

**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**

8 MEDIUM DENSITY 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. LOCATION OF THE MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE	2
3. MDRZ CHARACTER	3
4. DENSITY	4
5. DESIGN GUIDELINES AND URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY	6
6. OBJECTIVE 8.2.4 AND ASSOCIATED POLICIES	6
7. GARAGES	7
8. SETBACKS	8
9. ACTIVITY STATUS	9
10. WALKWAY ADJOINING SCURR HEIGHTS	13
11. HOME OCCUPATION	15
12. COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES	15
13. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	16
14. NON-NOTIFICATION	16
15. OUTDOOR STORAGE	17
16. NATURAL HAZARDS MATTER OF DISCRETION	17
17. ARROWTOWN HISTORIC MANAGEMENT TRANSITION OVERLAY AREA	17
18. CONCLUSION	18

Appendix 1 – Updated revised chapter

Appendix 2 – Additional section 32AA evaluation of the additional recommended changes

Appendix 3 – Updated list of submission points with recommended decision

Appendix 4 – Economic Review of Medium Density Level Provisions by Philip Osborne

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Amanda Jane Leith. I prepared the section 42A report for the Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) 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) location of the MDRZ;
 - (b) MDRZ Character;
 - (c) density;
 - (d) design guidelines and urban design strategy;
 - (e) objective 8.2.4 and associated policies;
 - (f) garages;
 - (g) setbacks;
 - (h) activity status;
 - (i) walkway adjoining Scurr Heights;
 - (j) home occupation;
 - (k) commercial activities;
 - (l) community activities;
 - (m) non-notification;
 - (n) bulk material storage;
 - (o) natural hazards matter of discretion; and
 - (p) Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area.
- 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 subdivision 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. I have also attached an economic review of the

MDRZ provisions by Philip Osborne in **Appendix 4**, which I have read and considered.

1.5 I have provided a summary of the character of the MDRZ in section 2 of my reply evidence for the Low Density Residential Zone.

1.6 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. LOCATION OF THE MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

2.1 In relation to Objective 8.2.1 which outlines where the MDRZ is to be located in the District, the Hearings Panel (**Panel**) questioned whether this provision could be more generic given that Policy 8.2.1.1 essentially repeats the wording in the objective. I have recommended a change to Objective 8.2.1 to emphasise that the MDRZ is to be located close to employment centres or public transport routes to encourage the use of non-motorised forms of transportation or public transportation in Queenstown. Policy 8.2.1.1 now follows Objective 8.2.1 in being more specific and giving effect to the objective, and is a matter of clarification.

2.2 The Panel also noted that the policies under Objective 8.2.1 generally do not give effect to the location aspect of the objective. With the recommended amendment to Objective 8.2.1 outlined above, I consider that Policy 8.2.1.1 now gives effect to this objective. I agree that s42A Policy 8.2.1.2 does not give effect to the objective however and consider it better suited to sit under Objective 8.2.2; consequently I recommend its relocation (redraft Policy 8.2.2.7).

2.3 With regard to redraft Policy 8.2.1.2 (notified Policy 8.2.1.4), I consider that clarifying that the outward spread of residential growth *'away from employment*

centres' provides a link back to Objective 8.2.1. In addition, I also accept the Panel's comment in relation to redraft Policy 8.2.1.2, in that the MDRZ is proposed as only one method of a number proposed to contribute toward minimising urban sprawl. Consequently, I have clarified this within the policy also. These recommended amendments are included within the attached **Appendix 1**.

3. MDRZ CHARACTER

- 3.1** On 11 October the Panel in relation to Objective 8.2.2 asked that I further consider the wording '*positively responds*' in the context of whether the objective is seeking to maintain the existing amenity values of areas, or to bring about new amenity values. I accept that the wording of the objective does not provide this certainty and that it is imperative that it does. I note that notified Objective 8.2.4 originally attempted to address this matter through inclusion of '*provide reasonable protection of amenity values, within the context of an increasingly intensified suburban zone where character is changing and higher density housing is sought*', however I recommended its modification in the s42A report¹ in line with the submission received from Reddy Group Limited (699).
- 3.2** The majority of the proposed MDRZ has been identified over developed residential land. The proposed change in zoning to MDRZ is anticipated to result in redevelopment of sites in line with the density permitted by the MDRZ which will bring about changes within these established residential areas. I expect that these changes will predominantly be to do with housing typology and a reduction in the space around dwellings that is provided for in the current operative zones. Consequently, I recommend that Objective 8.2.2 be amended to clarify the nature of the environment to which development is intended to contribute, by including the words '*planned medium density character of the area*'. I consider that this wording signals to PDP readers that a change in the character of an area is anticipated; however that development is expected to contribute positively through high quality urban design.
- 3.3** The Panel also noted that the policies associated with Objective 8.2.2 are all primarily in relation to the effects upon the public realm rather than adjoining sites. Upon further review of these policies I accept the Panel's point and

¹ At paragraphs 10.36 - 10.37 of the s42A Report dated 14 September 2016.

consider that these are predominantly addressing effects upon the street. Furthermore, I consider that redraft Objective 8.2.3 relates to the effects of developments upon the amenity of adjoining sites. As both aspects are covered in the objectives, I do not consider it necessary to make any additional amendments to the objectives in this regard. Although Objective 8.2.2 refers to 'site', I consider that the design of a development and its impact upon the street needs to take into account the features of the 'site' and consequently, this is still of relevance.

- 3.4 With regard to redraft Objective 8.2.3, I consider that this could also be further amended to identify that the character of the zone will change as areas develop into medium density environments. Consequently, I recommend the wording be amended to reflect this. I note that this change better reflects the notified wording of the objective. These changes are detailed within **Appendix 1**.

4. DENSITY

- 4.1 The Panel requested confirmation as to which objectives and policies the site and density rules are derived from.
- 4.2 I consider that Objective 8.2.1 outlines the locational aspects of the MDRZ. This objective also specifies that '*medium density development*' is anticipated; however is no more specific than this. Notwithstanding, given the recommended amendment to the activity status of Rule 8.5.5 (discussed below), I consider that a corresponding policy to support Objective 8.2.1 should also have been recommended to identify the locations that higher densities are encouraged within.
- 4.3 Recommended redraft Objective 8.2.3 now outlines that a '*medium density character*' is anticipated and seeks to ensure that reasonable protection of the amenity of adjoining sites occurs. I consider that an additional policy (redraft Policy 8.2.3.4) in relation to density should also sit under this objective to ensure that increased densities still protect the anticipated future amenity and character of the zone.
- 4.4 These recommended new policies are set out in **Appendix 1**. I consider that the scope to recommend these amendments is provided by the Wanaka Trust

(536) and the Estate of Norma Kreft (512) submissions which sought a change to the activity status of Rule 8.5.5 to allow increased density via restricted discretionary activity as opposed to the non-complying activity status that was notified.

Maximum lot area / Minimum site density

- 4.5** In the s42A report I recommended a minimum site density (s42A Rule 8.5.5.2) and maximum lot area (s42A Rule 27.6.1) for the greenfield MDRZ areas in Frankton² and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road (Scurr Heights). The foundation for this recommendation was the submission made by Ballantyne Investments Limited (620) which stated that development within the MDRZ should be maximised to reduce urban sprawl.
- 4.6** On 21 October 2016, submission 620 was withdrawn. As a result of this withdrawal, I no longer have scope to recommend a minimum site density or maximum lot area. I have accordingly recommended deletion of redraft Rule 8.5.5.2 and redraft Rule 27.6.1 in **Appendix 1**.
- 4.7** Although there is no longer scope, in my opinion, I still consider that the maximisation of the land resource is an important matter, as is the diversity of housing product being developed and housing affordability which are both impacted by this factor.
- 4.8** Notwithstanding, I accept the concerns raised by Universal Developments (177) in their evidence to the Panel on 12 October 2016 in relation to these rules and the resulting burdens that would occur on the Scurr Heights MDRZ land as a result. In particular the submitter outlined that the proposed rules would not achieve their intended outcome given the topography of the site and stormwater requirements. I note that the Frankton MDRZ also has varied topography and similar stormwater issues, as well as having transmission lines running through the land.
- 4.9** Consequently, given the recommended rules only relate to these areas of the MDRZ and the issues highlighted, I consider that the deletion of s42A Rule

2 Consideration of this recommendation in relation to Frankton was deferred by the Chair to the mapping hearing

8.5.5.2 and s42A Rule 27.6.1 will not result in a significant impact upon the total dwelling capacity of the zone.

5. DESIGN GUIDELINES AND URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY

5.1 S42A Policy 8.2.2.6 related to development taking into account any design guidelines or strategies applicable to the area in the design of a development. The Jandel Trust (717) and FII Holdings (847) opposed this policy on the basis that there is no certainty to landowners in referring to documents that are formed outside of the planning process. In the s42A report I responded to these submissions recommending that '*Council adopted*' be included within the policy.³

5.2 Since this time, Council has resolved on 27 September 2016 to include design guidelines for the MDRZ within the Stage 2 PDP work. I have been advised that at the time when these are to be adopted, they will require a variation to be adopted by reference into the MDRZ chapter (as the Arrowtown Design Guidelines are currently).⁴ Consequently, as there are currently no adopted design guidelines or strategies applicable to the MDRZ to adopt via reference, I recommend deletion of this policy and note that in the future there may be a variation to include guidelines as a matter of consideration into Chapter 8.

6. OBJECTIVE 8.2.4 AND ASSOCIATED POLICIES

6.1 The Panel identified that s42A Policies 8.2.4.1 and 8.2.6.1 (redraft Rule 8.2.5.1) were very similar in the outcome they seek to achieve. I agree with the Panel in this regard and prefer the more specific wording of s42A Policy 8.2.6.1 (redraft Rule 8.2.5.1) and consequently recommend deletion of s42A Policy 8.2.4.1.

6.2 The Panel also noted that s42A Policy 8.2.4.2 is similar to Policy 8.2.2.1. I consider that the content of s42A Policy 8.2.4.2 also overlaps with Policy 8.2.2.2. These policies are all seeking to encourage pedestrian use of streets through adding interest within the streetscape as well as maintaining safety through crime prevention through environmental design (**CPTED**) methods. As a consequence, I have recommended that s42A Policy 8.2.4.2 be deleted.

3 At paragraph 10.49 of the s42A report dated 14 September 2016

4 Variation 1 to the PDP, stream 6A, heard on 7 November 2016

- 6.3** I also acknowledge that s42A Policy 8.2.6.1 (redraft Policy 8.2.5.1) does not specify that it is only connections to adjacent transport links and networks that is sought. This could therefore lead, as the Panel questioned, to requests for contributions to tracks further afield. Consequently, as a matter of clarification I have recommended inclusion of the word '*adjacent*' into the policy.
- 6.4** Upon review of the remaining two policies under s42A Objective 8.2.4, I note that I recommended amendments to these provisions in the s42A report⁵ to clarify that they were intended to only apply to non-residential activities as they relate to on-site provision of bike parking and protecting public health and safety through utilising CPTED methods. As these are intended to only relate to non-residential activities, I recommend their relocation to sit under redraft Objective 8.2.7. I also recommend deletion of s42A Objective 8.2.4 as I consider that its intent is covered through the other remaining chapter provisions. These recommendations are included within **Appendix 1**.

7. GARAGES

- 7.1** Having heard the evidence of Mr Greaves on behalf of D Barton (269), Plaza Investments Ltd (551) and Varina Propriety Ltd (591) and Mr Williams on behalf of Mount Crystal Ltd (150) and Universal Developments Ltd (177) in relation to Policy 8.2.2.3, I agree with their evidence. However, I also consider that the width and design of the garage should also be taken into account. This policy will consequently align with the other provisions relating to garages in redraft Rules 8.5.8.1(b) and 8.5.14. The recommended changes to the policy are identified in **Appendix 1**.
- 7.2** In relation to redraft Rule 8.5.8.1(b) the Hearings Panel questioned what the purpose of the 4.5m setback distance for garages from the road is. The intended purpose as outlined within Mr Falconer's urban design evidence⁶ was to allow a vehicle to be parked in the driveway in front of the garage. The Panel subsequently questioned whether this is suitable from a transportation safety standpoint.

5 At paragraph 10.40 of the s42A report dated 14 September 2016

6 At paragraph 4.33 of Mr Falconer's statement of evidence dated 14 September 2016

- 7.3 I note that Mr Williams in his evidence sought to amend the recommended 4.5m setback distance to instead state:

Garages shall not protrude forward of the front line of the dwelling.

- 7.4 I have discussed the proposed 4.5m distance with Council's Principal Resource Management Engineer, Mr David Wallace. Whilst the proposed 4.5m setback distance will not enable all vehicles (such as vans) to be wholly contained on-site in a driveway, Council's road formation standards for residential areas generally require a 700mm wide grass berm within the road reserve alongside the road boundary and a footpath beyond. This 700mm berm provides a buffer for longer vehicles that are parked within driveways without unduly obstructing footpaths. Consequently and taking a pragmatic view, the 4.5m setback will in most instances provide for the parking of vehicles within the driveway without issue.

- 7.5 Whilst I acknowledge Mr Williams' suggestion and have seen similar provisions utilised elsewhere successfully, I retain my recommendation in relation to the 4.5m setback distance for garages not only for the relief it will potentially provide in the built form as it is viewed from the street, but also to allow the parking of vehicles within the driveway.

- 7.6 In relation to redraft Standard 8.5.14, the Panel noted that if the outcome is to prevent the dominance of garages over the built form on the site then the use of a proportion of the site frontage may not work. Upon further consideration, I agree that the use of a proportion of the front façade width may be a better measure. Consequently, I have recommended changes to this effect in **Appendix 1**. I consider that the submission from M Lawton (117) provides the scope to make this change.

8. SETBACKS

- 8.1 The Panel questioned how terrace housing is being promoted within the rules when Rule 8.5.8 requires setbacks between each house or building. Rule 8.5.8 is that the setback distances apply to boundaries and not between residential units on the same site. Therefore I have not recommended any amendments in this regard.

8.2 With regard to redraft Rule 8.5.13, the Panel queried whether this standard is required within the MDRZ chapter as it is replicated in Chapter 36. From a review of the Right of Reply for Chapter 30 – Energy and Utilities, I found that redraft Rule 30.4.29⁷ would apply, however that the setback requirement for residential units is not clear. Consequently, I recommend that redraft Rule 8.5.13 is retained within the chapter.

9. ACTIVITY STATUS

9.1 Ms Rennie on behalf of the Estate of Norma Kreft (512) and the Wanaka Trust (536) presented evidence in relation to the activity status of the standards pertaining to:

- (a) building height;
- (b) density;
- (c) building coverage;
- (d) recession planes;
- (e) landscaped permeable surface; and
- (f) minimum boundary setbacks.

9.2 In summary, Ms Rennie supports a restricted discretionary activity status for all of the abovementioned standards, on the basis that a restricted discretionary activity status is the appropriate test for consideration of the benefits of a design and it will facilitate more flexibility and encourage a range of housing typologies.

9.3 I also note that I have read Ms Rennie's supplementary evidence provided to the Panel following the hearing, in which Ms Rennie recommends further amendments to the provisions within the MDRZ chapter.

Building Height

9.4 With regard to building height, I note that Ms Rennie recommends inclusion of reference to "*two to three storeys*" within the Zone Purpose (8.1) and within the new policy she proposes in her supplementary evidence. The s32 report and also the notified MDRZ chapter is specific regarding the two storey height

⁷ Mr Craig Barr's Right of Reply dated 22 September 2016

anticipated within the proposed MDRZ. On page 49 of the s32 report the reason for this is explained:⁸

..building height remains limited to 2 storeys and is consistent with the expectations for a residential environment.

- 9.5** Notwithstanding the above, I do note that notified Policy 8.2.1.3 outlined that more than two storeys may be possible "*on some sloping sites where the development is able to comply with all other standards (including recession planes, setbacks, density and building coverage)*". However, given the policy was very specific as to the exact scenario in which additional storey(s) may be supported, I recommended deletion of this policy within the s42A report⁹ as a result of the submission of the Reddy Group Ltd (699).
- 9.6** I do anticipate that in some instances, such as sloping sites, that additional height may be acceptable; however I consider that the intention of the MDRZ as notified was to maintain a predominantly two storey built form character across the zone. I also consider that the instances where greater than two storeys is acceptable will be the exception to the rule and do not anticipate this to occur across the zone. As a result, I recommend retention of the notified non-complying activity status for building height (Rule 8.5.1).
- 9.7** Should the Panel be minded to support the restricted discretionary activity status for building height, in light of many of the submissions received, I consider that some specific areas of the proposed MDRZ may be more sensitive than others to additional height. For example, Arrowtown and Wanaka due to their unique characteristics including heritage character (Arrowtown) and the existing low building heights and flat topography (Wanaka MDRZ located adjacent to the town centre). Consequently, a split activity status may be beneficial.

Density

- 9.8** As a result of the recommendation to delete the Homestar density incentive, I recommended in the s42A report that the 250m² minimum net site area per

8 The s32 report is contained in Appendix 3 to the s42A report dated 14 September 2016

9 At paragraph 10.114 of the s42A report dated 14 September 2016

residential unit be retained but the activity status be changed from non-complying to discretionary.¹⁰

- 9.9** Upon considering Ms Rennie's evidence in relation to the activity status of Rule 8.5.5, I concur that a restricted discretionary activity status would better reflect the increased density and varied housing typologies that are sought within the zone. I also note that this approach aligns with some of the questions posed by the Panel in relation to whether a maximum density is really required within the zone and whether the built form standards could be sufficient. I still consider that a minimum net site area needs to be applied, however that a restricted discretionary activity status would provide certainty to developers, residents and plan administrators as to what is required to be assessed and what may be acceptable.
- 9.10** Ms Rennie has recommended a number of matters of discretion and assessment matters in her supplementary evidence in relation to Rule 8.5.5. I noted in my summary of evidence that assessment matters are not currently utilised within the residential chapters, with reliance instead being placed upon the use of both broad and fine grained policy to guide outcomes. In order to be consistent, I have amended Ms Rennie's recommended provisions to only apply matters of discretion. These recommended changes are shown in Standard 8.5.5 in **Appendix 1**.
- 9.11** To correspond with this recommendation I have also recommended two new policies in relation to increased densities which I have outlined above (redraft Policies 8.2.1.3 and 8.2.3.4).

Building Coverage, Recession Planes, Boundary Setbacks

- 9.12** Upon consideration of Ms Rennie's evidence presented to the Panel in relation to Rules 8.5.4: Building Coverage, 8.5.6: Recession Planes and 8.5.8: Minimum Boundary Setbacks I also concur with Ms Rennie that a restricted discretionary activity status would be the most efficient and flexible activity status to promote both good urban design outcomes and to allow consideration of alternatives which may mitigate potential adverse effects upon neighbouring properties. Consequently, I have consequently recommended

¹⁰ At paragraphs 9.47 - 9.51 of the s42A report dated 14 September 2016

that this activity status be amended from non-complying to restricted discretionary in redraft Rules 8.5.4, 8.5.6 and 8.5.8 in **Appendix 1**.

- 9.13** As above, Ms Rennie has recommended a number of matters of discretion and assessment matters for these rules in her supplementary evidence. I have amended these to only apply to matters of discretion.
- 9.14** In addition to the matters that Ms Rennie recommends within the matters of discretion or assessment matters, for all of these standards I have recommended inclusion of a matter of discretion pertaining to consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 for developments within Arrowtown. This recommendation aligns with the matters of discretion in notified Rule 8.4.11 and I consider it to be of relevance given that breaches of these standards within the Arrowtown context need to be assessed in the context of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. Furthermore, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 include provisions relating to all of these built form standards.
- 9.15** To correspond with the above recommendation to incorporate the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a matter of discretion and given that assessment matters are not being utilised within the chapter, I also recommend amendments to redraft Policies 8.2.4.1 and 8.2.4.3 to strengthen these policies and better align them with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016.
- 9.16** I consider that the submissions of the Wanaka Trust (536) and the Estate of Norma Kreft (512), which sought the change in activity status for these standards to restricted discretionary, provides scope for these recommended changes, as do the submissions received requesting the application of strict design controls in Arrowtown (D Clarke (26), S Zuchlag (304) and M Kramer (268)).

Landscaped Permeable Surface

- 9.17** As outlined in the s42A report, I have already recommended a restricted discretionary activity status for Rule 8.5.7. Notwithstanding, I have also recommended that an additional matter of discretion be applied with regard to consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 for the same reasons as outlined above. Furthermore, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 include provisions in relation to landscaping.

Continuous Building Length

9.18 Rule 8.5.9 was notified with a restricted discretionary activity status; however I note that the notified matters of discretion do not include consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. I consider that this should be included for developments within Arrowtown and as above consider that the submissions received requesting the application of strict design controls in Arrowtown (D Clarke (26), S Zuchlag (304) and M Kramer (268) provide scope. I have therefore made this recommendation within **Appendix 1**.

10. WALKWAY ADJOINING SCURR HEIGHTS

10.1 In response to the submissions received from M Prescott (73), W Richards (55) and D Richards (92) seeking that views from the walkway adjoining the Scurr Heights MDRZ are protected, I recommended two new rules in the s42A report: s42A Rule 8.5.1.1(a) which restricts building height within 15m of the walkway designation to 5.5m and s42A Rule 8.5.8.2(a) which requires a minimum setback from the walkway of 6m.

10.2 In relation to the recommended 6m setback, the Panel questioned whether this setback was necessary to avoid impacting views.

