

**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 Hearing Stream 06
– Residential chapters

**REPLY OF AMANDA JANE LEITH
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

11 LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL ZONE CHAPTER

11 November 2016

 **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. PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL ZONE	2
3. SUBDIVISION OBJECTIVE AND POLICIES	4
4. BUILDING RESTRICTION AREA	5
5. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES	5
6. BUILDING MATERIALS AND COLOUR	6
7. PROPOSED ADDITIONAL AREAS OF LLRZ-B SUBZONE	6
8. SETBACKS FROM ROADS, INTERNAL BOUNDARIES AND WATERBODIES	6
9. NON-NOTIFICATION	7
10. CONCLUSION.....	7

Appendix 1 – Updated revised chapter

Appendix 2 – Additional S32AA evaluation of the additional recommended changes

Appendix 3 – Updated list of submitter points with recommended decision

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Amanda Jane Leith. I prepared the section 42A report for the Large Lot Residential Zone (**LLRZ**) chapter of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**). My qualifications and experience are listed in that s42A report dated 14 September 2016.
- 1.2 I have reviewed the evidence filed by other expert witnesses on behalf of submitters, attended part of the hearing on the 10 October – 27 October 2016 and have been provided with information from submitters and counsel at the hearing, including reports of what has taken place at the hearing each day.
- 1.3 This reply evidence covers the following issues:
- (a) purpose and character of the Large Lot Residential Zone;
 - (b) subdivision;
 - (c) building restriction areas;
 - (d) prohibited activities;
 - (e) building materials and colour;
 - (f) proposed additional areas of LLRZ-B subzone;
 - (g) setbacks from roads, internal boundaries and waterbodies; and
 - (h) non-notification provisions.
- 1.4 Where I am recommending changes to the provisions as a consequence of the Hearing evidence, I have appended these as **Appendix 1 (Revised Chapter)**. I have attached an additional section 32AA evaluation in **Appendix 2**, and an updated list of submission points with recommended decisions in **Appendix 3**. Where I have not discussed the Hearing evidence, I have considered the points raised however have nothing further to add from that included within the s42A report on the matter.
- 1.5 In this Reply:
- (a) if I refer to a provision number without any qualification, it is the notified provision number and has not changed through my recommendations;
 - (b) if I refer to a "s42A" provision number, I am referring to the provision version in **Appendix 1** of my s42A report; and

- (c) if I refer to a "redraft" provision number, I am referring to the redraft provision number in **Appendix 1** to this Reply.

2. PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL ZONE

- 2.1** A key question the Hearing Panel (**Panel**) asked in relation to the proposed LLRZ was how it differentiated from the Rural Residential zone (in Chapter 22 of the PDP). The Panel has also questioned how the LLRZ zone achieves the strategic direction objective of having more compact urban areas (Strategic Direction Objective 3.2.2.1 and Urban Development Objective 4.2.3¹).
- 2.2** The LLRZ is located within the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) for Wanaka, in areas currently zoned Rural Residential in the Operative District Plan (ODP).
- 2.3** The proposed LLRZ is differentiated from the PDP Rural Residential zone through being located within the UGB whereas the Rural Residential zone is located outside.
- 2.4** It is anticipated that in the future, re-zoning of the LLRZ to a more intensive residential zone may occur, should housing demand continue to increase in Wanaka. Based upon the Council's existing ODP Dwelling Capacity Model (**DCM**) it is not anticipated that this re-zoning would need to occur within the life of the PDP, however this assumption will need to be re-tested upon the completion of the updates to the existing ODP DCM and the creation of the PDP DCM ahead of the mapping hearings, and through the actions recently sent out in the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity (which are set out in Council's legal reply).
- 2.5** The third paragraph of the notified Zone Purpose for the LLRZ (11.1) identified that a higher density of lots may be appropriate in some areas. In the s42A report I recommended deletion of this paragraph on the basis that I identified a number of additional areas of the zone which should have a 2000m² minimum net site areas as opposed to the notified 4000m² net site area.

¹ Mr Matthew Paetz' Right of Reply relating to Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction and Chapter 4 – Urban Development.

- 2.6** The Panel asked whether Council has completed any work on whether the proposed LLRZ lot size would easily facilitate subdivision in the future. To my knowledge no work has been done in this regard. Notwithstanding, I did take into account approximate lot size and dwelling size and age in my s42A recommendation regarding the reduction in the minimum net site area of parts of the zone. For example, the existing development in the vicinity of Beacon Point Road in the notified LLRZ has been established with lot sizes of around 4000m². However, the relatively recent construction of very large houses, many of which have evidently high architectural and construction value (schist cladding, bespoke design etc) reduces the likelihood of the majority of these lots from being redeveloped within at least the anticipated life of the PDP.
- 2.7** In considering a 4000m² or 2000m² site without topographical or access constraints, Rule 11.5.2 prescribes a maximum building coverage of 15%, Rule 11.5.4 requires a 10m setback from roads and Rule 11.5.3 prescribes a minimum internal setback of 6m or 4m respectively depending upon the prescribed lot size. Taking these standards into account, I do not consider that development of these lots at their prescribed density would preclude future infill development such as that being proposed within the LDRZ chapter.
- 2.8** Overall, I consider that the proposed LLRZ is differentiated from the Rural Residential zone via its location within the UGB, with much of the zone also provided with connections to Council reticulated water and wastewater services. Furthermore, given my s42A recommendation to reduce the minimum net site area for many areas of the proposed LLRZ to 2000m², this further distinguishes the LLRZ from the Rural Residential zone.
- 2.9** The Panel also questioned the use of 'low density' references within the Zone Purpose (11.1) and suggested that this zone should be differentiated from the Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**) via the use of a more suitable term to describe the anticipated character of the zone. The Panel also identified that the proposed LLRZ covers a number of areas in Wanaka where there is existing residential development and questioned why this is not reflected within the Zone Purpose (11.1).
- 2.10** I have recommended changing the term 'low density' to 'peri-urban' in the Zone Purpose (11.1) in **Appendix 1**. This term is intended to describe the character of the zone on the edge of the suburban area in Wanaka, being lots

