approach. The review will also continue to be informed by Shaping Our Future and other statutory processes and documents that Council produces (eg. Long Term Plan, Annual Plan).

70 To allow for some focused consultation over the next 12 months in a manner that will not derail the proposed timeframes, it is proposed that a Resource Management Focus Group be formed. The group will comprise of relevant technical and professional interests, community and sector representatives and be established to act as a reference group and 'sounding board' for policy direction.

### **Resourcing & Financial**

71 The District Plan team is now substantially staffed, with one remaining vacant position which a concerted effort is being made to fill. Team members will be allocated to work packages, either in a 'Project Management' role (coordinating and managing consultant input) or in an 'Ownership' role with limited / no use of consultants and with full responsibility for policy assessment, drafting and process management and delivery.

### **Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions**

72 The LGA purpose provisions (ss10, 11, 11A) have been considered:

- Activity (local democracy, infrastructure, local public services or performance of regulatory functions);
- Quality (efficient, effective and appropriate to present and future circumstances); and
- Economic (most cost-effective for households and businesses).

73 The proposed approach to the District Plan review responds appropriately to these provisions, in that it will ultimately result in more strategic, cost effective and efficient planning approaches for the community. At the same time it will provide a strong level of planning rigour and will respond appropriately to the development and growth pressures in the district.

### **Council Policies**

74 The following Council Policies were considered:

- Policy on Significance: The District Plan Review is considered to be of significance due to its district-wide significance across a range of economic, environmental and social matters.
- Annual Plan 2013/2014: the Annual Plan acknowledges a move away from a rolling review approach to a 'comprehensive review of most of the District Plan'. The Annual Plan further notes that the 'the process will allow the plan to be restructured and simplified'. The proposed approach is consistent with this objective.
- 2012 – 2022 Ten Year Plan: Like the Annual Plan there is an emphasis on comprehensive review and a plan restructure to simplify.

### **Consultation**

75 As described above.

### **Publicity**

76 Subject to Council's decision, release of this paper (with the exception of legal advice) is recommended, and an appropriate media statement and advice to key stakeholders should be issued.

**Public Excluded**

- 77 It is recommended that the public be excluded from this item on the basis of maintaining legal professional privilege (Section 7(2)(g) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987).
- 78 Further, given commercial sensitivities around inclusions and exclusions to the review, and to allow free and frank discussion around these, it is appropriate that Council consider this paper public excluded.

**Attachments**

Attachment C: District Plan Review Inclusions and Exclusions

Attachment D: Proposed District Plan Review Program (Stage 1)

## Priority Tables – District Plan Review – April 2014

**TABLE 1: To be included in Review (Stage 1: commencing May 2014, notified May 2015)**

No.	Proposed Section	Existing Chapter	Age years	Benefits	Staff
1	Introduction, Information and Interpretation	Merges existing chapters 1 & 2	10	Ties plan together	All
<b>S</b>	<b>Strategic</b>				
2	Strategic Direction	Part of District Wide	10	Relates to whole Plan Provide direction Streamline Assist in consideration of private plan changes Align with RPS/NPS	MP / All
3	Tangata Whenua	Part of District Wide and Statutory Acknowledgement	10	Maintain relationship with Iwi	TP
<b>4</b>	<b>Urban</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Residential</b>				
5a	Low Density Residential Zone	Split from existing Residential	10	Fix known problems Simplify Consider some potential medium density zoning Reconsider development controls	MP / New
5b	Medium Density Residential Zone	Split from existing Residential	3-10	Fix known problems Simplify Consider some higher densities Reconsider development controls	MP / New
5c	High Density Residential Zone	Split from existing Residential	3-10	Fix known problems Simplify Reconsider development controls	MP/ New
5d	Residential Arrowtown Historic Management Zone	Split from existing Residential	10	Fix objectives & policies	MP