10.3 On 12 October Mr Goldsmith and Mr Williams presented to the Panel on behalf of Universal Developments (177) in relation to these rules seeking to protect views along the walkway. As part of their evidence they submitted a topographical plan of the Scurr Heights land, along with cross-sections indicating the eastern boundary of the site adjoining the walkway designation, the location of the walkway within the designation, and the relative levels of both. Also included were diagrams showing the Operative District Plan (**ODP**), Low Density Residential Zone (**LDRZ**) permitted setback and height from the walkway, and the recommended s42A MDRZ setback and height restriction. It is evident when reviewing these diagrams that the recommended s42A rules will not achieve their intended purpose to retain access to views along the majority of the walkway. Furthermore, the ODP LDRZ rules will also not retain these views.

- 10.4** Mr Williams noted in his evidence that the submitter is willing to volunteer a 4.5m setback from the walkway. However, as shown in the abovementioned diagrams, this will not achieve the aim of retaining views from the walkway.
- 10.5** I note that the Panel questioned Mr Williams as to whether application of the recession plane requirement in Rule 8.5.6 would allow retention of views along some portions of the walkway. Mr Williams has provided supplementary evidence to the Panel in which a recession plane of 45 degrees is applied 2.5m above the walkway boundary. These diagrams show that this method will also not retain views along the majority of the walkway.
- 10.6** The Panel suggested that I consider whether a similar rule to Site Standard 7.5.5.2(xix)(a) in the ODP, which limits the height of buildings along the southern side of Frankton Road to retain views, would achieve the outcome sought.
- 10.7** I note that three lots adjoining the walkway designation which are accessed via Bovett Place all have a consent notice registered on their Computer Freehold Register (**CFR**) which limits their height to a maximum of 5.5m. As noted by the Panel, dwellings recently constructed on these lots obstruct views for people of short stature; however still allow views across for taller people.
- 10.8** In considering the cross-sections provided by the submitter, the application of a rule restricting the height of buildings to no higher than the walkway level (such as the Frankton Road rule) would result in very low building heights being permitted on lots adjoining the walkway or significant levels of earthworks being necessary. To allow building heights of a level equal to no greater than 1.5m above the level of the walkway would however allow views to be retained from the walkway across roofs and would also allow construction of at least a single storey element in the rear portion of these future lots adjacent to the walkway designation boundary.
- 10.9** These future dwellings could increase into a two storey dwelling as the house design corresponds to the slope down to the west. I note that on the flatter section of the site (in the vicinity of cross-section A in Mr Williams' supplementary evidence) that additional excavation may be necessary to comply with this rule in this area, however due to the topography of the remainder of the site, this proposed rule would still allow construction of a

dwelling whilst still maintaining the views that are valued by the Wanaka community.

- 10.10** As a result, I recommend deletion of s42A Rules 8.5.1.1(a) and 8.5.8.2(a) and inclusion of a new (redraft) Standard 8.5.15 as shown in **Appendix 1**. I have recommended a restricted discretionary activity status for the new rule as the potential effects of the breach are only in relation to access to views to the west from the walkway. I also recommend an additional policy (redraft Policy 8.2.3.3) to align with redrafted Objective 8.2.3. I consider that the relief sought within the M Prescott (73), W Richards (55) and D Richards (92) submissions provides scope for this recommended new rule and the additional policy could be considered a corresponding change.

11. HOME OCCUPATION

- 11.1** For the LDRZ the Panel questioned whether the standards in Rule 7.4.14 should be included in Table 7.5 instead of with the activity. I consider that this question is also of relevance in relation to Rules 8.4.15 and 8.4.16 for the MDRZ. Consequently, I have applied a consistent approach to that outlined in paragraph 15.1 of the LDRZ right of reply. As these changes do not alter the provisions or their application I consider this to be a clarification change.

12. COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

- 12.1** The Panel noted that redraft Objective 8.2.7 and its associated policies provide for small scale commercial activities within the MDRZ, however also queried whether the same built form standards should apply to buildings for commercial activities as for residential units.
- 12.2** I see merit in providing flexibility in the design of small scale commercial buildings within the MDRZ to provide a point of difference and an identifiable node within the area. There are many historical examples of this within New Zealand, such as the corner shop buildings within residential areas.

- 12.3** Notwithstanding the above, I note that redraft Policy 8.2.7.6 does not provide this flexibility as it states:

Ensure any commercial development is of a design, scale and appearance compatible with its surrounding residential context.

- 12.4** The submissions received on the chapter do not provide the scope to alter the abovementioned policy and therefore I have not made any recommended changes within **Appendix 1**.

- 12.5** The Panel also questioned why Arrowtown is not included within Rule 8.4.6 as allowing Commercial Activities as a discretionary activity (as they are in Queenstown, Frankton and Wanaka). In reviewing the s32 report, I have been unable to identify the reasoning behind this differentiation. I note that Commercial Activities can still be considered within Arrowtown however via Rule 8.4.7 but these would be a non-complying activity rather than discretionary under Rule 8.4.6.

13. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

- 13.1** I have considered the evidence presented at the hearing by Ms Hutton on behalf of the Otago Foundation Trust Board (408) seeking an amendment to the activity status of Community Activities to restricted discretionary and I retain my recommendation of a discretionary activity status. I consider that the matters of discretion proposed by Ms Hutton are all encompassing and essentially equate to a discretionary activity status.

14. NON-NOTIFICATION

- 14.1** The Panel in relation to non-notification Rule 8.6.1.1 suggested further clarification within the rule, to explain that the activity which can be non-notified comprises Residential Units that comply with Rule 8.4.11 and that also comply with all of the standards in 8.5. I agree that this clarification would be of benefit to future plan users and consequently have made this update in redraft Rule 8.6.1.1 in **Appendix 1**.

15. OUTDOOR STORAGE

15.1 Ms Banks has addressed the matter of 'Outdoor Storage' and 'Bulk Material Storage' in paragraphs 12.2 – 12.5 of her Right of Reply in relation to the High Density Residential zone. I concur with her assessment and conclusion and consequently recommend that a consistent approach is undertaken for the MDRZ. It is my opinion that Rule 8.4.5 should be deleted, however I note that there are no submissions seeking this relief, consequently, I have not recommended this change within **Appendix 1**.

16. NATURAL HAZARDS MATTER OF DISCRETION

16.1 As shown in **Appendix 1**, I recommend that the matters of discretion for natural hazards in Rule 8.4.11 and redrafted Rule 8.4.21 are modified to remove the requirement for an assessment by a suitably qualified person. This recommended change is consistent with the recommended change within the Business zone s42A reports. The change also gives effect to notified Policy 28.3.2.3 of Chapter 28 (Natural Hazards), which lists the information requirements for natural hazards assessments and does not include a requirement for all natural hazards assessments to be undertaken by a suitably qualified person. I note that the Otago Regional Council (798) sought considerable changes to the Natural Hazards framework within the PDP and consider therefore that there is scope to address this throughout the PDP.

16.2 I have also included the updated natural hazard matter of discretion within the recommended matters of discretion relating to the restricted discretionary activity status for density and building coverage. I consider that this is a valid matter of discretion for these standards as they may result in an increased number of units or floor area within hazard prone areas and this requires assessment.

17. ARROWTOWN HISTORIC MANAGEMENT TRANSITION OVERLAY AREA

17.1 Within the s42A report, I recommended the creation of an Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area with the purpose of requiring that all new residential units within this area obtain restricted discretionary activity consent pursuant to Rule 8.4.11.1. This ensures that the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 are assessment via a matter of discretion.

17.2 The Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone also has a Transition Overlay Area which is for the purpose of allowing non-residential activities to occur in the area.

17.3 It has been noted by the Panel as part of the hearing on the Arrowtown Design Guidelines that the policy framework supporting the two transition overlay areas is inconsistent. This inconsistency occurs as the function of the two areas is different as outlined above. I consider that Objective 10.2.6 and its associated policies support the function of the ARHMZ Transition Overlay Area, whereas the MDRZ Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area is supported via redraft Objective 8.2.4 and its associated policies.

18. CONCLUSION

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



Amanda Leith
Senior Planner
11 November 2016

APPENDIX 1
8 MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE REVISED CHAPTER

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

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.

Changes shown in orange reflect the provisions that the Hearings Panel has deferred to the hearings on mapping. The recommendations made within the Appendix 1 to the s42A report are retained.

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.

Changes shown in ~~blue strikethrough~~ and underline are amendments which relate to Variation 1 – Arrowtown Design Guidelines, notified 20 July 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.

8 Medium Density Residential

8.1 Zone Purpose

The Medium Density Residential Zone has the purpose to provide land for residential development at increased densities. In conjunction with the High Density Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone, the zone will play a key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply. The zone will primarily accommodate residential land uses, but may also support limited non-residential activities where these enhance residential amenity or support an adjoining Town Centre, and do not impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply.

The zone is situated in locations in Queenstown, Frankton, Arrowtown and Wanaka that are within identified urban growth boundaries, and easily accessible to local shopping zones, town centres or schools by public transport, cycling or walking. The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for an increased density of housing in locations that are supported by ~~appropriate utility~~ adequate existing or planned infrastructure.

Comment [AL1]: 699

The zone will enable a greater supply of diverse housing options for the District. The main forms of residential development anticipated are terrace housing, semi-detached housing and detached townhouses on smaller ~~sections sites~~. The zone will realise changes to density and character over time to provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the District. In particular, the zone will provide a greater diversity of housing options for smaller households including single persons, couples, small young families and older people seeking to downsize. It will also enable more rental accommodation for the growing population of transient workers in the District.

Comment [AL2]: Clarification

While providing for a higher density of development than is possible in the Low Density Residential Zone, the zone utilises development controls to ensure reasonable amenity protection is maintained. Importantly, building height will be generally limited to two storeys.

Development will be required to ~~adhere to~~ achieve high standards of urban design, providing site responsive built forms and utilising opportunities to create vibrant public spaces and active transport connections (walking and cycling). In Arrowtown, particular consideration will need to be given to the town's special character, and the design criteria identified by the Arrowtown Design Guidelines ~~2006~~ 2016. ~~A high standard of environmental performance is encouraged to improve the comfort, health and overall sustainability of built forms. To ensure the practical and timely realisation of housing supply, incentives for sustainable building design will expire five years after the date the zone is made operative.~~

Comment [AL3]: 699

Comment [AL4]: 172, 300, 264, 651, 117

Comment [AL5]: 61, 97, 699

Community activities are anticipated given the need for such activities within residential areas and the high degree of accessibility of the zone.

Pursuant to Section 86(b)(3) of the RMA, Rule 8.5.13 has immediate legal effect.

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

8.2 Objectives and Policies

8.2.1 ~~Objective - Medium density development will be realised~~ **occurs** close to ~~town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres, employment centres which encourages travel via non-vehicular modes of transport or via public transport public transport routes and non-vehicular trails~~ in a manner that is responsive to housing demand pressures.

Comment [AL6]: Clarification to become a more general objective

Comment [AL7]: 699 & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Policies

8.2.1.1 ~~The zone accommodates existing traditional residential housing forms (dwelling, residential flat), but fundamentally has the purpose to~~ Provide opportunities for medium density housing land close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres and public transport routes that is appropriate for medium density housing.

Comment [AL8]: 699 & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

~~8.2.1.2 Enable Mmedium density development is anticipated up to two storeys in of varying varied building forms typologies including terrace, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and small lot detached housing.~~

Comment [AL9]: 699, & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute and grammatical change

8.2.1.3 ~~More than two storeys may be possible on some sloping sites where the development is able to comply with all other standards (including recession planes, setbacks, density and building coverage).~~

Comment [AL10]: Relocated to sit under Objective 8.2.2

Comment [AL11]: 699

~~8.2.1.4~~ 8.2.1.32 The zone provides Provide for compact development forms that ~~provide encourage~~ a diverse housing supply and ~~contribute toward~~ containing the outward spread of residential growth ~~away from employment centres areas.~~

Comment [AL12]: 699 & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

8.2.1.5 ~~Higher density development is incentivised to help support development feasibility, reduce the prevalence of land banking, and ensure greater responsiveness of housing supply to demand.~~

Comment [AL13]: Clarification

Comment [AL14]: 699, 117, 172, 300, 264, 651

~~8.2.1.3 Enable increased densities where they are located within easy walking distance of employment centres and public transport routes.~~

Comment [AL15]: 512, 536

8.2.2 **Objective - Development contributes** to the **environment planned medium density character of the area** through quality urban design solutions which **positively responds to the site, neighbourhood and wider context complement and enhance local character, heritage and identity.**

Comment [AL16]: Wording returned to notified version

Comment [AL17]: Clarification

Comment [AL18]: 699

Policies

8.2.2.1 ~~Ensure Bbuildings shall address streets and provide direct connection between front doors and the street, with limited presentation of unarticulated blank walls or facades to the street.~~

Comment [AL19]: 699

8.2.2.2 ~~Require visual connection with the street through the inclusion of windows, outdoor living areas, low profile fencing or landscaping. Where street activation (by the methods outlined by the Policy above) is not practical due to considerations or constraints such as slope, multiple road frontages, solar orientation, aspect and privacy., as a minimum buildings shall provide some form of visual connection with the street (such as through the inclusion of windows, outdoor living areas, low profile fencing or landscaping).~~

Comment [AL20]: 699

8.2.2.3 ~~Avoid Ensure~~ Street frontages shall not be ~~are not~~ dominated by garaging, parking and accessways through ~~consideration of their width, design and proximity to the street boundary, measures including not locating garages forward of the front elevation of the residential unit, use of two separate doors to break up the visual dominance of double garages or use of tandem garages or locating a second storey over the garage to enhance passive surveillance and street activation.~~

Comment [AL21]: 699 & 117

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

8.2.2.4 ~~Ensure developments reduce visual dominance effects~~ ~~the mass of buildings shall be is broken down through variation in facades and materials, roof form, building separation and recessions or other techniques to reduce dominance on streets, parks, and neighbouring properties.~~

Comment [AL22]: 699

8.2.2.5 ~~Ensure~~ ~~landscaped~~ ~~areas shall be are~~ well designed and integrated into the design of developments, providing high amenity spaces for ~~outdoor living purposes recreation and enjoyment~~, and to soften the visual impact of development, with particular regard to the street frontage of developments.

Comment [AL23]: 699

~~8.2.2.6 Require~~ ~~Development must take account of any~~ ~~Council adopted~~ ~~design guide or urban design strategy applicable to the area.~~

Comment [AL24]: 717 and 847

Comment [AL25]: 717 and 847

~~8.2.2.7~~ ~~8.2.2.6~~ ~~Ensure~~ ~~The amenity and/or environmental values of natural~~ ~~site~~ ~~features (such as topography, geology, vegetation, waterways and creeks) are taken into account by incorporated into the site layout and design, and integrated as assets to the development (where appropriate).~~

Comment [AL26]: 699

~~8.2.2.7 Enable~~ ~~Medium density development is anticipated up to two storeys in of varying varied building forms typologies including terrace, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and small lot detached housing.~~

Comment [AL27]: 699, & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute and grammatical change

Comment [AL28]: Relocated from Policy 8.2.1.2

~~8.2.3 Objective – New buildings are designed to reduce the use of energy, water and the generation of waste, and improve overall comfort and health.~~

Policies

8.2.3.1 ~~Enable a higher density of development and the potential for non-notification of resource consent applications where building form and design is able to achieve certification to a minimum 6 star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.~~

Comment [AL29]: 172, 300, 264, 651, 117

8.2.3.2 ~~Encourage the timely delivery of more sustainable building forms through limiting the time period in which incentives apply for development which is able to achieve certification to a minimum 6 star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.~~

Comment [AL30]: 61, 97, 699

8.2.3.3 ~~Development considers methods to improve sustainable living opportunities, such as through the inclusion of facilities or programs for efficient water use, alternative waste management, edible gardening, and active living.~~

Comment [AL31]: 172, 300, 264, 651, 117, 130

~~8.2.4~~ ~~8.2.3~~ ~~Objective - Provide reasonable protection of amenity values, within the context of an increasingly intensified suburban zone where character is changing and higher density housing is sought. Development provides high quality living environments for residents and maintains provides reasonable protection of the amenity of adjoining sites taking into account the planned medium density character of the area.~~

Comment [AL32]: 699

Comment [AL33]: Clarification and return to notified wording

Policies

~~8.2.4.1~~ ~~8.2.3.1~~ ~~Apply recession plane, building height, yard setbacks and site coverage, and window sill height controls as the primary means of ensuring reasonable protection of neighbours' access to sunlight, privacy and amenity values.~~

Comment [AL34]: 238, 717, 847

Comment [AL35]: 699

8.2.4.2 ~~Ensure buildings are designed and located to respond positively to site context through methods to maximise solar gain and limit energy costs.~~

Comment [AL36]: 699

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

~~8.2.4.3~~ Where compliance with design controls is not practical due to site characteristics, development shall be designed to maintain solar gain to adjoining properties.

Comment [AL37]: 699

~~8.2.3.2~~ Ensure built form achieves an acceptable level of privacy for the subject site and neighbouring residential units through the application of setbacks, offsetting of habitable ~~room~~ windows, screening or other means.

Comment [AL38]: Clarification

Comment [AL39]: 383

~~8.2.3.3~~ Ensure building heights along the western side of Designation 270 do not prevent access to views from the formed walkway to the west toward Lake Wanaka and beyond.

Comment [AL40]: 73, 55, 92

~~8.2.3.4~~ Ensure developments of increased density take into account the amenity of existing developments on adjoining sites acknowledging the anticipated future amenity and character of the zone.

Comment [AL41]: 512, 536

~~8.2.5 8.2.4~~ Objective - Development supports the creation of vibrant, safe and healthy environments.

Comment [AL42]: Consequential deletion as policies are either covered elsewhere or have been relocated

Policies

~~8.2.5.1 8.2.4.1~~ Promote active living through providing or enhancing connections to public places and active transport networks (walkways and cycleways) where possible.

Comment [AL43]: 591

~~8.2.5.2 8.2.4.2~~ Design p Provides a positive connection to the street and public places, and promotes ease of walkability for people of all ages.

Comment [AL44]: Deleted as is the same in content as Policy 8.2.6.1 below

Comment [AL45]: & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

~~8.2.5.3 8.2.4.3~~ Encourage W walking and cycling is encouraged through provision of bicycle parking and, where appropriate for the scale of activity, end of trip facilities (shower cubicles and lockers) for use by staff, guests or customers of non residential activities.

Comment [AL46]: Deleted as the content is the same as Policy 8.2.2.1 and Policy 8.2.2.2.

~~8.2.5.4 8.2.4.4~~ Protect P public health and safety is protected through design methods for non-residential developments to increase passive surveillance and discourage crime, such as through the provision of security lighting, avoidance of long blank facades, corridors and walkways, and good signage.

Comment [AL47]: & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Comment [AL48]: 591

Comment [AL49]: 591

Comment [AL50]: Relocated to site under 8.2.8 (now 8.2.7)

~~8.2.6 8.2.54~~ Objective - In Arrowtown medium density development responds sensitively to the town's character.

Policies

~~8.2.6.1 8.2.54.1~~ Notwithstanding the higher density of development anticipated in the zone, ensure development is of a form that is sympathetic to the character of Arrowtown, including its building design and form, scale, layout, and materials in accordance with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006-2016, with particular regard given to:

- i. Building design and form;
- ii. Scale, layout and relationship of buildings to the street; and
- iii. Materials and landscape responses.

Comment [AL51]: 26, 304, 268

~~8.2.6.2 8.2.54.2~~ Flat roofed housing forms are avoided.

~~8.2.6.3 8.2.54.3~~ Medium density housing development responds sensitively to the street and public spaces through the inclusion of landscaping (including hedges along the street boundary, small trees and shrubs) to soften increased building mass.

Comment [AL52]: 26, 304, 268

~~8.2.7 8.2.65~~ Objective - Ensure mMedium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and minimises impacts on infrastructure and roading networks.

Comment [AL53]: 699 and 505

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

Policies

8.2.7.1 Medium density development is provided close to town centres and local shopping zones to reduce private vehicle movements and maximise walking, cycling and public transport patronage.

Comment [AL54]: 699

8.2.7.2-8.2.65.1 Ensure development connects to existing or planned adjacent Medium density development is located in areas that are well serviced by public transport linkages, trail/track networks and infrastructure, trail/track networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity of infrastructure networks and maintains the safety, efficiency and functionality of those networks.

Comment [AL55]: Clarification

Comment [AL56]: 699 and 505

Comment [AL57]: 719

8.2.7.3-8.2.65.2 Access and parking is located and designed to optimise maintain the efficiency and safety of the transportation network and minimise impacts adverse effects to on-street parking.

Comment [AL58]: 719

Comment [AL59]: 505

8.2.7.4 A reduction in parking requirements may be considered in Queenstown and Wanaka where a site is located within 400 m of either a bus stop or the edge of a town centre zone.

Comment [AL60]: 699, 505, 668, 599

8.2.7.5-8.2.65.3 Encourage Low impact approaches to storm water management, including on-site treatment and storage / dispersal approaches are enabled to limit demands on public infrastructure networks.

Comment [AL61]: 699 and 408

8.2.8-8.2.76 Objective - Provide for e Community activities and facilities that are generally best located in a residential environment close to residents.

Comment [AL62]: Panel Minute

Comment [AL63]: 524

Policies

8.2.8.1-8.2.76.1 Enable the establishment of community activities and facilities where adverse effects on residential amenity in terms of noise, traffic, hours of operation, lighting, glare and visual impact can be suitably avoided or mitigated.

Comment [AL64]: 524

8.2.8.2 Ensure any community uses or facilities are of limited intensity and scale, and generate only small volumes of traffic.

Comment [AL65]: 408

8.2.8.3-8.2.76.2 Ensure any community activities uses or facilities are of a design, scale and appearance compatible with a residential context.