of larger size, setbacks and predominance of open space over built form, however not of complete rural or pastoral character.

- 2.11** With regard to the Panel's question as to why the Zone Purpose (11.1) does not acknowledge that the proposed LLRZ covers areas of existing development that have recently been developed under the ODP, in effect legitimising the existing development by creating a zone, I do not consider that it is necessary to do this within a zone purpose statement. I see the Zone purpose as describing the zone and setting out what is and what is not anticipated. I do not consider it necessary to outline the reasons as to why the zone was created.

3. SUBDIVISION OBJECTIVE AND POLICIES

- 3.1** In relation to my s42A report recommendation pertaining to s42A Rule 27.5.1, the Panel requested that I also consider whether any amendments are required to be made to redraft Objective 27.3.3 and redraft Policies 27.3.3.1-2 of Mr Bryce's right of reply on Chapter 27 – Subdivision and Development.
- 3.2** This objective and policies pertain to the LLRZ land between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Road, which under the notified PDP was the only area of the LLRZ that was permitted to have a minimum net site area of 2000m². The objective seeks to recognise and protect the zone's landscape and amenity values. The policies seek to have regard to the impact of development on landscape values and effects of development on slopes, ridges and skylines.
- 3.3** I note that the majority of the recommended s42A LLRZ-B sub-zone is in areas that are surrounded by either LDRZ or ODP Township zoned land and consequently landscape values are not as sensitive. As already discussed in some detail, the LLRZ is within the Wanaka UGB. In my s42A assessment as to the appropriate locations for the proposed LLRZ-B subzone land, I considered the topography and context and avoided recommending those areas that I considered more sensitive, such as the LLRZ located to the north and east of Mt Iron.
- 3.4** As a result, I do not consider that redraft Objective 27.3.3 and redraft Policies 27.3.3.1-2 of Mr Bryce's right of reply need to be amended to include the

additional areas proposed to be included within the LLRZ-B subzone. I have therefore not recommended any additional changes to Chapter 27.

4. BUILDING RESTRICTION AREA

- 4.1** The Panel questioned whether s42A Rule 11.4.8 (redraft Standard 11.5.12) was necessary given that there do not appear to be any Building Restriction Areas (**BRAs**) applicable to the zone. I confirm that within the proposed LLRZ, there are no BRAs identified on the planning maps. There is however a pocket of LLRZ land located at the northern end of Beacon Point Road (Lot 1 DP 325889), a portion of which is proposed to be zoned LLRZ and a BRA is also identified over the remainder of this lot which is proposed as Rural. A submission (142) has been received from the landowners of this site who seek for the LLRZ portion of the land to be extended into the proposed Rural zoning. This proposal will be a matter for consideration during the future mapping hearing; however I recommend that this rule remain as a placeholder in case the submission is supported.
- 4.2** Notwithstanding the above, I note that this rule should be located within the standards table (redraft Standard 11.5.12) and therefore this change is shown within **Appendix 1**.

5. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

- 5.1** The Panel noted that the number of prohibited activities within the LLRZ chapter is less than the other residential chapters and questioned whether this implies that a lower amenity is anticipated within the LLRZ.
- 5.2** It is acknowledged that the LLRZ has a lesser number of prohibited activities than the other residential chapters. This is attributed to the larger lot sizes within the LLRZ allowing more activities to potentially occur without affecting the amenity of neighbouring properties. I note that the default activity status for any activity not expressly identified within Table 11.4 is non-complying. The non-complying test will ensure that consent is only granted for activities which meet s104D of the RMA, and in my view this default status is appropriate rather than adding additional prohibited activities.

6. BUILDING MATERIALS AND COLOUR

6.1 In relation to the "Note" within Standard 11.5.10, the Panel asked whether this is an attempt to incorporate conditions of consents that may have been imposed at a time when a higher standard was required, and if so, why people should have to continue to comply with a restriction imposed under a different planning regime.

6.2 I concur with this concern and recommend the deletion of this note. I however note that the existing conditions of consent or consent notice conditions will still apply unless additional resource consent is granted to change them. The RMA prescribes the process to deal with this situation, and cannot be overridden by a district plan.

7. PROPOSED ADDITIONAL AREAS OF LLRZ-B SUBZONE

7.1 The evidence presented to the Panel by Mr Bullen (47), Ms Blennerhassett (335), Mr Seyb and Mr White on behalf of Land and Infrastructure Management Ltd (812) on 12 October 2016 was in relation to additional areas of the LLRZ that they consider should also be included within the proposed LLRZ-B subzone.

7.2 I do not consider that this evidence raises any additional matters to that already considered within the s42A report, that warrant a change in my recommendation in this regard.