No.	Proposed Section	Existing Chapter	Age years	Benefits	Staff
<b>6</b>	<b>Commercial</b>				
6a	Town Centres	Existing	10	Height, urban design, flexibility, noise Consider expansion of CBD	New / MP
6b	Mixed Use	New		Will provide logical place for some special / mixed use zones once they are reviewed	New / MP
6c	Business	Existing	10	Fix objectives & policies Incompatible uses Reduce consents	New
6d	Queenstown Airport Mixed Used Zone	Existing	10	Consolidate policy, link to new Mixed use policy, and consider incorporating General Rural zoned land into one Airport Zone	
<b>7</b>	<b>Rural Areas</b>				
7a	Rural General	Existing	6-10	Confirm landscape lines & classifications Consider recent changes in rural uses Provide for farming activities Cumulative Effects Overlap with vegetation	CB
7b	Rural Living	Rural Lifestyle Zone	10	Fix building platform rule	CB
7c	Rural Residential Zone	Existing	10	Clarify purpose Reduce consents	CB
<b>8</b>	<b>Assessment Matters</b>				
	Assessment Matters	Taken from each zone	10	Clarify, tidy, consolidate into one area Reduce duplication throughout DP	ALL
<b>9</b>	<b>District Wide</b>				
9a	Earthworks	Taken from each zone chapter	8	Tie to other sections Reduce consents	TP
9c	Subdivision, Development & Financial Contributions	Existing	4-10	Simplify, improve	MP / New
9d	Heritage	Existing	10	Tidy up Heritage Landscapes	TP

No.	Proposed Section	Existing Chapter	Age years	Benefits	Staff
9e	Utilities (incl. Energy)	Existing but with renewable energy added in	10	Align with NPS on renewable energy and electricity transmission Encourage renewables	TP
9f	Noise	Taken from each zone chapter	10	Consistency New town centre policy	New
9g	Temporary Activities	Existing	10	Promotes economic development / events	New
9h	Natural Hazards	New	10	RMA reform requirement Risk management RPS Alignment	TP
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendices</b>				
A1	Definitions	Existing	Up to 10	Required by Env Court direction	All
A2	Protected Features	Existing	10	RMA amendments re. tree protection addressed Add any new Heritage Features Community support	TP
A3	Interpretative Diagrams	Existing	10	Related to other sections	All
A4	Significant Indigenous Vegetation	Existing and Threatened Plants	10	Required by Env Court direction	CB
A5	Designations	Existing	10	One process, comprehensive review at one time	tbc
<b>M</b>	<b>Maps</b>				
M	Maps	Existing	Mostly 10	Reflect reality Updated to allow for all above Correct errors	All

TABLE 2: To be included in Review (Stage 2: Commencing mid-late 2015, Notification mid-late 2016)

No.	Proposed Section	Existing Chapter	Age years	Benefits	Staff
<b>5/6</b>	<b>Urban</b>				
5e	Quail Rise Special Zone	Existing	8	General tidy up, possible integration into a residential chapter	TBC
5f	Penrith Park Special Zone	Existing	10	General tidy up, possible integration into a residential chapter	TBC
5g	Meadow Park Special Zone	Existing	8	General tidy up, possible integration into a residential chapter	TBC
5i	Townships	Existing	10	Requires amendment in terms of known problems and community support however not considered highly strategic	TBC
6d	Industrial Ballantyne Road Mixed Use Zone	Existing	10	Policy requires amendments however not urgent. Inclusion in Stage 2 will allow the policy to be better informed by relevant private plan change outcomes	TBC
<b>7</b>	<b>Rural Special</b>				
7d	Rural Visitor	Special Zones chapter	10	Needs amendment but not strategic or urgent	TBC
7e	Bendemeer Zone	Special Zone	10	Needs amendment but not strategic or urgent	TBC
7f	Resort (Millbrook & Waterfall Park & Jacks Point)	Existing	10	Potential to bring forward on a cost & resource neutral basis with agreement of single landowner.	TBC
7g	Hydro Generation	Existing	10	Needs amendment but not strategic or urgent	TBC
<b>9</b>	<b>District Wide</b>				
9i	Transport	Existing	10	Requires amendment and restructure, however policy generally sound and does not justify Stage 1 priority	TBC
9j	Hazardous Substances	Existing	10	Needs amendment but not strategic or urgent	TBC

**TABLE 3: Not to be included in Review**

No.	Section	Existing Chapter	Age years	Benefits	Staff
	Frankton Flats A	Existing	6		N/A
	Frankton Flats B (once operative)	New	0		N/A
	Remarkables Park	Existing	10	Excluded by agreement with landowner	N/A
	Mount Cardrona Station	Existing	2		N/A
	Three Parks	Existing	2		N/A
	Kingston Village Special Zone	Existing	3		N/A
	Registered Holiday Homes Appendix	Existing	4		N/A
	Open Space	Existing	6		N/A
	Affordable housing provisions	Existing policy	1		N/A
	Signs	Existing	10	Already notified in dependent of Review March 2014	TP

## District Plan Review - Stage 1 - Work Program