Comment [AL66]: 408

8.2.10-8.2.87 Objective - Provide for limited s Small-scale commercial activities are provided for where such activities: they:

- contribute to a diverse residential environment;
- maintain residential character and amenity; and
- do not compromise the primary purpose of the zone for residential use.

Comment [SG67]: Renumbering as a result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions and other deleted provisions shown above.

Comment [AL68]: 717 & 847

Comment [AL69]: Panel Minute

Policies

8.2.10-18.2.87.1 Support C commercial activities that directly serve the day-to-day needs of local residents, or enhance social connection and vibrancy of the residential environment may be supported, provided these do not undermine residential amenity, the viability of the zone or a nearby Town Centre.

Comment [AL70]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

8.2.10.2-8.2.87.2 Ensure any commercial development is of low scale and intensity and generates small volumes of traffic.

8.2.10.3-8.2.87.3 Mitigate C-commercial activities which generate the adverse noise effects generated by commercial activities are not supported in the residential environment.

Comment [AL71]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Comment [AL72]: Clarification

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

~~8.2.10.4-8.2.87.4~~ Ensure ~~C~~ commercial activities are suitably located and designed to maximise or encourage walking, cycling and public transport patronage.

~~8.2.10.5-8.2.87.5~~ Locate ~~C~~ commercial activities ~~are located~~ at ground floor ~~level~~ and provide a quality built form which activates the street, and adds visual interest to the urban environment.

Comment [AL73]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

~~8.2.10.6-8.2.87.6~~ Ensure any commercial development is of a design, scale and appearance compatible with its surrounding residential context.

~~8.2.5.3-8.2.4.3-8.2.7.7~~ Encourage ~~W~~ walking and cycling ~~to and from the business is encouraged~~ through provision of bicycle parking and, where appropriate for the scale of activity, end-of-trip facilities (shower cubicles and lockers) for use by staff, guests or customers ~~of non-residential activities.~~

Comment [AL74]: Clarification

Comment [AL75]: & Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Comment [AL76]: 591

~~8.2.5.4-8.2.4.4-8.2.7.8~~ Protect ~~P~~ public health and safety ~~is protected~~ through design methods ~~for non-residential developments~~ to increase passive surveillance and discourage crime, such as through the provision of security lighting, avoidance of long blank facades, corridors and walkways; and good signage.

Comment [AL77]: 591

Comment [AL78]: Relocated from 8.2.4.3 and 8.2.4.4

8.2.11-8.2.98 Objective - The development of land fronting State Highway 6 (between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive) provides a high quality residential environment which is sensitive to its location at the entrance to Queenstown, minimises traffic impacts to the State Highway network, and is appropriately serviced.

Policies

~~8.2.11.1-~~ Intensification does not occur until adequate water supply services are available to service the development.

Comment [AL79]: 177 & 408

~~8.2.11.2-8.2.98.2~~ Encourage ~~A~~ low impact stormwater network design ~~is provided~~ that utilises on-site treatment and storage / dispersal approaches, and avoids impacts on the State Highway network.

~~8.2.11.3-8.2.98.3~~ Provide a ~~A~~ planting buffer ~~is provided~~ along the road frontage to soften the view of buildings from the State Highway network.

~~8.2.11.4-8.2.98.4~~ Provide for ~~S~~ safe and legible transport connections ~~are provided~~ that avoid any new access to the State Highway, and integrates with the road network and public transport routes on the southern side of State Highway 6.

Comment [AL80]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Note: Attention is drawn to the need to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) prior to determining an internal and external road network design under this policy.

Note: Attention is drawn to the need to obtain a Section 93 notice from the NZ Transport Agency for all subdivisions on State Highways which are declared Limited Access Roads. The NZ Transport Agency should be consulted and a request made for a notice under Section 93 of the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989.

~~8.2.11.5-8.2.98.5~~ Require that ~~T~~ the design of any road or vehicular access within individual properties is of a form and standard that accounts for long term traffic demands for the area between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive, and does not require the need for subsequent retrofitting or upgrade.

Comment [AL81]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

~~8.2.11.6-8.2.98.6~~ Provide a ~~A~~ safe and legible walking and cycle environment ~~is provided~~ that links to the other internal and external pedestrian and cycling networks and pedestrian and cyclist destinations on the southern side of State Highway 6 (such as public transport stations, schools, open space, and commercial areas) along the safest, most direct and convenient routes and is of a form and layout that encourages walking and cycling.

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

- provides a safe and convenient waiting area adjacent to the State Highway, which provides shelter from weather
- provides a direct and legible network.

Comment [AL82]: 408

Note: Attention is drawn to the need to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to determine compliance with this policy.

Comment [AL83]: 717 and 847

8.2.11.7-8.2.98.7 Provide A an internal road network is provided that ensures road frontages are not dominated by vehicular access and parking.

Comment [AL84]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Comment [AL85]: Deferred by the Panel until the hearing on mapping

8.2.12-8.2.109 Objective - The Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay enables non-residential development forms which support the role of the Town Centre and are sensitive to the transition with residential uses are located within the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay.

Comment [AL86]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Policies

8.2.12.1-8.2.109.1 Enable non-residential uses to establish in a discrete area of residential-zoned land adjoining the Wanaka Town Centre, where these activities suitably integrate with and support the role of the Town Centre.

8.2.12.2-8.2.109.2 Require non-residential and mixed use activities provide a quality built form which activates the street, minimises the visual dominance of parking and adds visual interest to the urban environment.

Comment [AL87]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

Comment [AL88]: 505

8.2.12.3 Allow consideration of variances to Rules for site coverage, setbacks and parking where part of an integrated development proposal which demonstrates high quality urban design.

Comment [AL89]: 505

8.2.109.3 Ensure the amenity of adjoining residential properties outside of the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay is protected through design and application of setbacks and to mitigate dominance, overshadowing and privacy effects.

Comment [AL90]: 505

8.2.13-8.2.110 Objective - Manage the development of land within noise affected environments to ensure mitigation of noise and reverse sensitivity effects.

Policies

8.2.13.1-8.2.110.1 Require, as necessary A all new and altered buildings for activities sensitive to road noise residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within 80 m of the State Highway shall be designed to provide protection from sleep disturbance and maintain appropriate amenity meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2107:2000.

Comment [AL91]: 408

Comment [AL92]: Panel's 4th Procedural Minute

8.2.13.2-8.2.110.2 Encourage all new and altered buildings containing an Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) located within the flight paths of the Queenstown Airport (identified by Figure 1 - Airport Approach and Protection Measures) to be designed and built to achieve an internal design sound level of 40 dB Ldn.

Comment [AL93]: 719

8.3 Other Provisions and Rules

8.3.1 District Wide

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
----------------	---------------	-----------------------

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

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

8.3.2 Clarification

Advice Notes

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

8.3.2.2 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.

~~8.3.2.3 Objectives and Policies apply to all activities. Site or location specific Objectives and Policies will apply in addition to all other Objectives and Policies.~~

Comment [AL94]: Clarification

~~8.3.2.3 The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.~~

Comment [AL95]: Provision relocated from below to sit under Advice Notes

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

General Rules

~~8.3.2.4~~ ~~8.3.2.34~~ The 'Additional Rules for Activities in the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay' apply in addition to the 'Rules for Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone' and shall override these to the extent of any inconsistency.

~~8.3.2.5~~ ~~8.3.2.45~~ Development resulting in more than one (1) residential unit per lot shall show each residential unit contained within the net site area. For the purposes of this rule net site area means an area of land shown on a plan with defined boundaries (legally defined or otherwise), less any area for shared access or any strip of land less than 6m in width.

Comment [AL96]: Clarification

~~8.3.2.6~~ ~~8.3.2.5~~ The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.

Comment [AL97]: Provision relocated to above to sit under Advice Notes

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

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

8.4 Rules - Activities

	Activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity status
8.4.1	Activities which are not listed in this table	NC
Rules for Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone generally		
8.4.2	Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues and fire fighting	P
8.4.3	Airports not otherwise defined	PR
8.4.4	Building Restriction Area Where a building restriction area is shown on the District Plan Maps, no building shall be located within the restricted area	NC
8.4.5	Bulk material storage Outdoor Storage	PR
8.4.6	Commercial Activities in Queenstown, Frankton or Wanaka, comprising no more than 100m ² of gross floor area	D
8.4.7	Commercial Activities (not otherwise identified)	NC
8.4.8	Commercial Recreation	D
8.4.9	Community facilities and/or activities	D
8.4.10	Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat 8.4.10.1 One (1) per site in Arrowtown, except within the Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area 8.4.10.2 For all other locations, three (3) or less per site Note – Additional rates and development contributions may apply for multiple units located on one site.	P
8.4.11	Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat 8.4.11.1 One (1) or more per site within the Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area 8.4.11.1.1 8.4.11.2 Two (2) or more per site in Arrowtown 8.4.11.2 8.4.11.3 For all other locations, four (4) or more per site Discretion is restricted to all of the following: ◦ The location, external appearance, site layout and design and how the development addresses its context and contributes positively to the residential character and amenity of the area of buildings and fences ◦ The extent to which the development positively addresses the street activation ◦ visual privacy of adjoining properties ◦ The extent to which the design advances housing diversity and	RD

Comment [AL98]: No submissions on this, but bulk material storage is not defined in Chapter 2, although Outdoor Storage is defined.

Comment [AL99]: Rule reverts to notified wording as no scope to recommend its deletion

Comment [AL100]: 408

Comment [AL101]: 836

Comment [AL102]: 383

Comment [AL103]: 199, 306, 264, 180, 26

Comment [AL104]: 836

Comment [AL105]: 383

Comment [AL106]: 199, 306, 264, 180, 26

Comment [AL107]: 699

Comment [AL108]: 512, 536

Comment [AL109]: 699

Comment [AL110]: 699

Comment [AL111]: 383

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

Activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity status
<p>promotes sustainability either through construction methods, design or function-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ In Arrowtown, the extent to which the development responds positively to consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006 2016 as a guide ◦ For land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and the Shotover River, provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment, Landscaping Plan and Maintenance Program, and extent of compliance with Rule 8.5.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ safety and effective functioning of the State Highway network; ◦ Integration with other access points through the zone to link up to Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout and/or Ferry Hill Drive; ◦ Integration with public transport networks ◦ Integration with pedestrian and cycling networks, including to those across the State Highway. ◦ The extent to which building dominance mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm ◦ Design of P parking and access: safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours ◦ Design and integration of landscaping The extent to which landscaped areas are well integrated into the design of the development and contribute meaningfully to visual amenity and streetscape, including the use of small trees, shrubs or hedges that will reach at least 1.8m in height upon maturity ◦ Where a site is subject to any n Natural hazards and where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><u>Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property, • whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and • the extent to which whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated-reduced[†]; <p>Note – Additional rates and development contributions may apply for</p>	<p>Comment [AL112]: 699</p> <p>Comment [AL113]: 699</p> <p>Comment [AL114]: 719</p> <p>Comment [AL115]: 717 and 847</p> <p>Comment [AL116]: 719</p> <p>Comment [AL117]: Deferred by the Panel to the hearings on mapping</p> <p>Comment [AL118]: 699</p> <p>Comment [AL119]: 699</p> <p>Comment [AL120]: Re-phrasing all matters of discretion to be matters of discretion rather than assessment matters</p>

[†] ~~Policies that guide the assessment of proposals on land affected by natural hazards are located in Chapter 28.~~

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity status
	multiple units located on one site.	
8.4.12	Factory Farming	PR
8.4.13	Fish or meat processing	PR
8.4.14	Forestry	PR
8.4.15	<p>Home occupation where:</p> <p>8.4.15.1 No more than one full time equivalent person from outside the household shall be employed in the home occupation activity.</p> <p>8.4.15.2 The maximum number of vehicle trips* shall be:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Heavy Vehicles: none permitted</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. other vehicles: 10 per day.</p> <p>8.4.15.3 Maximum net floor area of 60m².</p> <p>8.4.15.4 Activities and the storage of materials shall be indoors.</p> <p>*A vehicle trip is two movements, generally to and from a site.</p>	P
8.4.16	Home occupation not otherwise identified	D
8.4.18 8.4.17 8.4.16	Manufacturing and/or product assembling activities	PR
8.4.19 8.4.18 8.4.17	Mining	PR
8.4.20 8.4.19 8.4.18	Panel beating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motor body building.	PR
8.4.21 8.4.20 8.4.19	Retirement village	D
8.4.24 8.4.21 8.4.20	Any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956	PR
Additional Rules for Activities in the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay		
8.4.25 8.4.22 8.4.21	<p>Buildings</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to consideration of all of the following: external appearance, materials, signage platform, lighting, impact on the street, and natural hazards to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the building blends well with and its contributes to an 	RD

Comment [AL121]: Standards in 8.4.15 relocated to 7.5.15 along with discretionary status in 8.4.16

Comment [SG122]: Renumbering as a result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions. Notified as 8.4.18 – 8.4.21

Comment [SG123]: Renumbering as a result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions. Notified as 8.4.24

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity status
	<p>integrated built form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The external appearance of the building is sympathetic to the surrounding natural and built environment. The use of stone, schist, plaster or natural timber is encouraged • The views along a street or of significant view shafts have been considered and responded to • <u>Maintenance of the visual privacy of adjoining properties</u> • The building facade provides an active interface to open space on to which it fronts, and the detail of the facade is sympathetic to other buildings in the vicinity, having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building materials - Glazing treatment - Symmetry - External appearance - Human scale - Vertical and horizontal emphasis. • Storage areas are appropriately located and screened • Where a site is subject to any n Natural hazards and where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property, • whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and • the extent to which whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated-reduced². 	
<p>8.4.26 8.4.23 8.4.22</p>	Commercial activities	P
<p>8.4.27 8.4.24 8.4.23</p>	Community activities	P

Comment [AL124]: 335

Comment [AL125]: 383

² ~~Policies that guide the assessment of proposals on land affected by natural hazards are located in Chapter 28.~~

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity status
<p>8.4.29 8.4.25 8.4.24</p>	<p>Licensed Premises for the consumption of alcohol on the premises between the hours of 8am and 11pm, and also to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any person who is residing (permanently or temporarily) on the premises. • any person who is present on the premises for the purpose of dining up until 12am. 	P

Comment [SG126]: Renumbering as a result of withdrawal of Visitor Accommodation provisions. Notified as 8.4.29

8.5 Rules - Standards

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
8.5.1	<p>Building Height (for flat and sloping sites)</p> <p>8.5.1.1 Wanaka and Arrowtown: A maximum of 7 metres except for the following:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Within 15 metres of Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the maximum height is 5.5 metres.</p> <p>8.5.1.2 All other locations: A maximum of 8 metres.</p> <p>Note: Refer to Definition for interpretation of building height.</p>	NC
8.5.2	<p>Sound insulation and mechanical ventilation</p> <p>8.5.2.1 For buildings located within 80 m of a State Highway 6 between (between Hansen Road and the Shotover River).</p> <p>Any residential buildings, or buildings containing activity sensitive to road noise, and located within 80 m of the road boundary of a State Highway 6 between Lake Hayes and Frankton shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2107:2000 achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB $L_{Aeq}(24h)$.</p> <p>Compliance with this rule can be demonstrated by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the internal design sound level.</p>	NC
8.5.3	<p>Development on land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive shall provide the following:</p> <p>8.5.3.1 Transport, parking and access design that:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Ensures connections to the State Highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. There is no new vehicular access to the State Highway Network.</p> <p>8.5.3.2 A Traffic Impact Assessment which addresses all of the following:</p>	NC

Comment [AL127]: 73, 55, 92

Comment [AL128]: Replaced with Rule 8.5.14

Comment [AL129]: 719

Comment [AL130]: 719

Comment [AL131]: 719

Comment [AL132]: 719

Comment [AL133]: 719

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
<p>c. Potential traffic effects to the local and State Highway network (including outcomes of consultation with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA))</p> <p>d. Potential effects of entry and egress to the local and State Highway network (including outcomes of consultation with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA))</p> <p>e. An access network design via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, and the avoidance of any new access to the State Highway Network</p> <p>f. Integration with existing transport networks and cumulative effects of traffic demand with known current or future developments</p> <p>g. Integration with public transport networks</p> <p>h. Methods of traffic demand management.</p> <p>i. Integration with pedestrian and cycling networks, including to those across the State Highway.</p> <p>8.5.3.3-8.5.3.2A Landscaping Plan and Maintenance Program which provides a planting buffer fronting State Highway 6 as follows and shall include all of the following:</p> <p>a. the retention of existing vegetation (where practicable)</p> <p>b. a minimum of 2 tiered planting (inclusive of tall trees and low shrubs)</p> <p>c. planting densities and stock sizes which are based on achieving full coverage of the planting areas within 2 years</p> <p>d. use of tree species having a minimum height at maturity of 1.8 m</p> <p>e. appropriate planting layout which does not limit solar access to new buildings or roads.</p> <p>a. A density of two plants per square metre located within 4m of the State Highway 6 road boundary selected from the following species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ribbonwood (Plagianthus regius) • Corokia cotoneaster • Pittosporum tenuifolium • Grisilinea • Coprosma propinqua • Olearia dartonii <p>Once planted these plants are to be maintained in perpetuity.</p>	

Comment [AL134]: 717 and 847

Comment [AL135]: 399, FS1061, FS1270 and 408

Comment [AL136]: Deferred by the Panel to the hearing on mapping

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status	
8.5.4	<p>Building Coverage</p> <p>A maximum of 45%.</p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>External appearance, location and visual dominance of the buildings as viewed from both the street and adjacent properties</u> • <u>Impact upon the character of the surrounding area</u> • <u>External amenity for the future occupants of the residential units</u> • <u>Impacts upon access to views, sunlight and shading of adjacent properties</u> • <u>Access and parking</u> • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown’s character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> • <u>Natural hazards where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area</u> <p><u>Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property.</u> • <u>whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and</u> • <u>whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently reduced.</u> 	D-RD	<p>Comment [AL139]: 512, 536</p> <p>Comment [AL137]: 512, 536, 26, 304, 268</p> <p>Comment [AL138]: 798</p>
8.5.5	<p>Density</p> <p>8.5.5.1 The maximum site density shall be one residential unit or dwelling per 250m² net site area.</p> <p>However, this rule shall not apply where the development can achieve certification to a minimum 6 star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the exceptions applying to developments achieving certification to a minimum 6 star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool shall cease to apply at a date being five years after the date the Medium Density Residential Zone is made operative.</p> <p>8.5.5.2 The minimum site density for the Medium Density Residential zoned land in Frankton adjoining State Highway 6 and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road shall be one residential unit per 400m² net site area.</p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Proximity to employment centres and public transport routes</u> • <u>Internal and external amenity for the future occupants of the residential units</u> 	NC-D, RD	<p>Comment [AL147]: 512 and 536</p> <p>Comment [AL148]: 512, 536</p> <p>Comment [AL140]: 836</p> <p>Comment [AL141]: 172, 300, 264, 651</p> <p>Comment [AL142]: 61, 97, 699, 238, 362</p> <p>Comment [AL143]: 620</p> <p>Comment [AL144]: Submission 620 has been withdrawn. No longer have scope to recommend this rule</p>

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Impacts upon adjacent properties in respect of dominance, outlook and privacy</u> • <u>External appearance, building bulk and dominance effects upon the streetscape</u> • <u>Traffic, parking and access</u> • <u>Noise</u> • <u>Rubbish storage and collection</u> • <u>Natural hazards where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area</u> <p><u>Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property.</u> • <u>whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and</u> • <u>whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently reduced.</u> 	
8.5.6	<p>Recession plane (applicable to flat sites only, and for including accessory buildings on flat and sloping sites)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Boundary: 2.5m and 55 degrees. • Western and Eastern Boundaries: 2.5m and 45 degrees. • Southern Boundaries: 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 adjoining a town centre zone, fronting the road, or a park or reserve. <p>Note - Refer to Definitions for detail of the interpretation of recession planes.</p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Privacy effects</u> • <u>Access to sunlight and the impacts of shading</u> • <u>Effects upon access to views of significance</u> • <u>Visual dominance and external appearance</u> • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> 	<p>NC-RD</p>
8.5.7	<p>Landscaped permeable surface</p> <p>At least 25% of site area shall comprise landscaped permeable surface.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal does not provide 25%, discretion is restricted to the</u></p>	<p>NC-RD</p>

Comment [AL145]: 512, 536

Comment [AL146]: 798

Comment [AL151]: 512, 536

Comment [AL149]: 591

Comment [AL150]: 512, 536, 26, 304, 268

Comment [AL154]: 236, 512

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
	<p><u>following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The effects of any reduced landscape provision on the visual appearance or dominance of the site and buildings from adjacent sites and the public realm:</u> • <u>The ability for adequate on-site stormwater disposal</u> • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> 	
8.5.8	<p>Minimum Boundary Setback</p> <p>8.5.8.1 Road boundary setback: 3m, <u>except for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>State Highway boundaries where the setback shall be 4.5m</u> b. <u>Garages which shall be setback 4.5m</u> <p>8.5.8.2 All other boundaries: 1.5m <u>except for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Sites adjoining Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the minimum setback shall be 6m.</u> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>External appearance and visual dominance of the building as viewed from the street and adjacent properties</u> • <u>Amenity and character of the streetscape</u> • <u>Access to sunlight, shading and privacy of adjoining properties</u> • <u>Access to views of significance</u> • <u>On-site parking</u> • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> <p>Exceptions to side and rear boundary setbacks <u>(excluding the setback in 8.5.8.2(a))</u> include:</p> <p>Accessory buildings for residential activities may be located within the set back distances, where they do not exceed 7.5m in length, there are no windows or openings (other than for carports) along any walls within 1.5m of an internal boundary, and comply with rules for Building Height and Recession Plane.</p>	<p>D-RD</p>
8.5.9	<p>Continuous Building Length</p> <p>The <u>continuous</u> length of any building facade above <u>one storey ground floor level</u> shall not exceed 46m <u>24m</u>.</p>	<p>RD</p>