8. SETBACKS FROM ROADS, INTERNAL BOUNDARIES AND WATERBODIES

8.1 The Panel in relation to Standard 11.5.3 questioned what potential reverse sensitivity effects are anticipated as a result of reduced setbacks from internal boundaries. Given the 6m (for the LLRZ-A subzone) and 4m (for LLRZ-B subzone) internal setback distances recommended, I do not anticipate that residential activity would give rise to these potential effects. Furthermore all non-residential uses are listed in Table 11.4 as being discretionary or non-complying activities and consequently, potential reverse sensitivity effects from these activities are covered. As a result, in my opinion the fourth bullet point in the matters of discretion in Standard 11.5.3 could be deleted. Notwithstanding, I have not recommended this change in **Appendix 1** as there

were no submissions received in relation to this point and I consequently do not consider that there is scope to make this amendment.

8.2 The Panel questioned why Standard 11.5.5 in relation to the setback of buildings from waterbodies has a restricted discretionary activity status, whereas Standard 11.5.4 which specifies the road setback requirement has a non-complying activity status.

8.3 From reviewing the two rules, the only reasoning I can find for this difference in activity status is due to the setback for roads being 10m whereas the setback from waterbodies is 20m. In reviewing the wording of both rules further, I do not find any fundamental issues with the difference in the activity status assigned to each. Furthermore, I note that there were no submissions received in relation to this matter.

9. NON-NOTIFICATION

9.1 The Panel identified that Clause 11.6.1 is surplus to requirements as it identifies that all controlled activities can be non-notified, but there are no controlled activities listed within the chapter.

9.2 I have consequently recommended deletion of all of 11.6 in **Appendix 1** as a point of clarification.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 Overall, I consider that the revised chapter as set out in **Appendix 1** is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA.



Amanda Leith
Senior Planner
11 November 2016

APPENDIX 1
11 LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL ZONE REVISED CHAPTER

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Key:

Recommended changes to notified chapter are shown in red underlined text for additions and ~~red strike~~ through text for deletions, Appendix 1 to Right of Reply, dated 11 November 2016.

Recommended changes to notified chapter are shown in underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions. Appendix 1 to section 42A report, dated 14 September 2016.

Note: The provisions relating to Visitor Accommodation, which were withdrawn from the PDP by resolution of Council on 23 October 2015, are not shown in this Revised Chapter.

11 Large Lot Residential

11.1 Zone Purpose

The Large Lot Residential Zone provides low-density peri-urban living opportunities within defined Urban Growth Boundaries. The zone also serves as a buffer between higher density residential areas and rural areas that are located outside of Urban Growth Boundaries.

Comment [AL1]: Clarification

The zone generally provides for a density of one residence every 4000m². Identified areas have a residential density of one residence every 2000m² to provide for a more efficient development pattern to utilise the Council's water and wastewater services while maintaining opportunities for a variety of housing options, landscaping and open space.

~~Being located within the Urban Growth Boundaries, a higher density of allotments could be appropriate in some areas where it would not exceed infrastructure capacity, degrade the established pattern of development or amenity values within established neighbourhoods.~~

Comment [AL2]: Consequential amendment as a result of changes to 11.5.9

The potential adverse effects of buildings are controlled by bulk and location, colour and lighting standards and, where required, design and landscaping controls imposed at the time of subdivision.

Community activities may be appropriate provided the low-density development peri-urban character, and amenity for residents is maintained and there is a demonstrated need to locate in the zone.

Comment [AL3]: Clarification

While development is anticipated in the zone, some areas are subject to natural hazards and, where applicable, it is anticipated that development will recognise and manage the risks of natural hazards at the time of subdivision.

Pursuant to Section 86(b)(3) of the RMA, Rule 11.5.5 has immediate legal effect.

11.2 Objectives and Policies

11.2.1 Objective - High levels of residential amenity within the Large Lot Residential Zone.

Policies

11.2.1.1 Maintain character and amenity through minimum allotment sizes, with particular emphasis on maintaining the character and amenity of established areas.

11.2.1.2 Allow ~~Recognise opportunities for~~ infill and subdivision to higher densities in identified locations and require that any infill and subdivision to higher densities outside of the identified locations maintains providing the amenity, open character and privacy of the area ~~established neighbourhoods are not degraded and opportunities for garden and landscape plantings are retained.~~

Comment [AL4]: Consequential amendment as a result of changes to 11.5.9

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

- 11.2.1.3 Maintain and enhance residential character and high amenity values by controlling the colour, scale, location and height of buildings, and in certain locations or circumstances require landscaping and vegetation controls.
- 11.2.1.4 Control lighting to avoid glare to other properties, roads, public places and the night sky.
- 11.2.1.5 Have regard to fire risk from vegetation and the potential risk to people and buildings, when assessing subdivision, development and any landscaping.

11.2.2 Objective - ~~Ensure the p~~ Predominant land uses are residential and where appropriate, community and recreational activities.

Comment [AL5]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Policies

- 11.2.2.1 Provide for residential and home occupation as permitted activities, and recognise that depending on the location, scale and type, community activities may be compatible with and enhance the environment.
- 11.2.2.2 Commercial development located on the periphery of residential and township areas shall avoid undermining the integrity of the town centres, urban rural edge and where applicable, the Urban Growth Boundaries.
- 11.2.2.3 **Ensure** that any commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants maintain or enhance the amenity, quality and character of the Large Lot Residential Zone and surrounding areas.
- 11.2.2.4 **Avoid** non-residential activity that would undermine the viability of the District's commercial zones.

Comment [SG6]: Renumbering result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions. Notified 11.2.2.4

Comment [SG7]: Renumbering result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions. Notified 11.2.2.5

11.3 Other Provisions and Rules

11.3.1 District Wide Rules

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters. All provisions referred to are within Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan, unless marked as Operative District Plan (ODP).

1 Introduction	2 Definitions	3 Strategic Direction
4 Urban Development	5 Tangata Whenua	6 Landscapes
24 Signs (18 <u>Operative ODP</u>)	25 Earthworks (22 <u>Operative</u>)	26 Historic Heritage
27 Subdivision	28 Natural Hazards	29 Transport (14 <u>Operative</u>)
30 Utilities and Renewable Energy	31 Hazardous Substances (16 <u>Operative</u>)	32 Protected Trees
33 Indigenous Vegetation	34 Wilding Exotic Trees	35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings
36 Noise	37 Designations	Planning Maps

11.3.2 Clarification

Comment [SG8]: Added words, matter of clarification, no change of substance

Advice Notes

- 11.3.2.1 A permitted activity must comply with all the rules listed in the activity and standards tables in this chapter, and any relevant district wide rules.

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

- 11.3.2.2 Compliance with any of the following standards in this chapter, in particular the permitted standards, does not absolve any commitment to the conditions of any relevant land use consent, consent notice or covenant registered on the site's computer freehold register.
- 11.3.2.3 The Council reserves the right to ensure development and building activities are undertaken in accordance with the conditions of resource and subdivision consent through monitoring.
- 11.3.2.4 Applications for building consent for permitted activities shall include information to demonstrate compliance with the following standards, and any conditions of the applicable resource consent or subdivision.
- 11.3.2.5 Where an activity does not comply with a Standard listed in the Standards table, the activity status identified by the 'Non-Compliance Status' column shall apply. Where an activity breaches more than one Standard, the most restrictive status shall apply to the activity.
- 11.3.2.6 The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.

Comment [SG9]: It is suggested this is relocated to under 11.3.2.1, so clarification notes relating to this Chapter are located together

P	Permitted	C	Controlled
RD	Restricted Discretionary	D	Discretionary
NC	Non Complying	PR	Prohibited

11.4 Rules – Activities

Table 1	Activities located in the Large Lot Residential Zone	Activity status
11.4.1	Any other activity not listed in Tables 1-2.	NC
11.4.2	Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat.	P
11.4.3	Recreational Activity.	P
11.4.4	Home occupation.	P
11.4.5 11.4.8	Licensed Premises.	NC
11.4.6 11.4.9	Community activities.	D
11.4.7 11.4.10	Commercial recreation.	D
11.4.8 11.4.11	Any building within a Building Restriction Area that is identified on the planning maps.	NC

Comment [AL10]: 836

Comment [AL11]: 383

Comment [SG12]: Renumbering as a result of withdrawn Visitor Accommodation provisions.

Comment [AL13]: Provision relocated into Table 11.5 as it is a standard

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Table 1	Activities located in the Large Lot Residential Zone	Activity status
<p>11.4.9</p> <p>11.4.12</p> <p><u>11.4.8</u></p>	Panel beating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motor body building.	PR

11.5 Rules - Standards for Activities

Table 2	Standards for Activities	Non-compliance status
11.5.1	<p>Building Height</p> <p>11.5.1.1 A maximum height limit of 8 metres, except:</p> <p>11.5.1.2 A maximum height of 7 metres:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. on sites located between Beacon Point Road and the margins of Lake Wanaka; and</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. on sites located between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive.</p> <p>11.5.1.3 A maximum height of <u>5.5 metres above a floor level of 283 metres reduced level (RL)</u>:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. on the site(s) located at the northern end of Beacon Point Road and adjacent to the western edge of the Penrith Park Zone.</p>	NC
11.5.2	<p>Building Coverage</p> <p>The maximum ground floor area of any building shall be 15% of the net site area.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effect on open space, character and amenity. • Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties. • Visual dominance of buildings. • The ability to provide opportunities for garden plantings and landscaping. 	RD
11.5.3	<p>Setback from internal boundaries</p> <p>a. <u>Large Lot Residential A - The minimum setback of any building from internal boundaries shall be 6 metres, except:</u></p> <p>b. <u>Large Lot Residential B – The minimum setback of any building for internal</u></p>	RD

Comment [AL14]: 142

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Table 2	Standards for Activities	Non-compliance status
	<p>boundaries shall be 4 metres on sites located between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual dominance. • Effects on open space, character and amenity. • Effects on privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties. • Reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties. • Landscaping. 	
11.5.4	<p>Setback from roads</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from a road boundary shall be 10m.</p>	NC
11.5.5	<p>Setback of buildings from water bodies</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from the bed of a river, lake or wetland shall be 20m.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any indigenous biodiversity values. • Visual amenity values. • Landscape character. • Open space. • Whether the waterbody is subject to flooding or natural hazards and any mitigation to manage the location of the building. 	RD
11.5.6	<p>Continuous Building Length</p> <p>The continuous length of any building facade above one-storey ground floor level shall not exceed 20m:</p> <p>Discretion shall be restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which variation in the form of the building including the use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof form, and varied materials and textures, reduces the potential d Dominance of the building taking into account • The extent to which topography or and landscaping and mitigates any dominance impacts. • The extent to which the height of the building influences the dominance of the building in association with the continuous building length. 	RD