Comment [AL152]: 512, 536, 26, 304, 268

Comment [AL153]: 536, 512

Comment [AL155]: 719

Comment [AL156]: 657

Comment [AL157]: 73, 55, 92

Comment [AL158]: 512, 536, 26, 304, 268

Comment [AL159]: Consequential change due to 8.5.8.2 above

Comment [AL160]: 73,55,92

Comment [AL161]: Replaced with Rule 8.5.14

Comment [AL162]: 238

Comment [AL163]: 238

Comment [AL164]: 699

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
	<p>Where a proposal exceeds this length, discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building dominance • Building design, materials and appearance • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> • 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 dominance of the building • The extent to which topography or landscaping 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 	
	<p>Comment [AL165]: 26, 304, 268</p>	
	<p>Comment [AL166]: 699</p>	
8.5.10	<p>Window Sill heights</p> <p>Window sill heights above the first storey shall not be set lower than 1.5m above the floor level where the external face of the window is within 4m of the site boundary.</p> <p>Exceptions to this rule are where building elevations face the street or reserves, or where opaque glass is used for windows. In these scenarios the rule does not apply.</p>	D
	<p>Comment [AL167]: 238, 717, 847</p>	
8.5.11 8.5.10	<p>Waste and Recycling Storage Space</p> <p>8.5.11.1-8.5.10.1 Residential activities shall provide, as a minimum, space for a 120 litre residential wheelie bin and 240 litres recycling wheelie bin per residential unit.</p> <p>8.5.11.2-8.5.10.2 All developments shall suitably screen waste and recycling storage space from neighbours, a road or public space, in keeping with the building development or provide space within the development that can be easily accessed by waste and recycling collections.</p>	NC
8.5.12 8.5.11	<p>Glare</p> <p>8.5.12.1-8.5.11.1 All exterior lighting shall be directed away from the adjacent sites and roads and downward to limit effects on the night sky.</p> <p>8.5.12.2-8.5.11.2 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.</p>	NC
8.5.13 8.5.12	<p>Setback of buildings from water bodies</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from the bed of a river, lake or</p>	RD

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
	<p>wetland shall be 7m.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • indigenous biodiversity values • Visual amenity values • Landscape character • Open space and the interaction of the development with the water body • Environmental protection measures (including landscaping and stormwater management) • Whether the waterbody is subject to flooding or natural hazards and any mitigation to manage the location of the building 	
8.5.14 8.5.13	<p>Setbacks from electricity transmission infrastructure</p> <p>8.5.14.1 National Grid Sensitive Activities are located outside of the National Grid Yard.</p>	NC
8.5.14	<p>Dominance of Garages</p> <p>Garage doors and their supporting structures (measured parallel to the road) are not to exceed 50% of the frontage of the site as viewed from the road width of the front elevation of the building which is visible from the street.</p>	D
8.5.15	<p>Height Restrictions for Land Adjoining Designation 270</p> <p>No building or building element on the western side of Designation 270 shall rise greater than 1.5m above the nearest point of the formed walkway path within Designation 270.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to views to the west toward Lake Wanaka and the mountains beyond from the walkway within Designation 270 	RD
8.5.16	<p>Home Occupation</p> <p>8.5.16.1 No more than one full time equivalent person from outside the household shall be employed in the home occupation activity.</p> <p>8.5.16.2 The maximum number of vehicle trips* shall be:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Heavy Vehicles: none permitted</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Other vehicles: 10 per day.</p> <p>8.5.16.3 Maximum net floor area of 60m².</p> <p>8.5.16.4 Activities and the storage of materials shall be indoors.</p> <p>*A vehicle trip is two movements, generally to and from a site.</p>	D

Comment [AL168]: 166

Comment [AL169]: 117

Comment [AL170]: 73, 55, 92

Comment [AL171]: Relocated from 8.4.15 above

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications

~~8.6.1 Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified.~~

Comment [AL172]: 792

~~8.6.2~~ 8.6.1 The following Restricted Discretionary activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified:

~~8.6.2.1 Residential development where the development is able to achieve certification to a minimum 6 star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.~~

Comment [AL173]: 199, 177, 362, 264, 506, 676, 503

~~8.6.2.2 Notwithstanding the above, clause 8.6.2.1 shall cease to apply at a date being five years after the date the Medium Density Residential Zone is made operative.~~

Comment [AL174]: 61, 97, 699

~~8.6.1.1 Residential units which comply with rule 8.4.11 and all of the Standards in 8.5~~

Comment [AL175]: 408, FS1270
199, 177, 362, 264

Comment [AL176]: Clarification

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 8

Chapter 27 – Subdivision and Development

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

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Residential	Medium Density Residential	250m ²
Zone		Maximum Lot Area
Residential	Medium Density Residential	The maximum lot area for the Medium Density Residential zoned land in Frankton adjoining State Highway 6 and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road shall be 400m²

Comment [AL177]: 620

Comment [AL178]: Submission 620 has been withdrawn. No longer have scope to recommend this provision

Comment [AL179]: 620

Comment [AL180]: Submission 620 has been withdrawn. No longer have scope to recommend this provision

APPENDIX 2
ADDITIONAL S32AA EVALUATION OF THE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED
CHANGES

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 Objective 8.2.1

Recommended amended Objective 8.2.1

Medium density development ~~will be realised~~ occurs close to ~~town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres, employment centres~~ which encourages travel via non-vehicular modes of transport or via public transport ~~public transport routes and non-vehicular trails~~ in a manner that is responsive to housing demand pressures.

Appropriateness (s32(1)(a))

The change is appropriate as it is more general in its wording to allow Policy 8.2.1.1 to support it through providing additional detail.

Updated redraft Policy 8.2.1.2 (notified 8.2.1.4)

Recommended updated redraft Policy 8.2.1.3

~~The zone provides~~ Provide for compact development forms that provide encourage a diverse housing supply and contribute toward contain~~ing~~ the outward spread of residential growth away from employment centres ~~areas~~.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This updated policy acknowledges that the proposed MDRZ is only one of the methods proposed to contain urban sprawl. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is efficient as it provides greater clarity that it is not the intent of the MDRZ to solely provide a response to urban sprawl.

New Policy – 8.2.1.3

Recommended new Policy – 8.2.1.3

Enable increased densities where they are located within easy walking distance of employment centres and public transport routes.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new policy outlines the anticipated locations where increased density can occur. • Having increased densities within walking distance of employment centres or public transport routes is intended to reduce reliance upon use of private vehicles for travel. This will help reduce traffic congestion and parking issues in employment locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy is effective and efficient as it is clear as to where additional density is to be located.

Updated Objective 8.2.2

Recommended updated Objective 8.2.2

Development contributes to the ~~environment~~ **planned medium density character of the area** through quality urban design solutions which positively responds to the site, neighbourhood and wider context ~~complement and enhance local character, heritage and identity.~~

Appropriateness (s32(1)(a))

The change is appropriate as it identifies that the character and amenity of the established residential areas over which the proposed MDRZ will change over time as medium density development occurs.

Updated Policy – 8.2.2.3

Recommended updated Policy – 8.2.2.3

~~Avoid Ensure~~ **Street frontages shall not be are not** dominated by garaging, parking and accessways through **consideration of their width, design and proximity to the street boundary. measures including not locating garages forward of the front elevation of the residential unit, use of two separate doors to break up the visual dominance of double garages or use of tandem garages or locating a second storey over the garage to enhance passive surveillance and street activation.**

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefit of the change is that the policy is less prescriptive however will still ensure that the dominance of garages is assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amended policy is more effective and efficient as it allows more flexibility in the design of garages.

Deleted Policy – 8.2.2.6

Recommended Deleted Policy – 8.2.2.6

~~Require D~~ **development must take account of any Council adopted design guide or urban design**

strategy applicable to the area.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">None identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none">None identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposed deletion is efficient as there are currently no design guidelines or design strategies applicable to the MDRZ. This will consequently avoid confusion.

Relocated Policy – 8.2.2.7

Recommended Relocated Policy – 8.2.2.7

~~Enable Mmedium density development is anticipated up to two storeys in of varying-varied building forms typologies including terrace, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and small lot detached housing.~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">None identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none">This relocated policy aligns to the design and appearance expectations of Objective 8.2.2 rather than the location description outlined in Objective 8.2.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As the policy is more aligned to Objective 8.2.2, it will be more efficient and effective in its application.

Updated s42A Objective 8.2.3 (notified 8.2.4)

Recommended updated Objective 8.2.3

~~Provide reasonable protection of amenity values, within the context of an increasingly intensified suburban zone where character is changing and higher density housing is sought. Development provides high quality living environments for residents and maintains provides reasonable protection of the amenity of adjoining sites taking into account the planned medium density character of the area.~~

Appropriateness (s32(1)(a))

The change is appropriate as it identifies that the character and amenity of the established residential areas over which the proposed MDRZ will change over time as medium density development occurs. As a result, the policy outlines that the current amenity may not be maintained, however that a reasonable level of residential amenity will take into account the transition to a medium density intensity of development.

New Policy 8.2.3.3

Recommended New Policy 8.2.3.3

~~Ensure building heights along the western side of Designation 270 do not prevent access to views from the formed walkway to the west toward Lake Wanaka and beyond.~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy and associated Rule 8.5.15 will impact upon the development potential of the future lots adjoining Designation 270. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The protection of views over the subject land will maintain views from the walkway which the community value. • The restriction on building height adjacent to the walkway to allow views to the west to be retained is consistent with other resource consent decisions within the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed policy is effective and efficient as it is clear in its intent and aligns with the Rule 8.5.15 that is proposed.

New Policy 8.2.3.4

Recommended New Policy 8.2.3.4
Ensure developments of increased density take into account the amenity of existing developments on adjoining sites acknowledging the anticipated future amenity and character of the zone.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy specifies the expectations of the design of developments where increased density is sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy is effective and efficient as it aligns with the proposed restricted discretionary activity status for density and the recommended matters of discretion.

Deleted s42A Objective – 8.2.4

Recommended Deleted Objective 8.2.4
Development supports the creation of vibrant, safe and healthy environments.

Appropriateness (s32(1)(a))
Deletion of this objective is appropriate as its content is addressed via other proposed objectives and policies in the chapter. The deletion therefore avoids repetition.

Deleted s42A Policy 8.2.4.1 (notified 8.2.5.1)

Recommended Deleted Policy 8.2.4.1
Promote active living through providing or enhancing connections to public places and active transport networks (walkways and cycleways) where possible.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
--------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion avoids repetition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deletion of this policy is more efficient as the content is already provided within Policy 8.2.6.1.
--	---	---

Deleted s42A Policy 8.2.4.2 (notified 8.2.5.2)

Recommended Deleted Policy 8.2.4.2

~~Design p Provides a positive connection to the street and public places, and promotes ease of walkability for people of all ages.~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion avoids repetition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deletion of this policy is more efficient as the content is already provided within Policies 8.2.2.1 and 8.2.2.2.

Updated redraft Policy 8.2.4.1 (notified 8.2.6.1)

Updated redraft Policy 8.2.4.1

Notwithstanding the higher density of development anticipated in the zone, ensure development is of a form that is sympathetic to the character of Arrowtown, ~~including its building design and form, scale, layout, and materials~~ in accordance with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines [2006-2016](#), with particular regard given to:

- i. Building design and form;
- ii. Scale, layout and relationship of buildings to the street; and
- iii. Materials and landscape responses.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowtown properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended changes are more specific as to the most important matters to consider in the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. This is of benefit given the length and number of matters the guidelines cover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is more effective and efficient as it is more specific and clear in what is intended in its assessment.

Updated redraft Policy 8.2.4.3 (notified 8.2.6.3)

Updated redraft Policy 8.2.4.3

Medium density housing development responds sensitively to the street and public spaces through the inclusion of landscaping (including hedges along the street boundary, small trees and shrubs) to soften increased building mass.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
--------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended change results in specific reference to hedging along the street boundary which may result in additional cost in the provision of these as part of a development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended change addresses hedges along street boundaries which are considered an important characteristic of the Arrowtown residential areas by the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is more effective and efficient as it better aligns with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016.
---	---	--

Updated Policy 8.2.8.3 (notified 8.2.10.3)

Recommended updated Policy 8.2.8.3

Mitigate ~~C commercial activities which generate the~~ adverse noise effects ~~generated by commercial activities~~ are not supported in the residential environment.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clarification as to the effects which are to be mitigated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is effective as it is clearer as to what is sought.

Relocated Policies 8.2.7.7 and 8.2.7.8

Recommended relocated Policies 8.2.7.7 and 8.2.7.8

~~8.2.7.7 Encourage W walking and cycling to and from the business is encouraged~~ through provision of bicycle parking and, where appropriate for the scale of activity, end-of-trip facilities (shower cubicles and lockers) for use by staff, guests or customers of non-residential activities.

~~8.2.7.8 Protect P public health and safety is protected~~ through design methods for non-residential developments to increase passive surveillance and discourage crime, such as through the provision of security lighting, avoidance of long blank facades, corridors and walkways; and good signage.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the recommendations in the s42A report specifying that these policies apply only to non-residential activities, the relocation of these policies to sit under Objective 8.2.7 which pertains to commercial activities is logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommended relocation is efficient and effective as their alignment to Objective 8.2.7 clarifies the assessment of non-residential developments.

Updated Rule – 8.4.5

Recommended Updated Rule 8.4.5 - Prohibited

Bulk material storage - ~~Outdoor Storage~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bulk material storage is not defined within the PDP and this may therefore result in confusion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The term 'Outdoor Storage' may result in unintended consequences of normal residential outdoor storage such as a woodpile being prohibited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• .• The proposed amendment is effective in removing a misleading activity regulation within the activity table, and otherwise reverting to the default activity status of notified Rule 7.4.1.

Updated Rule – 8.4.11

Recommended Updated Rule – 8.4.11 – Restricted Discretionary

Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat

8.4.11.1 One (1) or more per site within the Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay Area

~~8.4.11.1~~ 8.4.11.2 Two (2) or more per site in Arrowtown

~~8.4.11.2~~ 8.4.11.3 For all other locations, four (4) or more per site

Discretion is restricted to all of the following:

- ~~• The location, external appearance, site layout and design and how the development addresses its context and contributes positively to the residential character and amenity of the area of buildings and fences~~
 - The extent to which the development positively addresses the street activation
 - visual privacy of adjoining properties
 - ~~• The extent to which the design advances housing diversity and promotes sustainability either through construction methods, design or function-~~
 - In Arrowtown, the extent to which the development responds positively to consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006 2016 as a guide
 - For land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and the Shotover River, provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment, Landscaping Plan and Maintenance Program, and extent of compliance with Rule 8.5.3:
 - safety and effective functioning of the State Highway network;
 - Integration with other access points through the zone to link up to Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout and/or Ferry Hill Drive;
 - Integration with public transport networks
 - Integration with pedestrian and cycling networks, including to those across the State Highway.
 - The extent to which building dominance mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm
 - Design of P parking and access: safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours
 - Design and integration of landscaping The extent to which landscaped areas are well integrated into the design of the development and contribute meaningfully to visual amenity and streetscape, including the use of small trees, shrubs or hedges that will reach at least 1.8m in height upon maturity
 - ~~• Where a site is subject to any-n Natural hazards and where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses~~
- Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:
- the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property,
 - whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and
 - ~~• the extent to which whether~~ such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated

reduced-

Note – Additional rates and development contributions may apply for multiple units located on one site.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a risk that a development will proceed without an assessment, when it should, in fact, be required. If a proposal occurs which does not sufficiently mitigate risks or worsens such risks, this may result in economic, environmental, and social costs if there is ever a natural hazard event.• The council may miss an opportunity to improve its knowledge base of existing hazards (provided by the private sector) to the same extent it may if all developments were required to produce one.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cost savings in that it may avoid applicants having to obtain an expert assessment where (for example) the extent of new building is small; the risk posed by the hazard is known to be low; the hazard is already well documented/understood; or the risk is already sufficiently mitigated through compliance with other rules (e.g. minimum floor levels).• Enables case by case determination of whether a hazard assessment is necessary, based on location, existing information, and the nature and scale of the proposal to ensure the level of information required is appropriate.• Avoids duplication and potential inconsistency with section 28.5 of the PDP Natural Hazards Chapter, which requires assessments commensurate with the level of risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The amended rule will be equally effective and more efficient (for the reasons stated) at implementing the objectives contained in chapter 28.• As amended, it will still enable the Council to require an assessment where necessary pursuant to Section 28.5 and Policy 28.3.2.3 of the PDP hazards chapter (which refers to information requirements in relation to natural hazards) but will not unnecessarily require this in all instances.

Updated Rule 8.4.15

Recommended Updated Rule – 8.4.15 – Permitted

Home occupation ~~where:~~

~~8.4.15.1 — No more than one full time equivalent person from outside the household shall be employed in the home occupation activity.~~

~~8.4.15.2 — The maximum number of vehicle trips* shall be:~~

~~a. Heavy Vehicles: none permitted~~

~~b. other vehicles: 10 per day.~~

~~8.4.15.3 — Maximum net floor area of 60m².~~

~~8.4.15.4 — Activities and the storage of materials shall be indoors.~~

~~*A vehicle trip is two movements, generally to and from a site.~~

Deleted Rule 8.4.16

Recommended Deleted Rule – 8.4.16 – Discretionary

~~Home occupation not otherwise identified~~

New Rule 8.5.16

Recommended New Rule – 8.5.16 – Discretionary

Home Occupation

8.5.16.1 No more than one full time equivalent person from outside the household shall be employed in the home occupation activity.

8.5.16.2 The maximum number of vehicle trips* shall be:

a. Heavy Vehicles: none permitted

b. Other vehicles: 10 per day.

8.5.16.3 Maximum net floor area of 60m².

8.5.16.4 Activities and the storage of materials shall be indoors.

*A vehicle trip is two movements, generally to and from a site.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The above recommended amendments are effective and efficient as they follow the established format of the PDP.

Updated Rule 8.4.21

Recommended updated Rule – 8.4.21 – Restricted Discretionary

Buildings

Discretion is restricted to consideration of all of the following: external appearance, materials, signage platform, lighting, impact on the street, and natural hazards to ensure that:

- The design of the building blends well with and its contributes to an integrated built form
- The external appearance of the building is sympathetic to the surrounding natural and built environment. The use of stone, schist, plaster or natural timber is encouraged
- ~~The views along a street or of significant view shafts have been considered and responded to~~

- Maintenance of the visual privacy of adjoining properties
 - The building facade provides an active interface to open space on to which it fronts, and the detail of the facade is sympathetic to other buildings in the vicinity, having regard to:
 - Building materials
 - Glazing treatment
 - Symmetry
 - External appearance
 - Human scale
 - Vertical and horizontal emphasis.
 - Storage areas are appropriately located and screened
 - ~~Where a site is subject to any n~~ Natural hazards and where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: ~~an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses~~
- Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:
- the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property,
 - whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and
 - ~~the extent to which~~ whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated reduced⁺

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk that a development will proceed without an assessment, when it should, in fact, be required. If a proposal occurs which does not sufficiently mitigate risks or worsens such risks, this may result in economic, environmental, and social costs if there is ever a natural hazard event. • The council may miss an opportunity to improve its knowledge base of existing hazards (provided by the private sector) to the same extent it may if all developments were required to produce one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost savings in that it may avoid applicants having to obtain an expert assessment where (for example) the extent of new building is small; the risk posed by the hazard is known to be low; the hazard is already well documented/understood; or the risk is already sufficiently mitigated through compliance with other rules (e.g. minimum floor levels). • Enables case by case determination of whether a hazard assessment is necessary, based on location, existing information, and the nature and scale of the proposal to ensure the level of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amended rule will be equally effective and more efficient (for the reasons stated) at implementing the objectives contained in chapter 28. • As amended, it will still enable the Council to require an assessment where necessary pursuant to Section 28.5 and Policy 28.3.2.3 of the PDP hazards chapter (which refers to information requirements in relation to natural hazards) but will not unnecessarily require this in all instances.

	<p>information required is appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids duplication and potential inconsistency with section 28.5 of the PDP Natural Hazards Chapter, which requires assessments commensurate with the level of risk. 	
--	--	--

Updated Standard – 8.5.1

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.1 – Non-Compliant

Building Height (for flat and sloping sites)

8.5.1.1 Wanaka and Arrowtown: A maximum of 7 metres except for the following:

a. Within 15 metres of Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the maximum height is 5.5 metres.

8.5.1.2 All other locations: A maximum of 8 metres.

Note: Refer to Definition for interpretation of building height.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been identified through evidence provided at the hearing that Rule 8.5.1.1(a) does not achieve the purpose of retaining views from the walkway. Consequently there is no benefit in applying the reduced height in this manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended change makes the standard clearer and more efficient given that the provision recommended to be deleted will not achieve its intended purpose.

Updated Standard – 8.5.4

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.4 – ~~Discretionary~~ Restricted Discretionary

Building Coverage

A maximum of 45%.

Discretion is restricted to the following:

- External appearance, location and visual dominance of the buildings as viewed from both the street and adjacent properties
- Impact upon the character of the surrounding area
- External amenity for the future occupants of the residential units
- Impacts upon access to views, sunlight and shading of adjacent properties
- Access and parking
- In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide
- Natural hazards where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area

Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:

- the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property,
- whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and
- whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently reduced.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A more permissive activity status for building coverage leads to a risk of potential overdevelopment of sites resulting in overly dominant building, insufficient parking or access, a lack of landscaping and the like.²• Requiring consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowtown properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The restricted discretionary activity status will better achieve the proposed policy outcomes.• The restricted discretionary activity status is also an appropriate test for consideration of the benefits of design regarding a breach of the standard.• The restricted discretionary activity status will facilitate more flexibility and certainty and encourage the development of a range of housing typologies within the zone.• The restricted discretionary activity status still allows	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed matters of discretion are effective in that they provide clear and detailed matters against which a proposal is to be assessed.• The proposed matters of discretion are also efficient as they specify whether the effect to be considered is the street or adjacent properties.• The use of the natural hazards matter of discretion from Rule 8.4.11 is efficient as it provides consistency.⁴

² See above analysis of costs under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

⁴ See above analysis of efficiency and effectiveness under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

	<p>Council to refuse inappropriate development on a case by case basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural hazard matter of discretion ensures that any increased building coverage is assessed in terms of the potential hazards on the site.³ • Inclusion of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines as a matter of discretion is of benefit as it will ensure that any breaches are consistent with the character anticipated within Arrowtown. 	
--	---	--

Updated Standard – 8.5.5

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.5 – ~~Non-Compliant~~ Restricted Discretionary

³

See above analysis of benefits under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

Density

8.5.5.1 The maximum site density shall be one residential unit or dwelling per 250m² net site area.

~~However, this rule shall not apply where the development can achieve certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.~~

~~Notwithstanding the above, the exceptions applying to developments achieving certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool shall cease to apply at a date being five years after the date the Medium Density Residential Zone is made operative.~~

~~8.5.5.2 The minimum site density for the Medium Density Residential zoned land in Frankton adjoining State Highway 6 and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road shall be one residential unit per 400m² net site area.~~

Discretion is restricted to the following:

- Proximity to employment centres and public transport routes
- Internal and external amenity for the future occupants of the residential units
- Impacts upon adjacent properties in respect of dominance, outlook and privacy
- External appearance, building bulk and dominance effects upon the streetscape
- Traffic, parking and access
- Noise
- Rubbish storage and collection
- Natural hazards where the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area

Assessment matters relating to natural hazards:

- the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property,
- whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and
- whether such risk can be avoided or sufficiently reduced.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more permissive activity status for density leads to a risk of potential overdevelopment of sites.⁵ • The restricted discretionary activity status may also lead to an increased density of sites which may not be anticipated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restricted discretionary activity status will better achieve the proposed policy outcomes. • The restricted discretionary activity status is also an appropriate test for consideration of the benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed matters of discretion are effective in that they provide clear and detailed matters against which a proposal is to be assessed. • The proposed matters of discretion are also efficient as they specify whether the effect

⁵

See above analysis of costs under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

<p>by the community.</p>	<p>of design regarding a breach of the standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restricted discretionary activity status will facilitate more flexibility and certainty and encourage the development of a range of housing typologies within the zone. • The restricted discretionary activity status still allows Council to refuse inappropriate development on a case by case basis. • The natural hazard matter of discretion ensures that any increased building coverage is assessed in terms of the potential hazards on the site.⁶ 	<p>to be considered is the street or adjacent properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed matters of discretion give effect to the proposed objectives and policies relating to density. • The use of the natural hazards matter of discretion from Rule 8.4.11 is efficient as it provides consistency.⁷
--------------------------	---	--

Updated Standard – 8.5.6

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.6 – ~~Non-Compliant~~ Restricted Discretionary

⁶ See above analysis of benefits under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

⁷ See above analysis of efficiency and effectiveness under Rule 8.4.21 for further assessment of the natural hazards matter of discretion

Recession plane (applicable to flat sites only, and for including accessory buildings on flat and sloping sites)

8.5.6.1 Northern Boundary: 2.5m and 55 degrees.

8.5.6.2 Western and Eastern Boundaries: 2.5m and 45 degrees.

8.5.6.3 Southern Boundaries: 2.5m and 35 degrees.

8.5.6.4 Gable end roofs may penetrate the building recession plane by no more than one third of the gable height.

8.5.6.5 Recession planes do not apply to site boundaries adjoining a town centre zone, fronting the road, or a park or reserve.

Note - Refer to Definitions for detail of the interpretation of recession planes.

Discretion is restricted to the following:

- Privacy effects
- Access to sunlight and the impacts of shading
- Effects upon access to views of significance
- Visual dominance and external appearance
- In Arrowsmith, consistency with Arrowsmith's character, utilising the Arrowsmith Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more permissive activity status for recession planes leads to a risk of potential increased shading, interruption of views, building dominance and privacy effects. • Requiring consistency with the Arrowsmith Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowsmith properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restricted discretionary activity status will better achieve the proposed policy outcomes. • The restricted discretionary activity status is also an appropriate test for consideration of the benefits of design regarding a breach of the standard. • The restricted discretionary activity status will facilitate more flexibility and certainty and encourage the development of a range of housing typologies within the zone. • The restricted discretionary activity status still allows Council to refuse inappropriate development on a case by case basis. • Inclusion of the Arrowsmith Design Guidelines as a matter of discretion is of benefit as it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed matters of discretion are effective in that they provide clear and detailed matters against which a proposal is to be assessed.

	will ensure that any breaches are consistent with the character anticipated within Arrowtown.	
--	---	--

Updated Standard – 8.5.7

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.7 – Non-Complying Restricted Discretionary
<p>Landscaped permeable surface</p> <p>At least 25% of site area shall comprise landscaped permeable surface.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal does not provide 25%, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The effects of any reduced landscape provision on the visual appearance or dominance of the site and buildings from adjacent sites and the public realm;</u> • <u>The ability for adequate on-site stormwater disposal</u> • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown’s character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u>

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowtown properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines as a matter of discretion is of benefit as it will ensure that any breaches are consistent with the character anticipated within Arrowtown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended matter of discretion is efficient as it is the same as the other matters of discretion within the chapter.

Updated Standard – 8.5.8

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.8 – Discretionary Restricted Discretionary

Minimum Boundary Setback

8.5.8.1 Road boundary setback: 3m, except for:

- a- State Highway boundaries where the setback shall be 4.5m
- b- Garages which shall be setback 4.5m

8.5.8.2 All other boundaries: 1.5m except for:

- c- ~~Sites adjoining Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the minimum setback shall be 6m.~~

Discretion is restricted to the following:

- External appearance and visual dominance of the building as viewed from the street and adjacent properties
- Amenity and character of the streetscape
- Access to sunlight, shading and privacy of adjoining properties
- Access to views of significance
- On-site parking
- In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide

Exceptions to side and rear boundary setbacks ~~(excluding the setback in 8.5.8.2(a))~~ include:

Accessory buildings for residential activities may be located within the set back distances, where they do not exceed 7.5m in length, there are no windows or openings (other than for carports) along any walls within 1.5m of an internal boundary, and comply with rules for Building Height and Recession Plane.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more permissive activity status for boundary setback breaches leads to a risk of potential increased shading, interruption of views, building dominance and privacy effects. • Requiring consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowtown properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restricted discretionary activity status will better achieve the proposed policy outcomes. • The restricted discretionary activity status is also an appropriate test for consideration of the benefits of design regarding a breach of the standard. • The restricted discretionary activity status will facilitate more flexibility and certainty and encourage the development of a range of housing typologies within the zone. • The restricted discretionary activity status still allows Council to refuse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed matters of discretion are effective in that they provide clear and detailed matters against which a proposal is to be assessed. • The proposed matters of discretion are also efficient as they specify whether the effect to be considered is the street or adjacent properties.

	<p>inappropriate development on a case by case basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deletion of the increased setback associated with Designation 270 is of benefit as the evidence provided at the hearing showed that application of this rule would not achieve its intended purpose. • Inclusion of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines as a matter of discretion is of benefit as it will ensure that any breaches are consistent with the character anticipated within Arrowtown 	
--	---	--

Updated Standard – 8.5.9

<p>Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.9 – Restricted Discretionary</p>
<p>Continuous Building Length</p> <p>The continuous-length of any building facade above one-storey <u>ground floor level</u> shall not exceed 46m <u>24m</u>.</p> <p>Where a proposal exceeds this length, discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building dominance • Building design, materials and appearance • <u>In Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown’s character, utilising the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 as a guide</u> • 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 dominance of the building • The extent to which topography or landscaping 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

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines may result in additional design costs for developers of Arrowtown properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines as a matter of discretion is of benefit as it will ensure that any breaches are consistent with the character anticipated within Arrowtown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended matter of discretion is efficient as it is the same as the other matters of discretion within the chapter.

Updated Standard – 8.5.14

Recommended Updated Standard – 8.5.14 – Discretionary
<u>Dominance of Garages</u>
Garage doors and their supporting structures (measured parallel to the road) are not to exceed 50% of the frontage of the site as viewed from the road width of the front elevation of the building which is visible from the street.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommended change acknowledges that the garage width proportionate to the road frontage width may not achieve the intended purpose of mitigating the effects of dominant garages upon the streetscape. The recommended change to being proportional to the width of the dwelling is considered to be more beneficial in achieving this purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change is considered to be effective and efficient as gives effect to the associated policies relating to street activation and dominance of garages within the streetscape.

New Standard – 8.5.15

Recommended deleted Standard – 8.5.10 – Restricted Discretionary
<u>Height Restrictions for Land Adjoining Designation 270</u>
No building or building element on the western side of Designation 270 shall rise greater than 1.5m above the nearest point of the formed walkway path within Designation 270.
<u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Access to views to the west toward Lake Wanaka and the mountains beyond from the walkway within Designation 270</u>

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of this rule will affect the development potential of the future lots adjacent to the walkway in relation to their height. However it is anticipated that a single storey form will still be able to be constructed within the rear portion of these lots and comply with this rule. • Compliance with the rule may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with this recommended rule will ensure views from the public walkway to the west toward Lake Wanaka are maintained. This is a valued amenity for the community of Wanaka. • The proposed matter of discretion provides the ability to obstruct some portions of the view, however that the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommended rule is effective in that it will allow retention of views. • This rule is efficient as it is similar to the LDRZ rule (Rule 7.5.15) regarding development height above Frankton Road and therefore frequent plan users will be familiar with its application. • The proposed restricted

<p>result in additional earthworks having to be undertaken to lower the ground level to increase the allowable height of development adjacent to the walkway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A surveyor will be required to survey the height of the walkway adjacent to a proposed development to determine compliance with the rule. This additional level of survey may result in additional costs to the developer.	<p>intent is that access to views from the walkway are maintained.</p>	<p>discretionary activity status and matter of discretion are effective and efficient as it is clear what is to be assessed in relation to breaches of the rule.</p>
--	--	--

APPENDIX 3

UPDATED LIST OF SUBMISSION POINTS WITH RECOMMENDED DECISION

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
8.2		Stephen Spence		Oppose	Remove the proposed medium density zone and retain rural zoning on the land to the between Frankton Ladies Mile Highway and the Quail Rise Zone. Any development should be sympathetic to the style of development of the Quail Rise Zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1029.2	Universal Developments Limited		Oppose	Universal seeks that those parts of the submission that seek the removal of the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and retention of Rural Zoning on land between Frankton Ladies Mile Highway and the Quail Rise Zone. be disallowed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1061.2	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Oppose	OFTB opposes the submission as it seeks Rural General Zoning, for the reasons set out in submissions 408.1 - 408.28		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1167.2	Peter and Margaret Arnott		Oppose	Believes that the land (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 19932 and Section 129 Block 1 Shotover District) is suitable for Medium Density, Local Shopping Centre or Business Mixed Use zoning to achieve the sustainable management of the land. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1189.17	FIH Holdings Ltd		Oppose	Disallow relief sought. Opposes retention of rural zoning on the basis of the land not being suitable for rural activities and alternative zonings being more appropriate.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1195.16	The Jandel Trust		Oppose	Disallow relief sought. Opposes retention of rural zoning on the basis of the land not being suitable for rural activities and alternative zonings being more appropriate.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
8.2	FS1270.73	Hansen Family Partnership		Oppose	Opposes. Believes that maintaining rural zoning applicable to the land subject to this submission would be inappropriate for a number of reasons, particularly the efficient use and development of land which is suitable for development for activities other than rural activities. Seeks the submission be disallowed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
9.2		Terry Drayon		Oppose	Opposes the chapter provisions generally	Reject		Refer to entire S42A report
19.6		Kain Fround		Oppose	opposes the chapter provisions generally	Reject		Refer to entire S42A report
22.9		Raymond Walsh		Support	Supports the chapter provisions generally	Reject		Refer to entire S42A report
25.1		Mrs S M Speight		Oppose	Requests Medium Density Zone on northern side of Stafford Street be removed from the medium density zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
26.1		David Clarke		Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not opposed to infilling in Arrowtown but has concerns over infrastructure impacts. •Notes reduction in zone extent compared to the initial consultation version is a significant improvement •Questions impact of infill on parking and traffic, particularly relating to Adamson Drive, Stafford St and Centennial Ave; and corners of Stafford and Berkshire Street. •Questions impact of infill on low key infrastructure which is part of Arrowtowns character, eg. kerb and channel impacts •Questions effect of revised recession planes and road setbacks on character and amenity •Notes infill development should be gas reticulated and fire free to minimise air quality impacts •Questions impact of infill on capacity of schools •Requests strict design controls •Questions how affordability will be met, considering the working population travel to Queenstown or Frankton. •Supports infilling on a case by case basis, but considers proposed rules are too liberal. 			Issue Reference 1, 2 and 5
37.1		Olga Thomas		Oppose	Opposes the Medium Density Residential Zone in Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
42.2		J, E & ML Russell & Stlassny		Other	<p>Include in the medium density zone, or another appropriate chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •objectives and policies raising the presence of the Cardrona Gravel Aquifer and its potential effect on earthworks and residential development. •a rule requiring specific consideration of earthworks and building with reference to the Cardrona Gravel Aquifer •The requirement for engineering assessment and notification of any applications involving development in areas likely to be significantly impacted by the Cardrona Gravel Aquifer •Include a diagram of the Cardrona Gravel Aquifer in the Proposed District Plan (shown on Diagram A4-17 of the Operative District Plan). 		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	These matters have been included within Plan Change 49 (Chapter 22 of ODP) which will be included in Stage 2
42.2	FS1300.2	Wanaka Trust		Oppose	That the submission be refused insofar as it seeks amendments to chapter 8. That the submission be refused insofar as it seeks amendments to any part of the plan requesting the inclusion of provisions relating to the Cardrona Gravel Aquifer		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
44.1		Valerie Parker		Other	General support for the proposed district plan. Requests that properties on Russell Street (Wanaka) are exempt from rate rises.		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	

55.2		Willum Richards Consulting Ltd		Other	<p>Introduce a 10m 'no build zone' be put in place to the west of the walkway that borders the eastern edge of the proposed medium density zone shown on planning map 20, Wanaka.</p> <p>The no build zone could incorporate the playground and / or green areas which would be required as part of any medium density development.</p> <p>That the eastern most buildings in the development (nearest the walkway) be restricted to 5m.</p> <p>Depending on how the landscaping of the area is done and how the current hills etc. are flattened or enhanced, that breaking the visual amenity line of the lake from the walkway be a factor for consideration in the development of the whole area (whether this is within or in excess of the currently recommended 7m limit.).</p> <p>That the development / design / materials / colour schemes used for the building on the eastern side of the area (nearest the walkway) be sympathetic to the fact that they will be viewed by tourists and locals using the scenic walkway. Given that the 'front' of the buildings will generally be towards the lake, their 'back' should be neat, tidy and sympathetic to the fact that it will, in part, be framing an area of significant scenic amenity.</p>	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
61.1		Dato Tan Chin Nam		Oppose	Rezoning of all the land, bounded by Frankton Road (SH6A), Adelaide Street and Suburb Street, more particularly shown outlined on the copy of Map 35 attached to this submission, from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
88.2		Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust		Support	QLCHT supports changes for increased medium density in all proposed areas of Queenstown, Wanaka and Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
92.1		Deborah Richards		Other	<p>Submitters requests relate to the area of Medium Density Zone at Scurr Heights in Wanaka. Supports the medium density zone in this location, subject to the following requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That a 10m 'no build zone' be put in place to the west of the walkway. This could incorporate the playground and / or green areas which would be required as part of any medium density development. 2. The eastern most buildings in the development (nearest the walkway) be restricted to 5m. 3. Depending on how the landscaping of the area is done and how the current hills etc. are flattened or enhanced, that breaking the visual amenity line of the lake from the walkway be a factor for consideration in the development of the whole area (whether this is within or in excess of the currently recommended 7m limit.) 4. That the development / design / materials / colour schemes used for the building on the eastern side of the area (nearest the walkway) be sympathetic to the fact that they will be viewed by tourists and locals using the scenic walkway. Given that the 'front' of the buildings will generally be towards the lake, their 'back' should be neat, tidy and sympathetic to the fact that it will, in part, be framing an area of significant scenic amenity. 	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
99.1		Elizabeth Winstone		Oppose	That Arrowtown's zoning remains as it is currently.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
110.9		Alan Cutler		Other	<p>Fully supports the introduction of Medium Density Zones.</p> <p>For Wanaka the Medium Density throughout the southern side of the CBD could be extended further along the old lake terrace.</p> <p>Opposes to the blanket rezoning of the Scurr Heights parcel of land as MD.</p>		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
110.9	FS1285.9	Nic Blennerhassett		Oppose	Opposes the submitter's view. Having looked at the ownership of the parcel, and in consideration of the topography of the area, the submitter's now agree with the proposed MD zoning for the area of land shown on Map 20. Seeks that the QLDC is planning to use this area to promote low-cost housing, which is sorely needed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
110.9	FS1061.25	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
128.1		Russell Marsh		Support	Please (a) amend the plan to reinstate the original Frankton - Proposed Medium Density Zoning - per the MACTODD report or (b) amend the plan to include Stewart Street Lake Avenue Burse Street McBride Street into MDR zoning as opposed to LDR or (c) amend the plan to include Frankton district streets into MDR that are currently outside the Air noise Boundary (ANB) - per the Queenstown Airport website		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
128.1	FS1077.7	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		Oppose	To the extent that any of this land falls within the Queenstown Airport ANB or OCB BARNZ opposes the change and asks that the land be retained in the proposed zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
128.1	FS1340.59	Queenstown Airport Corporation		Oppose	QAC opposes the proposed rezoning of this land and submits that it is counter to the land use management regime established under PC35. Rezoning the land would have potentially significant adverse effects on QAC that have not been appropriately assessed in terms of section 32 of the Act.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
132.2		Rupert & Elizabeth Le Berne Illes		Other	Opposes the Medium Density Zone and infilling in Arrowtown. Requests the Council abandon the proposal and pursue other options.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
139.2		Iain Weir		Other	Zone Lot 2 DP340530 on Ironside Drive Wanaka (shown on proposed planning map 20), from Low Density Residential to Medium Density residential		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
140.1		Ian & Dorothy Williamson		Oppose	Opposes the potential rezoning of properties at Frankton Road to Medium Density. Requests that the Council retain the operative low density zoning.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
140.1	FS1189.2	FII Holdings Ltd		Oppose	Disallow relief sought. There are no traffic grounds that would prevent an alternative zoning of the land.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

140.1	FS1195.1	The Jandel Trust		Oppose	Disallow relief sought. There are no traffic grounds that would prevent an alternative zoning of the land.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
154.1		Neralie Macdonald		Oppose	Do not impose and enforce medium density with urbanised infill in Arrowtown. The preferred option is to change and extend the southern boundary this will allow for 400 dwellings approximately 1200 people to live within Arrowtown, while allowing the township to retain its unique character and charm.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
155.1		Linsey Whitchurch- Kopa		Other	Does not support the Medium Density Proposal, however agrees that Arrowtown must contribute to the growth of the Wakitipu area. A change to the urban growth boundary is a more suitable option with design restrictions on dwellings. Option to first time buyers currently in and contributing to Arrowtown community would be preferable also.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
164.1		Warren McCullagh		Oppose	opposes the inclusion of the area to the Southeast of Fernhill Road, between Richards park Lane and Lordens Place within the Medium Density Zone		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
173.1		Gordon Girvan		Oppose	That the council should leave the zoning in Wanaka as it is at present.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
173.1	FS1251.1	Varina Pty Limited		Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that expansion / amendments to residential and commercial zones in Wanaka are required given the growing population and tourist numbers.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.12		Universal Developments Limited		Other	General support and seek confirmation of the provisions except for specific matters identified in the submission.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.12	FS1061.17	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
180.1		Nigel Ker	8.5.1.1, & 8.5.8	Other	Medium density infill should be subject to strict design guidelines around heights, shading, setbacks and parking. Requests 2 car parks on site. Requests northern setback of 6 m with 4 m building height limit and height plane control	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2 and 5
181.1		Alistair and Christine Thomas		Oppose	Opposes the medium density zone in Arrowtown, requests to "leave Arrowtown as it is".		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
190.1		Angus Small		Oppose	Opposes the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
199.9		Craig Douglas		Oppose	Opposes the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown. Other proposals should be considered including extending the Arrowtown UGB.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
204.1		Arthur Gormack		Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown entirely. Suggests council look to other areas eg. Shotover country, Jacks point, Arthurs point.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
210.1		Ioris King		Oppose	Opposes the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown. Seeks that Council withdraw any plans for medium density infill within the Arrowtown boundary.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
221.2		Susan Cleaver		Oppose	That Medium density in Arrowtown be removed and reduced to Low Density and that the Urban boundary for Arrowtown is extended to include the area south of Arrowtown, up to the Arrowtown golf course.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
244.1		Tania Flight		Oppose	No medium density in Arrowtown. Instead, a southern boundary extension to cater for approximately 200 new houses released in stages as demand requires.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
261.2		June Watson		Oppose	Retention of the status quo. Opposes the medium density residential zone in Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
264.1		Philip Winstone		Oppose	No medium density housing zone for Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
265.2		Phillip Bunn		Oppose	Opposes the Medium density in Arrowtown. Supports the growth of the urban boundary.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
269.4		David Barton		Other	Medium density in Wanaka should focus on greenfield and not infill.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
273.1		The Full & Bye Trust		Oppose	Restrict the area of the Wanaka Medium Density Zone to more immediately adjacent to the town centre. Apply more stringent significant controls to retain the amenity value of the area, particularly as it progresses eastward toward the characteristically Wanaka scenic Cardrona Moraine, Bullock Creek, upper Helwick Street and East Tenby Street regions.	Accept in Part	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 2
276.1		Jane Hazlett		Oppose	Allow the Arrowtown boundary to extend		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
290.1		Christine Ryan		Support	Supports the Medium Density Zone	Accept		Refer to entire S42A report
290.1	FS1061.27	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted.	Accept		Refer to entire S42A report