Comment [AL15]: 335

Comment [AL16]: 335

Comment [AL17]: Reword from being an assessment matter to a matter of discretion

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Table 2	Standards for Activities	Non-compliance status
11.5.7	<p>Home Occupation</p> <p>Home occupation activities shall comply with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No more than one full time equivalent person from outside the household shall be employed in the home occupation activity. b. The maximum number of vehicle trips* shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy Vehicles: 2 per week. • Other vehicles: 10 per day. c. Maximum net floor area of not more than 60m². d. Activities and the storage of materials shall be indoors. <p>*A vehicle trip is two movements, generally to and from a site.</p>	D
11.5.8	<p>Glare</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All exterior lighting shall be directed away from the adjacent sites and roads and downward to limit effects on the night sky. b. No activity on any site shall result in greater than a 3.0 lux spill (horizontal or vertical) of lights onto any other site measured at any point inside the boundary of the other site. 	D
11.5.9	<p>Residential Density</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Large Lot Residential A - A maximum of one residential unit per 4000m² net site area, except: b. Large Lot Residential B - A maximum of one residential unit per 2000m² net site area on sites located between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive. 	D-NC
11.5.10	<p>Building Materials and Colours</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The surface finish of roofs and walls of buildings, including any structure larger than 5m², new, relocated, altered, re-clad or repainted, shall have a surface finish with a reflectance value not greater than 36%. Except: For sites on Mt Iron located at and above 330 meters above sea level: b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; c. Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%; d. Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%. <p>Note: where any conditions of a relevant subdivision or land use consent require lower reflectance values, those conditions shall prevail.</p> <p>Discretion is reserved to all of the following:</p>	RD

Comment [AL19]: Consequential amendment as a result of rule 11.5.9

Comment [AL18]: 166

Comment [AL20]: Clarification

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Table 2	Standards for Activities	Non-compliance status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the building would be visually prominent of the building, especially in the context of the wider neighbourhood, or whether the building is located on a prominent or elevated position. Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building. The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied. 	
11.5.11	<p>Recession plane</p> <p>The following applies to all sites with a net site area less than 4000m².</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Northern boundary: 2.5m and 55 degrees. Western, and eastern boundaries: 2.5m and 45 degrees. Southern boundary: 2.5m and 35 degrees. Gable end roofs may penetrate the building recession plane by no more than one third of the gable height. Recession planes do not apply to site boundaries fronting a road or a reserve. <p>Note: Refer to the recession planes interpretive diagram in the Definitions Chapter.</p>	NC
11.5.12	<p><u>Any building within a Building Restriction Area that is identified on the planning maps.</u></p>	NC

Comment [AL21]: Reworded to be matters of discretion rather than assessment matters

Comment [AL22]: Relocated from table 11.4

~~11.6 Non-Notification of Applications~~

~~11.6.1 Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited notified.~~

Comment [AL23]: There are no controlled activities listed in the chapter therefore this rule is not required

LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL 11

Chapter 27 – Subdivision and Development

27.5.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, average, less than the minimum specified.

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Residential	Large Lot Residential <u>A</u>	4000m ² 2000m ² in the following locations: • Between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive;
	Large Lot Residential <u>B</u>	2000m ²

Comment [AL24]: 166

Comment [AL25]: 166

APPENDIX 2
SECTION 32AA EVALUATION

Appendix 2

Section 32AA Assessment

Note: The relevant provisions from the revised chapter are set out below, showing additions to the notified text in underlining and deletions in ~~strike through text~~ from the s42A report and recommended changes from the Reply are shown in red underlined text for additions and ~~red strike through text~~ for deletions, (ie as per the revised chapter).

The section 32AA assessment then follows in a separate table underneath each of the provisions.

Updated Standard – 11.5.10

Recommended Updated Standard – 11.5.10 – Restricted Discretionary
<p>Building Materials and Colours</p> <p>a. The surface finish of roofs and walls of buildings, including any structure larger than 5m², new, relocated, altered, re-clad or repainted, shall have a surface finish with a reflectance value not greater than 36%. Except:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For sites on Mt Iron located at and above 330 meters above sea level:</p> <p>b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</p> <p>c. Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%;</p> <p>d. Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p>Note: where any conditions of a relevant subdivision or land use consent require lower reflectance values, those conditions shall prevail.</p> <p>Discretion is reserved to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the building would be visually prominent <u>of the building</u>, especially in the context of the wider neighbourhood, or whether the building is located on a prominent or elevated position. • Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building. • The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk that plan users may look at the PDP as to what is permitted when they are selecting building materials and colours and that these may be inconsistent with those applicable for the lot which have been imposed via a previous resource consent. This could result in costly changes having to be undertaken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deletion will ensure that a consistent rule is applied to all sites across the zone regardless of when they were approved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change represents effectiveness and efficiency through removing confusion and applying the same standard across the zone.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• For those developments which have already obtained resource consent that place more onerous restrictions on building materials and colours, a variation would need to be approved to amend these if the PDP restrictions are less onerous.		
--	--	--

APPENDIX 3

UPDATED LIST OF SUBMISSION POINTS WITH RECOMMENDED DECISION

Original Point Number	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
3.2		Alistair Munro		Oppose	Rezone the thin strip of Rural General land with a Building Restriction Overlay, as shown on Planning Map 20, located , between Lots 3, 4 and 5 DP900734 and Peak View Ridge, to Large Lot Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1285.2	Nic Blennerhassett		Support	Supports the submitter's request and agrees that along with the adjacent LLR zoned areas this solution will maintain a 'green belt' between current and future LDR zones.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1307.2	The Agamemnon Trust		Oppose	the Trust seeks to have the submission disallowed by Council		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1311.2	Crescent Investments Limited		Oppose	That the submission of Alistair Munro and the proposed removal of the building restriction area and rezoning of the land from Rural to Large Lot Residential is rejected in its entirety.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1326.2	Kirimoko Park Residents Association Inc.		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the submission of Alistair Munro and the proposed removal of the building restriction area and rezoning of the land from Rural to Large Lot Residential is rejected in its entirety.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1334.2	Otto Dogterom		Support	The submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.2	FS1335.2	Patricia and Barry Andrews		Support	The submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4		Alistair Munro		Support	Approve the proposed Large Lot Residential zone to the north of Studholme Road shown in Maps 22 and 23.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4	FS1012.2	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4	FS1311.4	Crescent Investments Limited		Oppose	That the submission of Alistair Munro and the proposed removal of the building restriction area and rezoning of the land from Rural to Large Lot Residential is rejected in its entirety.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4	FS1326.4	Kirimoko Park Residents Association Inc.		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the submission of Alistair Munro and the proposed removal of the building restriction area and rezoning of the land from Rural to Large Lot Residential is rejected in its entirety.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4	FS1334.4	Otto Dogterom		Support	The submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
3.4	FS1335.4	Patricia and Barry Andrews		Support	The submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
47.2		Peter Bullen		Support	Confirm the Large Lot Residential Zone and zoning as shown on Planning Map 22.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
47.2	FS1012.14	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
47.3		Peter Bullen		Support	Confirm the Large Lot Residential Zone and zoning as shown on Planning Map 22.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
47.3	FS1012.15	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
50.1		Terry Drayton		Oppose	refer to point 9.3 -		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
65.7		John Blennerhassett		Support	Adopt rezoning of land between Meadowstone Drive and Studholme Road as shown on Maps 22 to Large Lot Residential and Low Density Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
65.7	FS1012.11	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
69.1		Terence Hetherington		Support	Supports the proposed changes to large lot residential. That section 11 changes to the district plan be accepted.	Accept in Part		See entire s42A report
78.5		Jennie Blennerhassett		Support	Adopt rezoning of land between Meadowstone Drive and Studholme Road as shown on Maps 22 & 23.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

78.5	FS1012.25	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
87.7		Shelley McMeeken		Support	Adopt rezoning of land between Meadowstone Drive and Studholme Road as shown on Planning Maps 22 & 23.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
87.7	FS1012.32	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
111.3		Iain Weir		Support	Approve the change from Rural Lifestyle to Low Density Residential at 28C Studholme Road but keep the existing Visitor Accommodation subzone in place.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
113.2		Neil Matchett		Support	Confirm the land west of Far Horizons be confirmed as Large Lot Residential and that this area be within the Urban Growth Boundary as notified in the Proposed District Plan.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
117.5		Maggie Lawton	11.2.1.2	Other	Clarify the intention for the zones and adhere to them.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
142.1		as trustees of the Anzac Trust		Other	Submitter owns property at 361 Beacon Point Road. Part of this land is zoned as LLR with the remainder zoned rural with a building restriction. The area of the LLR zone land is less than 4000m2 and would prevent a two lot subdivision. Requests that the area to be zoned LLR should be altered as shown on the maps attached to the submission so that a two lot subdivision (each with one residence) would be a permitted activity.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
249.25		Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	The Large Lot Residential boundary at Studholme Road/West Meadows Drive should be amended as per Attachment 2 of the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
249.25	FS1193.2	Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust		Oppose	The proposed rezoning, and the proposed amendment to the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary are not suitable to achieve the sustainable management of the land. We seek that all of the relief sought be declined.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
253.2		Wanaka Lakes Health Centre		Oppose	That the zoning of the Wanaka Lake Health Centre (Lot 1 DP 410739) as shown on Map 23 be amended from Large Lot Residential to Local Shopping Centre. The health centre is not to be used for Large Lot Residential. Considers the most appropriate zone for the health centre site would be to extend the proposed Local Shopping Centre Zone northwards to cover the site and perhaps the hospital site to the north.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
253.2	FS1101.2	Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village		Support	The Local Shopping Centre zone better reflects the usage of the Wanaka Lakes Health Centre and the Aspiring Enliven Care Centre than the proposed Large Lot Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
322.1		Murray Stewart Blennerhassett		Support	To allow existing lots in this area, as well as planned subdivisions, to be allowed down to the lower limit of the proposed LLR zoning (2000 m2) either immediately or perhaps deferred for 7 or 10 years as with the first stages of the NorthLake subdivision. That services provision should be anticipated to a eventual LDR zoning density, the rezoning of which itself should be anticipated for the next District Plan Review.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1110.3	John Coe		Support	Those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1126.3	Anna Mills		Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1140.3	Jo Mills		Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1198.3	Myflie James		Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1207.3	Bridget Mary Rennie		Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sqm is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
322.1	FS1332.3	Nick Mills		Support	That parts submissions that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in large lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
335.17		Nic Blennerhassett		Support	Support the Large Lot Residential zoning shown on maps 22 and 23.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.11		Sean & Jane McLeod		Oppose	That any land zoned for large lot residential be changed to low density residential		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.11	FS1111.7	Colin Mantel		Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
502.17		Allenby Farms Limited		Not Stated	Amend Chapter 11 Large Lot Residential by adding the provision detailed in Appendix 6 attached to this submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
687.2		Lynden Cleugh		Other	Adopt the submission by Land & Infrastructure Management Ltd (LIM) which seeks an increased density within the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
687.2	FS1111.2	Colin Mantel		Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1