304.1		Sandra Zuschlag		Oppose	Arrowtown should not get any medium density zone. Arrowtown boundary should stay as it is. Design guidelines for Arrowtown for any new building, alteration and streetscape landscaping controlled by Arrowtown design review board. 6star rated homes should not have any special rules in regards to density - they should fall under the normal rules. Every house in the Wakatipu should be homestar 6 rated. No more wood fires too be allowed in new Arrowtown houses or no upgrading to wood fires allowed. Density should not only talk about percentage of building per site but also about how much area can be sealed (driveways - patios). More permeable surface are a must. Rainwater should be stored in tanks on site to be used for toilet flushing and garden watering. Financial support by the council.	Accept in Part		Issue References 1, 2 and 5
305.1		Josh McKeague		Oppose	QLDC reserve land Map 32 ref 572 remain reserve land and the underlying medium density designation be removed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
305.2		Josh McKeague		Oppose	QLDC reserve land Map 32 ref 572 remain reserve land and the underlying medium density designation be removed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
311.1		Lyndsey Lindsay		Oppose	Opposes all height.	Reject		Unknown
317.1		Elvene C Lewis		Oppose	Oppose Medium Density Zone within Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
319.1		Jon G Newson		Oppose	Concerned Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown will place a strain on street parking, off street parking and infrastructure (water supply and storm water). Believe we need more Shotover Country, Lakes Hayes and Jack Points developments.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 5
335.11		Nic Blennerhassett		Support	General support with specific amendments sought.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 6
335.11	FS1061.28	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 7
335.15		Nic Blennerhassett		Other	Support the zone as shown on planning map 21. Unsure with medium density zoning on planning map 20.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
341.1		Peter Mathieson		Oppose	Do not proceed with the Medium Density Residential zone in Arrowtown. Instead revisit greenfield areas at Arrowtown South and North West. Arrowtown must provide for urban growth. Not via the Housing Accord but via attractive low and medium density provisions. Medium and high density housing should be provided in less attractive / valuable sites e.g. Gorge Road, Shotover Country and areas where low income workers are required.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
389.5		Body Corporate 22362		Other	At a minimum that Body Corporate 22362 be included in the medium density zone if not the whole of Goldfields. Plan of Body Corporate 22362 attached showing the area concerned.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
389.5	FS1340.87	Queenstown Airport Corporation		Oppose	QAC is concerned rezoning requests that will result in the intensification of ASAN establishing within close proximity to Queenstown Airport. The proposed rezoning is a significant departure from the nature, scale and intensity of ASAN development currently anticipated at this site and may potentially result in adverse effects on QAC over the longer term. The proposed rezoning request should not be accepted.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.7		Sean & Jane McLeod		Other	That the medium density zone is extend to include most Fernhill and Sunshine bay on the lower slopes within 4-500m of Fernhill road and that it is also extended all the way along Frankton Road from the existing High Density areas to include Panorama Te, Larchwood Heights, Andrews park, Goldfields, Battery Hill Marina Heights and every thing in between. Questions Medium Density Zone location opposite Glenda Drive Suggests the Queenstown Heights Subzone be zoned as Low Density Residential.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.7	FS1271.2	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others		Support	Supports. Seeks approval of the areas identified as MDR zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.7	FS1331.2	Mount Crystal Limited		Support	Rezoning the land owned by Mt Crystal a combination of MDR and HDR as sought in submission # 150		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
391.7	FS1340.91	Queenstown Airport Corporation		Oppose	QAC is concerned rezoning requests that will result in the intensification of ASAN establishing within close proximity to Queenstown Airport. The proposed rezoning is a significant departure from the nature, scale and intensity of ASAN development currently anticipated at this site and may potentially result in adverse effects on QAC over the longer term. The proposed rezoning request should not be accepted.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
420.2		Lynn Campbell		Other	The submitter is concerned that not enough attention has been considered with respect to parking during the formulation of the Medium Density Zone. Additionally, the submitter raises concerns with regard to the safety of school pupils and elderly.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
423.2		Carol Bunn		Oppose	That the medium density zone in Arrowtown be removed and reduced to Low density, and that the urban boundary be extended south.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
445.1		Helwick Street Limited		Support	That the medium density zones be enacted. That the medium density areas immediately bordering both Wanaka and Queenstown business districts be deemed transitional zones to allow some small scale and appropriate commercial activity.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
445.1	FS1061.30	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted in part.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

470.1		Queenstown Playcentre		Other	Generally supports the idea of increasing density close to town, however requests that guidelines are introduced and plans are reviewed by an appropriate panel.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
479.1		Mr Trevor William Oliver		Not Stated	Opposes the proposed Medium Density Residential zone between Wynyard Crescent and Fernhill Road, and over the submitters property at 16B Wynyard Crescent, Fernhill (legally described as PUB & AUB1 ON UP 22268 and held in title OT14A/51, OT14A). Retain the Low density residential zoning of the residential block between Wynyard Crescent and Fernhill Road.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
479.1	FS1271.5	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that local authority approve the areas identified as MDR zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
503.2		DJ and EJ Cassells, The Bulling Family, The Bennett Family, M Lynch		Oppose	Remove the Medium Density Zone from the area between Park Street and Hobart Street and replace it with the current applicable provisions from the Operative District Plan (high density) OR amend the provisions of chapter 8 so that standards for density, lot size, building footprint, site coverage, setbacks recession places and heights are the same as currently applies under the operative plan and delete rules 8.5.5 and 8.6.2.1 OR Remove the Medium Density Zone and replace with provisions of the same effect as the proposed Chapter 10 (Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone)		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
503.2	FS1063.5	Peter Fleming and Others		Support	All allowed		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
503.2	FS1315.2	Greenwood Group Ltd		Oppose	The submission proposes to restrict the development opportunities of Greenwood's land by incorporating a special character overlay across an area that is suitable for High Density development.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
506.2		Friends of the Wakatiou Gardens and Reserves Incorporated		Not Stated	Remove the Medium Density Zone from the area between Park Street and Hobart Street and replace it with the current applicable provisions from the Operative District Plan (high density) OR amend the provisions of chapter 8 so that standards for density, lot size, building footprint, site coverage, setbacks recession places and heights are the same as currently applies under the operative plan and delete rules 8.5.5 and 8.6.2.1 OR Remove the Medium Density Zone and replace with provisions of the same effect as the proposed Chapter 10 (Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone)		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
506.2	FS1315.3	Greenwood Group Ltd		Oppose	This submission seeks (amongst other matters) that the area bounded by Hobart and Park streets to retain the current district plan provisions. Such an amendment to the Proposed Plan is opposed as it would give rise to inefficient use of land and restrictions to growth in an area where both location and accessibility provide cause for a development at a higher intensity.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
506.2	FS1063.11	Peter Fleming and Others		Support	We support all of their submission. QLDC have provided little or no relevant section 32 reports that is it is lacking in section 32 reports that are of any use. It is unacceptable that submissions on A4 paper all stacked on top of one another would be over 1 metre height and that they can be cross referenced by us mere mortals in 3 weeks. They are closed off less than a week before Christmas New Year which is stupid. We wish to comment further on this at Hearings. We wish to object to all submissions that in fact amount to private plan changes. They are undemocratic and most likely illegal. The maps are unreadable.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
506.2	FS1260.23	Dato Tan Chin Nam		Oppose	Zone the Area Medium Density Residential. The Area is ideally located and suitable for a greater intensity of development than the replacement zoning sought by the submitter (equivalent of the Operative Plan's High Density-Sub Zone C). The special character of the area sought to be recognised by the submitter can be accommodated while maintaining a medium density zoning.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
506.3		Friends of the Wakatiou Gardens and Reserves Incorporated		Not Stated	Delete rule 8.5.5	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
506.3	FS1063.12	Peter Fleming and Others		Support	We support all of their submission. QLDC have provided little or no relevant section 32 reports that is it is lacking in section 32 reports that are of any use. It is unacceptable that submissions on A4 paper all stacked on top of one another would be over 1 metre height and that they can be cross referenced by us mere mortals in 3 weeks. They are closed off less than a week before Christmas New Year which is stupid. We wish to comment further on this at Hearings. We wish to object to all submissions that in fact amount to private plan changes. They are undemocratic and most likely illegal. The maps are unreadable.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
506.7		Friends of the Wakatiou Gardens and Reserves Incorporated		Not Stated	Ensure that in the Residential chapters that densification does not reduce the existing public open spaces, reserves and gardens. Densification development should be done on the basis that additional public open spaces, reserves and public gardens are provided.	Reject		Issue Reference 6
506.7	FS1063.16	Peter Fleming and Others		Support	We support all of their submission. QLDC have provided little or no relevant section 32 reports that is it is lacking in section 32 reports that are of any use. It is unacceptable that submissions on A4 paper all stacked on top of one another would be over 1 metre height and that they can be cross referenced by us mere mortals in 3 weeks. They are closed off less than a week before Christmas New Year which is stupid. We wish to comment further on this at Hearings. We wish to object to all submissions that in fact amount to private plan changes. They are undemocratic and most likely illegal. The maps are unreadable.	Reject		Issue Reference 6

510.1		Wayne L Blair		Not Stated	- The current zoning for low, medium and high density should remain in Wanaka		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
510.1	FS1251.10	Varina Pty Limited		Oppose	Opposes. The submitter opposes and considers that expansion / amendments to residential and commercial zones in Wanaka are required given the growing population and tourist numbers in Wanaka.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
511.1		Helen Blair		Not Stated	- The current zoning for low, medium and high density should remain in Wanaka		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
511.1	FS1251.12	Varina Pty Limited		Oppose	Opposes. The submitter opposes and considers that expansion / amendments to residential and commercial zones in Wanaka are required given the growing population and tourist numbers in Wanaka.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
514.2		Duncan Fea		Support	Retain Chapter 8 in its entirety	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
514.2	FS1061.31	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Support	That the submission is accepted	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
521.1		Estate A P M Hodge		Support	Retain Chapter 8 in its entirety.	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
569.1		Russell Heckler		Oppose	That there will not be Medium Density within the present Arrowtown Boundary		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
571.19		Totally Tourism Limited		Not Stated	Any further or consequential or alternative amendments necessary to give effect to this submission.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
578.1		Keith Milne		Oppose	Reject medium density zone in Arrowtown. Keep the urban growth boundary where it is at present. Retain the existing rules for recession planes and boundary setbacks. Make infill development a notify-able activity, to consider each case taking neighbours concerns into account.	Reject	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 1 and 2
591.2		Varina Propriety Limited		Oppose	The Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay Zone is deleted and replaced with the Wanaka Town Centre Zone. Should some or all of the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay be approved, the Submitters seek the following particular outcomes and otherwise reserve their position: The objectives, policies and rules of the Medium Density Residential Zone are modified to allow non-residential built forms within the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay more enabling built form bulk and location controls.	Accept in Part	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 2
591.2	FS1179.1	Sneaky Curfew Pty Ltd		Support	Supports submission 591 in relation to the extension of the Wanaka Town Centre Zone to replace the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay on the Southern side of Brownston Street. Seeks that the following parts of submission 591 be allowed		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
591.2	FS1276.3	JWA and DV Smith Trust		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks to refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 8 MDR and any rezoning affecting medium Density Residential/Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay land on planning Map 21.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
597.1		John Duncan Lindsay		Oppose	Reject the medium density zone at Arrowtown. Maintain the height restrictions on buildings to the present level.	Reject	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 2
599.1		Peter Fleming	8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.5.5, 8.5.6, 8.4.28, 8.4.23, 8.4	Oppose	Abandon the medium density zone in Park Street area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
599.1	FS1265.2	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch		Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any density change over the Brisbane street area without having provisions for transport and car parking considered.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
599.1	FS1268.2	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc		Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any density change over the Brisbane street area without having provisions for transport and car parking considered.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
618.1		Heather Guise		Oppose	Opposes Medium Density Residential in Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
628.1		reception@jea.co.nz		Other	Rezone the "Medium Density zoned land outlined in red in the submission to "High Density Residential", the land is generally bounded by Park Street and Brisbane Street.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
628.1	FS1265.7	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch		Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
628.1	FS1268.7	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc		Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
628.1	FS1260.20	Dato Tan Chin Nam		Support	Zone the land identified in the submission High Density Residential. The land identified in the submission is located in close proximity to the town centre, and main public transport routes. The land is better suited for development enabled by a High Density Residential zoning.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
646.1		G W (Bill) Crooks		Oppose	Revisit the boundary changes around Arrowtown and delete the proposed changes to rezone land in Arrowtown for Medium Density.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
648.2		Gillian Kay Crooks		Oppose	Oppose Medium Density Zoning in Arrowtown. Already large areas of land zoned for residential use in the Wakatipu area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

652.1		Adventure Consultants Limited		Support	Adventure Consultants seek that their property (20 Brownstown Street, Wanaka) is re-zoned and that the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay (Map 21) is applied as proposed along with all relevant provisions as set out in the Proposed District Plan.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
655.6		Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited		Oppose	The inclusion of transport standards for the Medium Density Residential Zone	Reject		Issue Reference 5
655.6	FS1064.6	Martin MacDonald		Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed as per the reasons given in my original submissions reference numbers 451 and 454. I consider Medium Density zoning as inappropriate in this area, and that shifting of the outstanding natural landscape line and urban growth boundary line will result in significant adverse effects on the environment (both east and west of Hayes Creek) which is contrary to the principles of sustainable management.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
655.6	FS1071.7	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
668.9		Philip Thoreau		Other	The Medium Density Residential Zone proposal is supported by the submitters, except where indicated in the foregoing, where through reasons of either the proposed boundaries of the zone, through the provisions relating to density 8.5.5, recession planes 8.5.6 and in relation to parking 8.2.7.3 and 8.2.7.4, conflict with the objectives of the zone purpose of 8.1, and will adversely impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply whilst ensuring reasonable amenity protection and protecting the privacy and amenity of guests and residential users.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
668.9	FS1271.35	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
668.9	FS1331.31	Mount Crystal Limited		Oppose	The development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
668.10		Philip Thoreau		Oppose	It is submitted that it is preferred to have more stringent significant controls to retain the amenity value of the area, particularly as it progresses eastward toward the characteristically Wanaka scenic Cardrona Moraine, Bullock Creek, upper Helwick Street and East Tenby Street regions.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
668.11		Philip Thoreau		Other	It is submitted that the proposed area for the zone; which is essentially a part of the traditional and historical Wanaka town precinct requires sensitive care in its development so as to preserve actual character of the precinct which gives Wanaka its identity.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
676.1		Philip & Jocelyn Sanford	8.6.1, 8.6.2, 8.5.5	Oppose	We want the QLDC to reconsider Discretionary Activities and return to a democratic process whereby affected persons e.g., neighbours can have some say. See our attached submission.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 5
679.1		Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited		Oppose	We seek either a High Density Residential zoning on the land with a 12 metre height limit. or. some other zoning which provides for hotels at the height of the current development .		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
679.1	FS1063.2	Peter Fleming and Others		Oppose	All disallowed		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
679.1	FS1315.27	Greenwood Group Ltd		Support	Greenwood supports the submission for Copthorne which seeks either a high density residential rezoning with a 12 metre height limit or some other rezoning that provides for hotels at a height of the existing development on the submitter's site.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
682.1		Joan Allison Garvan & Myles Cameron White as Trustees for DL & JA Garvan Family Trusts		Support	Support the creation of the new Medium Density Residential Zone with the proposed rules as set out in the draft District Plan.	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
686.2		Garth Makowski		Other	Secondary Relief – Amend provisions to allow for an increase in density within the Medium Density Zone	Reject		Issue Reference 1
717.1		The Jandel Trust		Not Stated	The rezoning of the 179 Frankton-Ladies Miles Highway and wider area to Business Mixed Use zone or Industrial zone as shown on the map attached to this submission.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1029.7	Universal Developments Limited		Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed:		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1062.1	Ross Copland		Oppose	The submission be Transferred until Stage 2 of the review is publicly notified. Alternatively, the submission be disallowed.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1189.1	FII Holdings Ltd		Support	Allow relief sought. Support mixed use zoning of the land.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1061.41	Otago Foundation Trust Board		Oppose	That the submission is rejected.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1167.32	Peter and Margaret Arnott		Support	Supports in part. Agrees that the land (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 19932 and Section 129 Block I Shotover District) is suitable for Medium Density, Local Shopping Centre or Business Mixed Use zoning to achieve the sustainable management. Seeks that this land to be rezoned as Medium Density, Local Shopping Centre or Business Mixed Use zones.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1270.107	Hansen Family Partnership		Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.1	FS1340.140	Queenstown Airport Corporation		Oppose	QAC opposes the proposed rezoning of this land and submits that it is counter to the land use management regime established under PC35. Rezoning the land would have significant adverse effects on QAC that have not been appropriately assessed in terms of section 32 of the Act.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
729.1		Infinity Investment Group Limited		Other	The medium density land at Wanaka on the southern side of Aubrey Road is further evaluated and the medium density zoning is removed from visually prominent locations. An outline development plan requirement is imposed over the site that identifies areas of the site that are not suitable for development.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

737.1		Sneaky Curlew Pty Ltd		Support	Confirm the Medium Density Residential zone south of the Wanaka Town Centre, with the exception that the area proposed as Medium Density Residential - Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay (immediately to the south of Brownston Street in the blocks from Dunganon Street to Chalmers Street for half the block depth to Upton Street) be rezoned to Wanaka Town Centre zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
737.1	FS1276.7	JWA and DV Smith Trust		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks to refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 8 MDR and any rezoning affecting MDR/Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay land on planning Map 21.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
737.1	FS1251.14	Varina Pty Limited		Support	The submitter supports this submission with respect to the expansion of the Wanaka Town Centre Zone on the south side of Brownstone Street.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
737.2		Sneaky Curlew Pty Ltd		Not Stated	Possibly the Medium Density Residential - Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay be applied for half a block depth on the north side of Upton St, between Helwick and Dunganon Streets.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
737.2	FS1276.8	JWA and DV Smith Trust		Oppose	Opposes. Seeks to refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 8 MDR and any rezoning affecting MDR/Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay land on planning Map 21.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
751.8		Hansen Family Partnership		Support	Retain the provisions	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
752.4		Michael Farrier		Not Stated	The proposed Medium Density Zone is removed from the Plan on the basis of the character of Arrowtown, infrastructural requirements, amenity value and current atmospheric respirable particulate concentrations.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
773.10		John & Jill Blennerhassett		Support	We welcome this new zone designation becoming part of the Plan. While encouraging higher densities, including provision for terrace housing within this zone, thought needs to be given to provision of open space to balance the increased density of people.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
790.13		Queenstown Lakes District Council		Support	Requests that the Medium Density Residential Zone is confirmed on Lot 110 Deposited Plan 347413 known as Scurr Heights		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
814.1		Julie P Johnston		Oppose	Oppose the proposed Medium Density "urban infill" for Arrowtown but supports extending town boundaries to allow for extra dwellings.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
821.1		Janice Kinealy	8.5.6	Oppose	- Object to density change, specifically for Brisbane Street- from high density to medium density. - Size of buildings and recession planes are too large for the area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
821.1	FS1265.1	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch		Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any density change over the Brisbane street area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
821.1	FS1268.1	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc		Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any density change over the Brisbane street area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
821.1	FS1063.36	Peter Fleming and Others		Support	All be allowed		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
824.1		Barbara Derrett		Not Stated	Reference to Arrowtown I am HORRIFIED at the Council's proposal to ENFORCE MEDIUM DENSITY INFILL. This will reduce privacy, increase noise and congestion levels, increase off-street parking issues, reduce sunlight in an already sunlight-deprived town, storm water - curbing and channelling with add to the loss of character of the town, Road works and construction in central Arrowtown would go on for years, There would inevitably be reduced amenity values, such as open spaces, trees and vegetation. I SUPPORT INSTEAD for Arrowtown, A BOUNDARY CHANGE.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.22		Fil Holdings Limited		Oppose	Amend the zone as sought in the submission. The submitter seeks the rezoning of the site (145 Frankton - Ladies Mile Highway) and wider area to Business Mixed Use zone or Industrial zone; or amending the Medium Density Residential zone provisions.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.22	FS1195.18	The Jandel Trust		Support	Allow relief sought. Supports the removal of the rural general zoning on the land, a more appropriate zone would be a mixed use zone that provides for residential and lighter industrial/commercial uses. Supports the removal of the ONL boundary through the submitter's property.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.22	FS1270.28	Hansen Family Partnership		Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
853.1		Nicola Richards		Oppose	Do not adopt proposed Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
61.3		Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.1 Zone Purpose	Other	delete last sentence of paragraph 5 (the reference to the expiry date)	Accept		Issue Reference 1
97.1		Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Rezone Lot 1 DP 21182 (OT12D/1648) to high density residential. Delete last sentence of paragraph 5 relating to the Homestar expiry date.	Accept in Part	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 1

130.1		Richard & Lynn Kane	8.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The submitter considers incentives for sustainable building design, which will expire in five years after the date it is made operative are definitely not required in Wanaka. Questions why sustainable buildings are afforded special privileges.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
238.40		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Supports the purpose in part. Requests deletion of the sentence stating that incentives for sustainable building design would expire after 5 years. Requests provision of a map of anticipated community activities ,permeability, connections and linkages within these zones and ensure land is appropriately zoned for these.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1061.68	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That the submission is accepted in part.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1107.45	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1226.45	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1234.45	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Home Water Holdings Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1239.45	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1241.45	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1242.68	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Transferred to Hearing Stream Commercial	
238.40	FS1248.45	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1249.45	Tweed Development Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.40	FS1271.25	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to delete the sunset clause from Rule 8. 5. 5.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
264.2		Philip Winstone	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the medium density residential zone is not applied to Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
300.4		Rob Jewell	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Opposes the provision.	Reject		Refer to entire S42A report
306.1		NA	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That medium density housing should not be adopted within Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
389.6		Body Corporate 22362	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	As a whole we agree with the review and the proposal of increasing the density of the existing residential areas as a policy.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
408.7		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add change as underlined: "The Medium Density Residential Zone has the purpose to provide land for residential development at increased densities. In conjunction with the High Density Residential Zone and the Low Density Residential Zone, the zone will play a key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply. The zone will primarily accommodate residential land uses, but may also support limited non-residential activities where these enhance residential amenity or support and an adjoining Town Centre, and so not impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply. These non-residential activities may include community facilities such as churches which contribute to the urban fabric of an area by providing amenity, public spaces and accessibility."	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.7	FS1167.10	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.7	FS1270.36	Hansen Family Partnership	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
524.20		Ministry of Education	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Relief Sought: "Community activities and facilities are anticipated given the need for such activities within residential areas and the high degree of accessibility of the zone."	Reject		Issue Reference 3

524.20	FS1125.5	New Zealand Fire Service	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Allow. The Commission supports the change in activity status proposed by the submitter for Community Facilities and / or Activities. Communities have an expectation that an emergency will be responded to within a quick, efficient and timely manner. The adverse effects from a fire station are well understood and definable. They can be defined as relating to amenity including noise, traffic generation and on-site car parking. Given that there is a Community expectation around emergency services being able to respond quickly and efficiently, there should also be acknowledgement in the plan and by the community that a level of adverse effect in relation to fire stations is therefore acceptable.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
524.20	FS1061.39	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
649.1		Southern District Health Board	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	This proposal should facilitate the development of affordable and appropriate housing/accommodation opportunities for seasonal and lower-paid workers who currently have difficulty finding suitable accommodation in Queenstown and Wanaka. Public Health South has had concerns about overcrowding in worker accommodation and the potential risks this may have on health, especially the transmission of infectious diseases. Greater access to suitable accommodation should help to address this risk. The submitter requires that this provision is allowed.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
699.6		Reddy Group Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Not Stated	The Medium Density Residential Zone has the purpose to provide land for residential development at increased densities. In conjunction with the High Density Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone, the zone will play key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply. The zone will primarily accommodate residential land uses, but may also support limited non-residential activities where these enhance residential amenity or support an adjoining Town Centre, and do not impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply. The zone is situated in locations in Queenstown, Frankton, Arrowtown and Wanaka that are within identified urban growth boundaries, and easily accessible to local shopping zones, town centres or schools by public transport, cycling or walking. The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for an increased density of housing in locations that are supported by appropriate utility adequate existing or planned infrastructure. The zone will enable a greater supply of diverse housing options for the District. The main forms of residential development anticipated are terrace housing, semi-detached housing and detached townhouses on smaller sections. The zone will realise changes to density and character over time to provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the District. In particular, the zone will provide a greater diversity of housing options for smaller households including single persons, couples, small young families and older people seeking to downsize. It will also enable more rental accommodation for the growing population of transient workers in the District. While providing for a higher density of development than is possible in the Low Density Residential Zone, the zone utilises development controls to ensure reasonable amenity protection is maintained. Importantly, building height will be generally limited to two storeys. Development will be required to adhere to achieve high standards of urban design, providing site responsive built forms and utilising opportunities to create vibrant public spaces and active transport connections (walking and cycling). In Arrowtown, particular consideration will need to be given to the town's special character, and the design criteria identified by the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006. A high standard of environmental performance is encouraged to improve the comfort, health and overall sustainability of built forms. To ensure the practical and timely realisation of housing supply, incentives for sustainable building design will expire five years after the date the zone is made operative. The zone may also support visitor accommodation where this is best located within a residential environment and does not adversely impact on the supply of permanent (long term) rental accommodation. visitor accommodation within the zone will be sensitively designed with regard to its setting, and protect the privacy and amenity of guests and nearby residential uses. Community activities are anticipated given the need for such activities within residential areas and the high degree of accessibility of the zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2 and 5
717.3		The Jandel Trust	8.1 Zone Purpose	Not Stated	Amend as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone has the purpose to provide land for primarily residential development at increased densities. In conjunction with the High Density Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone, the zone will play a key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply. The zone will primarily accommodate residential land uses, but may also support limited non-residential activities where these enhance residential amenity or support an adjoining Town Centre or are located in areas that have lower residential amenity as a result of proximity to industrial zones or busy roads, and do not impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply...	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.3	FS1029.9	Universal Developments Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
717.3	FS1270.109	Hansen Family Partnership	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
792.1		Patricia Swale	8.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Oppose rezoning from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. See submission for further detail.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

847.1		FII Holdings Limited	8.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Amend -8.1 as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone has the purpose to provide land for primarily residential development at increased densities. In conjunction with the High Density Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone, the zone will play a key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply. The zone will primarily accommodate residential land uses, but may also support limited non-residential activities where these enhance residential amenity or support an adjoining Town Centre or are located in areas that have lower residential amenity as a result of proximity to industrial zones or busy roads, and do not impact on the primary role of the zone to provide housing supply...	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.1	FS1270.7	Hansen Family Partnership	8.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
117.35		Maggie Lawton	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	8.2.1.5 clarify meaning of "higher density" 8.2.2.3 questions whether this will be enforced through building consent 8.2.3.1 certification of Homestar should be checked at design stage and certified when built 8.2.5 supports the provision 8.2.7 supports the provision and notes also relevant to Low Density development	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
230.3		Loris King	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Strongly objects to the following included in the Medium Density Area: 8.2.7.4 8.2.8 8.2.9.1 8.2.10	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 5
230.3	FS1061.4	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 5
230.3	FS1251.6	Varina Pty Limited	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Opposes in part. The submitter opposes as it relates to matters on the Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones. The submitter considers that allowing for higher density housing, visitor accommodation and commercial activities in the residential zones of Wanaka is important to cater for growing population and tourist numbers.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 5
230.3	FS1125.12	New Zealand Fire Service	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Disallow. The Commission submitted in support of this objective. The Commission opposes this submission as Fire Stations need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times. This is so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able to respond to emergency callouts in a timely way, avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies. This objective strongly supports this.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1, 2, 3 and 5
391.8		Sean & Jane McLeod	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	generally supports the objectives and policies of the medium density residential zone	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
510.6		Wayne L Blair	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	8.4.10.2 - Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat - 3 per site 8.4.11.2 - Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat - 4 or more per site Which is the correct number? Remove confusion	Reject		No confusion - one permitted and the other restricted discretionary
511.6		Helen Blair	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	8.4.10.2 - Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat - 3 per site 8.4.11.2 - Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat - 4 or more per site Which is the correct number? Remove confusion	Reject		No confusion - one permitted and the other restricted discretionary
586.9		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Objectives 8.2.1-8.2.5 8.2.7-8.2.10	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
586.10		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Policies 8.2.1.1- 8.2.2.2. and 8.2.2.4- 8.2.7.5	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
591.5		Varina Propriety Limited	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Objective 8.2.2 and Objective 8.2.5 and their associated policies are modified so the specified urban design outcomes apply only to multiunit residential or visitor accommodation developments rather than all development. Objective 8.2.9 and associated policies and the relevant rule framework are modified to allow for a wider group of visitor accommodation activities. Amend the objectives, policies and rules to provide for and enable visitor accommodation activities in the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zones.	Accept in Part	Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	Issue Reference 2
775.9		H R & D A Familton	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Objectives 8.2.1-8.2.5 8.2.7-8.2.10	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
775.10		H R & D A Familton	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Policies 8.2.1.1- 8.2.2.2. and 8.2.2.4- 8.2.7.5	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
803.9		H R Familton	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Objectives 8.2.1-8.2.5 8.2.7-8.2.10	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report

803.10		H R Familton	8.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain Policies 8.2.1.1- 8.2.2.2. and 8.2.2.4- 8.2.7.5	Accept in Part		Refer to entire S42A report
199.10		Craig Douglas	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The proposed Arrowtown Medium Density zone be dropped.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
238.41		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports in part, with suggested rewording as below. Requests consideration of other areas that are currently zoned LDR around Frankton (as demonstrated on the map provided) should also be considered for medium density development. Medium density development will be realised within Urban Growth Boundaries and close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres, public transport routes and non-vehicular trails in a manner that is responsive to housing demand pressures. All medium density projects should appear before the Urban Design Panel or objective review authority and be assessed on high quality design including sustainable design principles.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1061.69	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1107.46	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1226.46	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1234.46	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1239.46	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1241.46	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1242.69	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Transferred to Hearing Stream Commercial	
238.41	FS1248.46	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.41	FS1249.46	Tweed Development Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
264.3		Philip Winstone	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Not to proceed with Medium Density Zone for Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
380.24		Villa dellago	8.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports the provision.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
571.14		Totally Tourism Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Objective 8.21 and Policy 8.2.1.1 are contradictory to the Rules, which provide for anything other than registered home stays or holiday homes let for up to 180 nights per year to be a Non-Complying Activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
699.7		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Not Stated	Medium density development will be realised occurs close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres, public transport routes and non-vehicular trails in a manner that is responsive to housing demand pressures.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 6
717.5		The Jandel Trust	8.2.1 Objective 1	Not Stated	Add new policy: 8.2.1.6 Encourage and provide for workers accommodation to be established higher densities and support workers accommodation as an ancillary land use to help offset potential adverse effects from non-residential activity.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
717.5	FS1029.11	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept in Part		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
717.5	FS1270.111	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
847.3		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Insert new policy: 8.2.1.6 Encourage and provide for workers accommodation to be established higher densities and support workers accommodation as an ancillary land use to help offset potential adverse effects from non-residential activity.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity

847.3	FS1270.9	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
847.3	FS1061.43	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.1 Objective 1	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
699.8		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1.1	Not Stated	The zone accommodates existing traditional residential housing forms (dwelling, residential flat), but fundamentally has the purpose to provide land Provide opportunities for medium density housing and visitor accommodation close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres and public transport routes. that is appropriate for medium density housing or visitor accommodation uses	Accept		Issue Reference 6
717.4		The Jandel Trust	8.2.1.1	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.1.1 The zone accommodates existing traditional residential housing forms (dwelling, residential flat), but fundamentally has the purpose to provide land close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres and public transport routes that is appropriate for medium density housing, workers accommodation or visitor accommodation uses.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
717.4	FS1029.10	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.1.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
717.4	FS1270.110	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.1.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
847.2		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.1.1	Other	Amend as follows: 8.2.1.1 The zone accommodates existing traditional residential housing forms (dwelling, residential flat), but fundamentally has the purpose to provide land close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres and public transport routes that is appropriate for medium density housing, workers accommodation or visitor accommodation uses.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
847.2	FS1270.8	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.1.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Workers accommodation should be no different to residential development in terms of amenity
699.9		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1.2	Not Stated	Enable Mmedium density development is anticipated up to two storeys in of varying building typologies forms including terrace, semi-detached, duplex, townhouse and small lot detached housing.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.10		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1.3	Not Stated	Enable mMore than two storeys may be possible on some sloping sites where the development is able to comply with all other standards (including recession planes, setbacks, density and building coverage).	Reject		Issue Reference 2
699.11		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1.4	Not Stated	The zone provides Provide for compact development forms that provide a diverse housing supply and contain the outward spread of residential growth areas.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
699.12		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.1.5	Not Stated	Higher density development is incentivised to help support development feasibility, reduce the prevalence of land banking, and ensure greater responsiveness of housing supply to demand.	Accept		Issue Reference 1,
792.2		Patricia Swale	8.2.1.5	Other	Seeks clarification Land banking statement - where is this happening told by a district planner not happening in this area.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
199.11		Craig Douglas	8.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	The proposed Arrowtown Medium Density zone be dropped.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
264.4		Philip Winstone	8.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Dont proceed with the MDHZ in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
380.25		Villa delLago	8.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports the provision.	Accept in Part		
699.13		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2 Objective 2	Not Stated	Development provides a positive contribution to the environment through quality urban design solutions which complement and enhances local character, heritage and identity. Residential areas are attractive, healthy and safe environments with functional and quality development that positively responds to the site, neighbourhood and the wider context and which are in keeping with or complement the planned built character of the place	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
847.5		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Insert new policy: 8.2.4.3 Providing an appropriate level of amenity while acknowledging that amenity will be reduced as a result of the proximity to existing non-residential activity, the State Highway and nearby Industrial and Commercial Zones.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
847.5	FS1061.45	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.2 Objective 2	Support	That is the submission is approved in part but redrafted to ensure "appropriate" is qualified to the context of an entrance to Queenstown	Reject		Issue Reference 3
847.5	FS1270.11	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
699.14		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.1	Not Stated	Manage development to ensure that bBuildings shall address streets and provide direct connection between front doors and the street, with limited presentation of unarticulated blank walls or facades to the street.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2

699.15		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.2	Not Stated	Require development to provide some form of visual connection with the street (such as through the inclusion of windows, outdoor living areas, low profile fencing or landscaping) Where street activation (by the methods outlined by Policy 8.2.2.3) is not practical due to considerations or constraints such as slope, multiple road frontages, solar orientation, aspect and privacy, as a minimum buildings shall provide some form of visual connection with the street (such as through the inclusion of windows, outdoor living areas, low profile fencing or landscaping).	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
505.11		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.2.3	Other	Amend policy 8.2.2.3 as follows: shall not be dominated by Mitigate adverse effects of garaging, parking and accessways on Street frontages.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
512.1		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Amend policy 8.2.2.3 as follows: shall not be dominated by Mitigate adverse effects of garaging, parking and accessways on Street frontages.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
512.1	FS1315.5	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.2.3	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
512.1	FS1260.31	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.2.2.3	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved. The amendments to the objective and policy framework for the MDR Zone better reflect the terminology of the RMA, and the purpose of the Zone.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
512.1	FS1331.16	Mount Crystal Limited	8.2.2.3	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
536.1		Wanaka Trust	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Amend policy 8.2.2.3 as follows: Street frontages shall not be dominated by Mitigate adverse effects of garaging, parking and accessways on Street frontages.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
536.1	FS1315.16	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.2.3	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
586.11		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.2.3	Reject		Issue Reference 2
699.16		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.3	Not Stated	Avoid Street frontages shall not be being dominated by garaging, parking and accessways.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
775.11		H R & D A Familton	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.2.3	Reject		Issue Reference 2
792.3		Patricia Swale	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Dominated garaging - where will this be?	Reject		Issue Reference 2
803.11		H R Familton	8.2.2.3	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.2.3	Reject		Issue Reference 2
699.17		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.4	Not Stated	Encourage developments to reduce dominance effects The mass of buildings shall be broken down through variation in facades and materials, roof form, building separation and recessions or other techniques to reduce dominance on streets, parks, and neighbouring properties	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
792.4		Patricia Swale	8.2.2.4	Oppose	With extra buildings need to provide for garaging and parking onsite with extra land coverage.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
699.18		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.5	Not Stated	Landscaped areas shall be well designed and integrated into the design of developments, to provide providing high amenity spaces for outdoor living spaces recreation and enjoyment, and to soften the visual impact of development from the street, with particular regard to the street frontage of developments	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.19		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.6	Not Stated	Require Ddevelopment must take account of to have regard to any design guide or urban design strategy applicable to the area.	Reject		Right of Reply
717.6		The Jandel Trust	8.2.2.6	Oppose	Delete policy 8.2.2.6	Accept		Right of Reply
717.6	FS1029.12	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.2.6	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Reject		Right of Reply
717.6	FS1270.112	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.2.6	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Right of Reply
847.4		Fil Holdings Limited	8.2.2.6	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.2.6	Accept		Right of Reply
847.4	FS1061.44	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.2.6	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Accept		Right of Reply
847.4	FS1270.10	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.2.6	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Right of Reply
699.20		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.2.7	Not Stated	Encourage The amenity and/or environmental values of natural site features (such as topography, geology, vegetation, waterways and creeks) are taken into account by to be incorporated into site layout and design, and integrated as assets to the development (where appropriate)	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
199.12		Craig Douglas	8.2.3 Objective 3	Support	supports the provision	Accept		Issue Reference 1

238.43		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Supports the provision in part, with suggested deletion of policies 8.2.3.1 and 8.2.3.2 which relate to certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1107.48	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1226.48	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1234.48	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1239.48	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1241.48	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1242.71	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
238.43	FS1248.48	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
238.43	FS1249.48	Tweed Development Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
264.5		Philip Winstone	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Not allow building sites below 250sqm via the Homestar incentive should the MDHZ proceed in Arrowtown	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
362.5		Philip Thoreau	8.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Oppose as prone to abuse and forced unhappy compromise and should be abandoned.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
380.26		Villa dellLago	8.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Supports the objective.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
699.21		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
773.12		John & Jill Blennerhassett	8.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Pembroke Park , as open space, will only become more valuable to the community as time goes on. We therefore applaud incentives to design (for business, domestic and landscape) to a higher standard (8.2.3), in conjunction with policies to expedite active transport and to enhance 'walkability'. We agree that design for prevention of crime and vandalism should be promoted (eg. how splendidly the Pembroke Park skateboard/cycle development has been used and respected by young people of wide age range, for whom it was designed and constructed ... well done all who have been involved !).	Accept		Issue Reference 1 and 5
273.5		The Full & Bye Trust	8.2.3.1	Other	Questions basis for sustainable buildings. Should be able to achieve special privileges relating to non notification.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
362.7		Philip Thoreau	8.2.3.1	Oppose	Oppose Policy 8.2.3.1 as no clear basis for the provision is given to explain why a sustainable building should be able to achieve these special privileges.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
668.2		Philip Thoreau	8.2.3.1	Other	Greater explanation and justification sought	Accept		Issue Reference 1
699.22		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.3.1	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
699.23		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.3.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
699.24		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.3.3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
199.13		Craig Douglas	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	supports the provision	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
380.27		Villa dellLago	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.22		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.2.4 Objective 4	Other	Amend to add new policy to address privacy/overlooking effects, such as through the following suggested wording: 'Built form achieves an acceptable level of privacy for the subject site and neighbouring dwellings through the application of setbacks, offsetting of habitable windows, screening or other means'	Accept		Issue Reference 2
383.22	FS1059.26	Erna Spijkerbosch	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Support	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.22	FS1061.50	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Reject		Issue Reference 2

383.22	FS1265.11	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.22	FS1268.11	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.25		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.4 Objective 4	Not Stated	Provide reasonable protection of amenity values, within the context of an increasingly intensified suburban zone where character is changing and higher density housing is sought Development provides high-quality on-site living environments for residents and achieves a reasonable standard of residential amenity for adjoining sites.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
717.7		The Jandel Trust	8.2.4 Objective 4	Not Stated	Add new policy: 8.2.4.3 Providing an appropriate level of amenity while acknowledging that amenity will be reduced as a result of the proximity to existing non-residential activity, the State Highway and nearby industrial and Commercial Zones.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.7	FS1029.13	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept		Issue Reference 4
717.7	FS1270.113	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
505.12		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.4.1	Other	Amend Policy 8.2.4.1 as follows: Apply Ensure recession plane, building height, yard setback, site coverage, and window sill height controls are complied with as the primary means of ensuring reasonable protection of neighbours' privacy and amenity values.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
699.26		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.4.1	Support	Apply recession plane, building height, yard setback, site coverage, and window sill height controls as the primary means of ensuring reasonable protection of neighbours' access to sunlight, privacy and amenity values.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
699.27		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.4.2	Not Stated	Ensure buildings are designed and located to respond positively to site context through methods to maximise solar gain and limit energy costs.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
699.28		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.4.3	Not Stated	Where compliance with design controls is not practical due to site characteristics, development shall be designed to maintain solar gain to adjoining properties.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
199.14		Craig Douglas	8.2.5 Objective 5	Support	supports the provision	Reject		Right of Reply
362.6		Philip Thoreau	8.2.5 Objective 5	Oppose	Oppose as prone to abuse and forced unhappy compromise.	Reject		Right of Reply
380.28		Villa dellago	8.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Supports the objective.	Reject		Right of Reply
510.2		Wayne L Blair	8.2.5 Objective 5	Not Stated	The objective to support the creation of vibrant, safe and healthy environments is a contradiction within the Wanaka area as the proposed increase to Medium Density within the Russell St - MacDougal St area would, in fact, clog the streets with parked cars and therefore make it unsafe for cyclists. As some streets within this area only have footpaths on one side, pedestrians are also at risk.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
511.2		Helen Blair	8.2.5 Objective 5	Not Stated	The objective to support the creation of vibrant, safe and healthy environments is a contradiction within the Wanaka area as the proposed increase to Medium Density within the Russell St - MacDougal St area would, in fact, clog the streets with parked cars and therefore make it unsafe for cyclists. As some streets within this area only have footpaths on one side, pedestrians are also at risk.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
649.2		Southern District Health Board	8.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Community design affects patterns of living that in turn influence health. Research shows that easy access to a safe place to exercise promotes fitness. Access to walking/cycling paths are positively associated with physical activity behaviours and proximity to places for physical activity within the neighbourhood promotes activity. The submitter requests that the provisions are allowed.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
699.29		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Right of Reply
805.48		Transpower New Zealand Limited	8.2.7 Objective 7	Other	Support with amendments. Amend to: Ensure medium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and does not adversely affect the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of minimises impacts on regionally significant infrastructure, including the National Grid and roading networks.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
699.30		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.5.1	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Right of Reply
719.40		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.5.1	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.5.1 as proposed	Reject		Right of Reply
699.31		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.5.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		Right of Reply