687.2	FS1207.5	Bridget Mary Rennie		Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sqm is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
709.2		Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village		Oppose	Add a new Objective 11. 2.3 as follows: <u>77.2.3 Objective - Manage the development of land within noise affected environments to ensure mitigation of noise and reverse sensitivity effects.</u>		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
709.2	FS1111.9	Colin Mantel		Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
709.2	FS1207.7	Bridget Mary Rennie		Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sqm is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
709.2	FS1212.2	Wanaka Lakes Health Centre		Support	The Local Shopping Centre zone better reflects the usage of the Wanaka Lakes Health Centre and the Aspiring Enliven Care Centre than the proposed Large Lot Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
166.4		Aurum Survey Consultants	11.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Review density of the zone. Questions how this zone is any different to rural residential? Large lot res needs to have a point of difference so a density of one dwelling per 2000m ² across the entire zone would make more sense.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1110.1	John Coe	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1111.5	Colin Mantel	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1126.1	Anna Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1140.1	Jo Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1198.1	Myffie James	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1207.1	Bridget Mary Rennie	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sqm is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.4	FS1332.1	Nick Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That parts submissions that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in large lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28		Queenstown Lakes District Council	11.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following sentence to the end of the third paragraph: " <u>Given that the zone is located within the Urban Growth Boundary, the possibility exists that the zoning may be changed in the future to accommodate a higher density of development than currently contemplated.</u> "	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28	FS1110.6	John Coe	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28	FS1126.6	Anna Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28	FS1140.6	Jo Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28	FS1198.6	Myffie James	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
383.28	FS1332.6	Nick Mills	11.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That parts submissions that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in large lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
719.76		NZ Transport Agency	11.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	Add a policy to 7.2.10 Objective as follows: 11.2.3.1 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within the State highway noise effects area shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2707:2000.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 3
719.77		NZ Transport Agency	11.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	Add a new Rule 11.5.4.1 as follows: 11.5.4.1 For buildings located adjacent to a State highway. Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within: 80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or .40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h. Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ 707:2000.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 3

383.29		Queenstown Lakes District Council	11.4 Rules – Activities	Other	Amend to delete "residential flat"	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 4
293.4		Murray Fraser	11.4.2	Support	The ability to establish dwellings, residential units and residential flats as a permitted activity will eliminate unnecessary costs (time and money) for the developer and Council.	Accept		See entire s42A report
438.23		New Zealand Fire Service	11.4.9	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		See entire s42A report
438.24		New Zealand Fire Service	11.5.1	Other	The NZFS wishes to exempt drying towers from this rule. Amend to state: <u>Exemption: Fire station towers are exempt from this rule</u>	Reject		These are appropriate matters for assessment as part of a resource consent process
335.19		Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.1.2	Support	Supports the height limit.	Accept		See entire s42A report
293.2		Murray Fraser	11.5.2	Oppose	Seek that Rule 11.5.2 which relates to maximum building coverage be amended to 30% to reflect the requested reduction to the minimum lot size for the Large Lot Residential zone.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 2
438.25		New Zealand Fire Service	11.5.2	Not Stated	The NZFS wishes to exempt fire stations from this rule. Amend to state: <u>Exemption: Fire stations are exempt from this rule</u>	Reject		These are appropriate matters for assessment as part of a resource consent process
812.2		Land & Infrastructure Management Limited	11.5.2	Oppose	Building coverage should be amended to 30%.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 2
117.17		Maggie Lawton	11.5.3	Other	Clarify the intention for the zones and adhere to them.	Reject		Restricted discretionary activity status prescribes the matters of discretion for reduced setbacks via resource consent.
142.3		as trustees of the Anzac Trust	11.5.3	Support	Submitter owns property at 361 Beacon Point Road. Part of this land is zoned as LLR with the remainder zoned rural with a building restriction. Notes that the existing residence has a building height restriction of RL288.50 mean sea level (datum code DUNEHT 1958). Due to site instability issues, submitter notes that a building height limit "off the ground" would leave uncertainty as to the built height of any new residence. Requests that the building height limit should be set at a specified RL, and the building height limit for any new residence should be RL288.50 mean sea level (datum code DUNEHT 1958).	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 2
335.20		Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.3	Support	Support the reduced setback of 4m.	Accept		See entire s42A report
719.78		NZ Transport Agency	11.5.4	Not Stated	Add a new Rule 11.5.4.1 as follows: 11.5.4.1 For buildings located adjacent to a State highway. Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within: 80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or 40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h. Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZS 707:2000.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 3
810.33		Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua	11.5.5	Not Stated	Setback of buildings from water bodies: Add a further matter of discretion: Manawhenua values.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 2
335.22		Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.6	Oppose	The continuous building length of 20m above one storey (11.5.6) is unduly permissive and should be reconsidered.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 2
9.3		Terry Drayton	11.5.9	Oppose	Zone the land along Studholme Road as rural residential with a minimum lot size of 4000msq not 2000msq and introduce a greenbelt the length of studholme rd on both sides before any further compromise is made on the nature of this unique rural area. Also to extend this greenbelt along Orchard Rd		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
9.3	FS1012.4	Willowridge Developments Limited	11.5.9	Oppose	That the submission to rezone land around Studholme Road as Rural Residential is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
9.3	FS1285.3	Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.9	Oppose	Opposes to the submitter's request and suggests that the minimum lot size for LLR throughout the district should be 2000 m ² , not 4000 m ² because the RR zone already caters for the larger lot size.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
15.1		John Blennerhassett	11.5.9	Other	The density of 2000msq allotment sizes along Studholme Road a permitted activity.	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 1
74.5		QLDC rates payer	11.5.9	Support	Confirm Rule 27.5.1 as it relates to the 2000m2 minimum lot area for land between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive, Large Lot Residential Zone as shown on Planning map 18.	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 1
74.5	FS1012.20	Willowridge Developments Limited	11.5.9	Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
78.4		Jennie Blennerhassett	11.5.9	Support	Confirm Rule 27.5.1 as it relates to the 2000m2 minimum lot area for land between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive in the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 1
78.4	FS1012.24	Willowridge Developments Limited	11.5.9	Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1

87.4		Shelley McMeeken	11.5.9	Support	Adopt Rule 27.5.1 as it relates to the 2000m2 minimum lot area for land between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive.	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 1
87.4	FS1012.29	Willowridge Developments Limited	11.5.9	Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
87.5		Shelley McMeeken	11.5.9	Support	Confirm Rule 27.5.1 as it relates to the 2000m2 minimum lot area for land between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive, in the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Accept		Refer Issue Reference 1
87.5	FS1012.30	Willowridge Developments Limited	11.5.9	Oppose	That the submission to approve the proposed large lot residential land to the north of Studholme Road is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land [submission 249.17]	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3		Murray Fraser	11.5.9	Oppose	Seek the minimum lot size within the Large Lot Residential Zone is reduced from 4000m ² to 2000m ² as 4000m ² is too restrictive and is the same as the minimum lot size for the Rural Residential zone. The creation of the Large Lot Residential Zone provides the opportunity to transition from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential. This would provide for the community's economic and cultural well being.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1110.2	John Coe	11.5.9	Support	Those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1111.4	Colin Mantel	11.5.9	Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1126.2	Anna Mills	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1140.2	Jo Mills	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1198.2	Myffie James	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1207.2	Bridget Mary Rennie	11.5.9	Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sq is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
293.3	FS1332.2	Nick Mills	11.5.9	Support	That parts submissions that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in large lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
299.1		Permanent Wanaka resident 32yrs	11.5.9	Other	That the large lot residential sections in Aubrey Road and in close proximity to Anderson Road be allowed for increased density but restricting the number of dwellings on a 4000sq metre section to two only with the maximum building platform of both dwellings combined not to exceed 1000sq metres.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
335.16		Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.9	Oppose	Oppose the 4000m ² and make the minimum lot size 2000m ² .	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1		Land & Infrastructure Management Limited	11.5.9	Not Stated	Seek a reduction of the minimum lot size within the Large Lot Residential Zone from 4000m2 to 2000m2.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1110.5	John Coe	11.5.9	Support	Those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1111.1	Colin Mantel	11.5.9	Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1126.5	Anna Mills	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1140.5	Jo Mills	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1198.5	Myffie James	11.5.9	Support	Seeks that those parts of the submission that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in Large Lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1207.6	Bridget Mary Rennie	11.5.9	Support	States that land is less than 1km from Town Centre, therefore can no longer be regarded Rural. Believes that 4000sq is too large to consider due to the expensive up keep. Suggests that there could be a different Rural residential (4000m2) and a large lot (2000m2) with enough space to plant trees and be away from neighborhoods, in order to maintain tranquility and birdlife.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
812.1	FS1332.5	Nick Mills	11.5.9	Support	That parts submissions that support reducing the minimum lot sizes in large lot Residential from 4,000m2 to 2,000m2 be allowed	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
117.18		Maggie Lawton	11.5.10	Support	Clarify the intention for the zones and adhere to them.	Reject		Refer Issue Reference 1
335.21		Nic Blennerhassett	11.5.11	Support	Supports the recession plane rule.	Accept		See entire s42A report
293.1		Murray Fraser	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Oppose	Seek the minimum lot size within the Large Lot Residential Zone is reduced from 4000m ² to 2000m ² as 4000m ² is too restrictive and is the same as the minimum lot size for the Rural Residential zone. The creation of the Large Lot Residential Zone provides the opportunity to transition from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential. This would provide for the community's economic and cultural well being.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1

166.10		Aurum Survey Consultants	27.5.1	Oppose	Amend the minimum lot sizes: High Density - no minimum Low Density Residential - 300m ² Large Lot Residential - 2000m ² across the zone Rural Lifestyle - reject capping average calculations at 4 hectares.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
166.10	F51111.6	Colin Mantel	27.5.1	Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1
335.30		Nic Blennerhassett	27.5.1	Other	Make the minimum allotment size in the Large Lot Residential zone 2000m ² .	Accept in Part		Refer Issue Reference 1