773.14		John & Jill Blennerhassett	8.2.5.2	Support	Pembroke Park , as open space, will only become more valuable to the community as time goes on (what foresight from our founders and ECNZ?). We therefore applaud incentives to design (for business, domestic and landscape) to a higher standard (8.2.3), in conjunction with policies to expedite active transport and to enhance 'walkability'.	Accept		Issue Reference 1 and 2
699.32		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.5.3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
773.15		John & Jill Blennerhassett	8.2.5.3	Support	Pembroke Park , as open space, will only become more valuable to the community as time goes on (what foresight from our founders and ECNZ?). We therefore applaud incentives to design (for business, domestic and landscape) to a higher standard (8.2.3), in conjunction with policies to expedite active transport and to enhance 'walkability'.	Accept		Issue Reference 1 and 2
699.33		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.5.4	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
199.15		Craig Douglas	8.2.6Objective 6	Other	set backs and recession planes be maintained as per the current plan.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
255.6		N.W. & C.E. BEGGS	8.2.6Objective 6	Other	Notes that Medium Density Housing in Arrowtown needs careful consideration as to its need, and if deemed necessary strict criteria must be in place to protect the Arrowtown character.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
264.6		Philip Winstone	8.2.6Objective 6	Oppose	No Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
380.29		Villa delLago	8.2.6Objective 6	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
268.4		Mark Kramer	8.2.6.1	Support	Adopting the Arrowtown guide lines 2006 in to the rules. As far as possible.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
199.16		Craig Douglas	8.2.7Objective 7	Oppose	the proposed Arrowtown Medium Density zone be dropped.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
264.7		Philip Winstone	8.2.7Objective 7	Oppose	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
505.13		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7Objective 7	Other	Amend objective 8.2.7 as follows: Ensure Medium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and minimises impacts adverse effects on infrastructure and roading networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
505.17		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7Objective 7	Not Stated	Insert new policy 8.2.7.6 as follows: Provide for vehicle use in a manner which retains essential vehicle access in the Medium Density Residential Zone while providing for pedestrian safety	Reject		Issue Reference 5
505.18		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7Objective 7	Not Stated	Insert new policy 8.2.7.7 as follows: Recognise the intensification of density and activity levels within the Medium Density Residential Zone will require comprehensive traffic management plans and sufficient on site car parking.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
512.2		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.2.7Objective 7	Oppose	Amend objective 8.2.7 as follows: Ensure Medium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and minimises impacts adverse effects on infrastructure and roading networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
512.2	FS1315.6	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.7Objective 7	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
512.2	FS1260.32	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.2.7Objective 7	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved. The amendments to the objective and policy framework for the MDR Zone better reflect the terminology of the RMA, and the purpose of the Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
512.2	FS1331.17	Mount Crystal Limited	8.2.7Objective 7	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
536.2		Wanaka Trust	8.2.7Objective 7	Oppose	Amend objective 8.2.7 as follows: Ensure Medium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and minimises impacts adverse effects on infrastructure and roading networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
536.2	FS1315.17	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.7Objective 7	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
699.34		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7Objective 7	Not Stated	Ensure medium density development efficiently utilises existing infrastructure and minimises impacts on infrastructure and roading networks. Medium density development is adequately serviced by network infrastructure	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
719.41		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.7Objective 7	Support	Retain 8.2.7 Objective as proposed	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
699.35		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7.1	Not Stated	Medium density development is provided close to town centres and local shopping zones to reduce private vehicle movements and maximise walking, cycling and public transport patronage.	Accept		Issue Reference 5

505.14		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7.2	Other	Amend policy 8.2.7.2 as follows: Encourage Medium density development is to be located in areas that are well serviced by public transport and infrastructure, trail/track networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity of infrastructure and transport networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
699.36		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7.2	Not Stated	Require Mmedium density development is located in areas that are well serviced by public transport and infrastructure, trail/track networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity of to be adequately serviced by existing or planned infrastructure networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
719.42		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.7.2	Not Stated	Amend 8.2.7.2 as follows: ...trail/trail networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity to ensure that it does not adversely affect the safety, efficiency and functionality of infrastructure networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
798.31		Otago Regional Council	8.2.7.2	Oppose	ORC requests that provisions for roading, access and parking should recognise the needs of active transport modes, public transport services and infrastructure. Provisions are requested for Residential developments, particularly those large in scale, to provide for public transport services and infrastructure in the future. Main road corridors in these areas should be retained to accommodate public transport services and infrastructure, both now and in the future.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
798.31	FS1276.1	JWA and DV Smith Trust	8.2.7.2	Support	Supports. Seeks to allow the Submission insofar as it requests provisions for roads, access and parking.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
805.49		Transpower New Zealand Limited	8.2.7.2	Other	Support with amendments. Amend to: Medium density development is located in areas that are well serviced by public transport and infrastructure, trail/track networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity of infrastructure networks and in a manner that will not adversely affect the safe, secure and effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and developing of regionally significant infrastructure. .	Reject		Issue Reference 5
362.4		Philip Thoreau	8.2.7.3	Oppose	Oppose the Policy as it conflicts with the objectives and zone purpose.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
505.15		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7.3	Other	Amend policy 8.2.7.3 as follows: Access and parking is located and designed to optimise efficiency and safety and minimise impacts adverse effects on on-street parking and traffic management.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
512.3		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.2.7.3	Oppose	Amend policy 8.2.7.3 as follows: Access and parking is located and designed to optimise efficiency and safety and minimise impacts adverse effects to on-street parking	Accept		Issue Reference 5
512.3	FS1315.7	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.7.3	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
512.3	FS1125.21	New Zealand Fire Service	8.2.7.3	Support	Allow in part. The Commission is neutral on whether or not subdivision is changed from a Discretionary to a Controlled Activity. However, should the Commissions submission point 438.39 requesting the inclusion of new standards requiring the provision of fire fighting water supply in accordance with the NZFS Code of Practice (SNZ PAS 4509:2008) not be accepted, and this submission point is accepted, then the Commission supports the inclusion of fire fighting water supply as a matter over which Council will restrict its control. The Commission requests though that the provisions include a specific reference to the the NZFS Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
512.3	FS1260.33	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.2.7.3	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved. The amendments to the objective and policy fi-amework for the MDR Zone better reflect the terminology of the RMA, and the purpose of the Zone.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
512.3	FS1331.18	Mount Crystal Limited	8.2.7.3	Support	The amendments set out in the submission to the Objectives and Policies for Part 8 - MDR Zone be approved	Accept		Issue Reference 5
536.3		Wanaka Trust	8.2.7.3	Oppose	Amend policy 8.2.7.3 as follows: Access and parking is located and designed to optimise efficiency and safety and minimise impacts adverse effects to on-street parking	Accept		Issue Reference 5
536.3	FS1315.18	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.2.7.3	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
699.37		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7.3	Not Stated	Access and parking is located and designed to optimise efficiency and safety and minimise impacts to on street parking	Reject		Issue Reference 5
719.43		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.7.3	Not Stated	Amend Policy 8.2.7.3 to read as follows: Access and parking is located and designed to optimise maintain the efficiency and safety of the transport network and minimise impacts to on-street parking.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
792.5		Patricia Swale	8.2.7.3	Oppose	Amend this statement to say how this will happen.	Reject		This is a policy. Rules set out the method.
273.6		The Full & Bye Trust	8.2.7.4	Oppose	This provision should be seen as misconceived and should be reconsidered.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
362.3		Philip Thoreau	8.2.7.4	Oppose	Oppose the policy as it will reduce amenity values and is inconsistent with zone purpose and objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5

505.16		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.7.4	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.7.4	Accept		Issue Reference 5
668.3		Philip Thoreau	8.2.7.4	Other	Reconsideration of Policy 8.2.7.4	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
668.3	FS1260.2	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.2.7.4	Oppose	Seeks that the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan. The suite of development controls, and density rules will allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes responding to a site and its particular context - and ultimately promoting the objectives and policies of the MDR Zone whilst allowing for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
668.3	FS1271.29	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.2.7.4	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
699.38		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7.4	Not Stated	A reduction in parking requirements may be considered in Queenstown and Wanaka where a site is located within 400 m of either a bus stop or the edge of a town centre zone.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
792.6		Patricia Swale	8.2.7.4	Oppose	Opposes the provision.	Accept		Issue Reference 5
408.8		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.7.5	Not Stated	Include change as underlined: "Low impact approaches to storm water management, on-site treatment and storage / dispersal approaches are enabled to limit demands on public transport infrastructure networks where practical."	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
408.8	FS1167.11	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.7.5	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
408.8	FS1270.37	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.7.5	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
699.39		Reddy Group Limited	8.2.7.5	Not Stated	Encourage Low impact approaches to storm water management, including on-site treatment and storage / dispersal approaches are enabled to limit demands on public infrastructure networks.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 5
171.1		The Wanaka Community House Charitable Trust	8.2.8Objective 8	Support	Supports the objective and policies 8.2.8.1, 8.2.8.2, 8.2.8.3 in general.	Accept		Issue Reference 3
264.8		Philip Winstone	8.2.8Objective 8	Oppose	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
380.30		Villa dellago	8.2.8Objective 8	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Issue Reference 3
408.9		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.8Objective 8	Support	Support	Accept		Issue Reference 3
408.9	FS1167.12	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.8Objective 8	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.9	FS1270.38	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.8Objective 8	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Issue Reference 3
438.11		New Zealand Fire Service	8.2.8Objective 8	Other	The NZFS wish to include the term "emergency service facilities" to this Objective. Amend to read: "Provide for community activities and facilities, and emergency service facilities that are generally best located in a residential environment close to residents"	Reject		Issue Reference 3
510.3		Wayne L Blair	8.2.8Objective 8	Not Stated	There should be no commercial activity within this area outside of normal working hours.	Reject		Hours of operation will be governed by compliance with noise standards
511.3		Helen Blair	8.2.8Objective 8	Not Stated	There should be no commercial activity within this area outside of normal working hours.	Reject		Hours of operation will be governed by compliance with noise standards
524.21		Ministry of Education	8.2.8Objective 8	Support	Retain	Accept		Issue Reference 3
792.7		Patricia Swale	8.2.8Objective 8	Oppose	Opposes the provision.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
438.12		New Zealand Fire Service	8.2.8.1	Other	NZFS wish to amend this Policy to reflect the provision for emergency services within the residential zone. Amend to read: "Enable the establishment of community activities and facilities and emergency service facilities where adverse effects on residential amenity values such as noise, traffic, lighting, glare and visual impact can be avoided or mitigated."	Reject		The definition of community activity includes emergency services
524.22		Ministry of Education	8.2.8.1	Support	Retain	Accept		Issue Reference 3
408.10		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.8.2	Other	Delete this rule as follows: Ensure any community uses or facilities are of limited intensity and scale, and generate only small volumes of traffic.	Accept		Issue Reference 3

408.10	FS1167.13	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.8.2	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.10	FS1270.39	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.8.2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 3
524.23		Ministry of Education	8.2.8.2	Support	retain	Accept		Issue Reference 3
524.24		Ministry of Education	8.2.8.3	Support	Retain	Accept		Issue Reference 3
61.4		Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.2.9 Objective 9	Other	Enable low (the word 'low' to be crossed out)		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
97.3		Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited	8.2.9 Objective 9	Other	Amend Objective 'Enable low (the word 'low' to be crossed out) medium density forms of visitor accommodation that are appropriate for a medium density environment and do not adversely impact on the supply of permanent rental accommodation.'		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
97.3	FS1059.56	Erna Spijkerbosch	8.2.9 Objective 9	Oppose	Retain the word 'low'		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
264.9		Philip Winstone	8.2.9 Objective 9	Other	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
380.31		Villa delLago	8.2.9 Objective 9	Other	Visitor accommodation should provide for underground parking where possible to get cars off the road and avoid unsightly above ground car parks		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
571.15		Totally Tourism Limited	8.2.9 Objective 9	Other	Oppose Objective 8.2.9, and policies 8.2.9.1, 8.2.9.2, and 8.2.9.3, which support and inform Rules 8.4.1, 8.4.22, and 8.4.23		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
1366.26		Moraine Creek Limited	8.2.9 Objective 9	Oppose	Oposes proposal to provide for visitor accommodation in the Medium Density Residential Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Amend to provide for visitor accommodation as a Controlled Activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.8		Patricia Swale	8.2.9.1	Oppose	A management plan shall be provided by whom? Doesn't say - when making rules need to know the content.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
1366.27		Moraine Creek Limited	8.2.9.1	Oppose	Oposes proposal to provide for visitor accommodation in the Medium Density Residential Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Amend to provide for visitor accommodation as a Controlled Activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
719.44		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.9.2	Not Stated	Amend 8.2.9.2 to read as follows: Visitor accommodation shall be designed in a manner to limit mitigate the adverse effects on residential areas associated with noise, vehicle access and parking on transport networks and residential areas		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.9		Patricia Swale	8.2.9.2	Oppose	In this rule should be mention of number of parks on site required.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
1366.28		Moraine Creek Limited	8.2.9.2	Oppose	Oposes proposal to provide for visitor accommodation in the Medium Density Residential Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Amend to provide for visitor accommodation as a Controlled Activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
719.45		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.9.3	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.9.3 as proposed		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
1366.29		Moraine Creek Limited	8.2.9.3	Oppose	Oposes proposal to provide for visitor accommodation in the Medium Density Residential Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Amend to provide for visitor accommodation as a Controlled Activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
264.10		Philip Winstone	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Oppose	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
380.32		Villa delLago	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Support	Supports the objective.	Accept		Issue Reference 3
510.4		Wayne L Blair	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Not Stated	I could find no explanation of "low scale" commercial activity. It already has been demonstrated that one developer has built a function centre, and are advertising as catering for larger numbers, within a low density area and have blatantly had total disregard to those residents living in the noise -carrying area as to how this impacts on their current lifestyle. To allow more commercial activity would further compromise the existing residents and their investment within this area. Due the "boundary pushing" of activity within the current Low Density area, what can residents expect if the Medium Density change is implemented?	Reject		Issue Reference 3
511.4		Helen Blair	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Not Stated	I could find no explanation of "low scale" commercial activity. It already has been demonstrated that one developer has built a function centre, and are advertising as catering for larger numbers, within a low density area and have blatantly had total disregard to those residents living in the noise -carrying area as to how this impacts on their current lifestyle. To allow more commercial activity would further compromise the existing residents and their investment within this area. Due the "boundary pushing" of activity within the current Low Density area, what can residents expect if the Medium Density change is implemented?	Reject		Issue Reference 3

717.23		The Jandel Trust	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.10 Objective - Provide for limited smallscale commercial activities where such activities: • contribute to a diverse residential environment; • maintain residential character and amenity; and • do not compromise the primary purpose of the zone for residential use.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
717.23	FS1029.29	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 3
717.23	FS1270.129	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
792.10		Patricia Swale	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Oppose	Object strongly to any type of commercial activities in this area.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
847.6		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Other	Amend as follows: 8.2.10 Objective - Provide for limited small-scale commercial activities where such activities: • contribute to a diverse residential environment; • maintain residential character and amenity; and • do not compromise the primary purpose of the zone for residential use.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
847.6	FS1061.46	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
847.6	FS1270.12	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.10 Objective 10:	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
792.13		Patricia Swale	8.2.10.2	Oppose	Confusing statement conflicting numbers per site (8.4.11.2)	Reject		Issue Reference 3
717.8		The Jandel Trust	8.2.10.3	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.10.3 Commercial activities which generate adverse noise effects are not supported in the residential environment, with the exception of any existing lawfully established uses.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.8	FS1029.14	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.10.3	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept		Issue Reference 4
717.8	FS1270.114	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.10.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.7		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.10.3	Other	Amend as follows: 8.2.10.3 Commercial activities which generate adverse noise effects are not supported in the residential environment, with the exception of any existing lawfully established uses.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.7	FS1270.13	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.10.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
380.33		Villa dellago	8.2.11 Objective 11	Other	Site development off State Highway 6 should be only perpendicular to the road (like Glenda Drive) and not adjacent to the road, so that large green spaces can still be seen along the road approaches to Queenstown.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.11		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11 Objective 11	Other	Make amendments as follows: The development of land fronting State Highway 6 (between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive) provides a high quality residential environment, with supporting community facilities which is sensitive to its location at the entrance to Queenstown, minimises traffic impacts to the State Highway network and is appropriately serviced.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.11	FS1167.14	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11 Objective 11	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.11	FS1270.40	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11 Objective 11	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.10		The Jandel Trust	8.2.11 Objective 11	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.11 Objective - The development of land fronting State Highway 6 (between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive) provides a high quality residential mixed use environment which some is sensitive to its location at the entrance to Queenstown, minimises traffic impacts to the State Highway network, and is appropriately serviced.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.10	FS1029.16	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11 Objective 11	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.10	FS1092.23	NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11 Objective 11	Oppose	That submission 717.10 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.10	FS1270.116	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11 Objective 11	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

719.46		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11 Objective 11	Support	If this area of land is to be re-zoned Medium Density Residential then this policy should be retained as proposed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.46	FS1061.53	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11 Objective 11	Oppose	That the submission is rejected		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.8		Fil Holdings Limited	8.2.11 Objective 11	Other	Amend as follows: 8.2.11 Objective - The development of land fronting State Highway 6 (between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive) provides a high quality residential mixed use environment which some is sensitive to its location at the entrance to Queenstown, minimises traffic impacts to the State Highway network, and is appropriately serviced.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.8	FS1270.14	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11 Objective 11	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.1		Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11.1	Oppose	Delete policy.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.1	FS1061.6	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.1	Support	That the submission is accepted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.12		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.1	Other	Make amendments as follows: "Intensification does not occur until adequate water supply services are available to service the development, Council will include its provisions within the LTP as a priority."		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.12	FS1029.5	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that those parts of the submission that seek amendments to Policies 8.2.11.1 and 8.2.11.2 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.12	FS1167.15	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.1	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.12	FS1270.41	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.2		Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11.2	Oppose	Delete policy.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
177.2	FS1061.7	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.2	Support	That the submission is accepted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.13		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.2	Other	Make amendments as follows: "A stormwater network design is provided that utilises on-site treatment and storage / dispersal approaches, and avoid impacts on the State Highway network."		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.13	FS1029.6	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11.2	Oppose	Universal seeks that those parts of the submission that seek amendments to Policies 8.2.11.1 and 8.2.11.2 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.13	FS1167.16	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.2	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.13	FS1270.42	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.47		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11.2	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.11.2 as proposed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.47	FS1061.54	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.2	Oppose	That the submission is rejected		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.14		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.3	Support	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.14	FS1167.17	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.3	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.14	FS1270.43	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.15		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.4	Other	Make amendments as follows: "Safe and legible transport connections are provided that avoid any new access to the State Highway, and integrates with the road network and public transport routes on the southern side of the State Highway 6. The only new access to the zone will be via a northern connection to the Eastern Arterial road roundabout to ensure integration with road network and public transport routes on the southern side of State Highway 6."		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

408.15	FS1167.18	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.4	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.15	FS1270.44	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.4	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.48		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11.4	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.11.4 and the advice notes as proposed	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.48	FS1061.55	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.4	Oppose	That the submission is rejected	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.16		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.5.	Other	No specific submission made but policy extract included in the submission.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.16	FS1167.19	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.5.	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.16	FS1270.45	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.5.	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.49		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11.5.	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.11.5 as proposed	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.49	FS1061.56	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.5.	Oppose	That the submission is rejected	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.17		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.6	Other	Amend as follows: "A safe and legible walking and cycling environment is provided within the area. that: - Links to external network and pedestrian and cyclist destinations on the southern side of State Highway 6 (such as public transport stations, schools, open space, and commercial areas) along the safest, most direct convenient routes) - Is of a form and layout that encourages walking and cycling - Provides a safe and convenient waiting areas adjacent to the State Highway, which provides shelter form the weather - Provides a direct and legible network. Note: attention is drawn to the need to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to determine compliance with the policy."	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.17	FS1167.20	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.6	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.17	FS1270.46	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.6	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.9		The Jandel Trust	8.2.11.6	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.11.6 A safe and legible walking and cycle environment is provided that: • links to the external network and pedestrian and cyclist destinations on the southern side of State Highway 6 (such as public transport stations, schools, open space, and commercial areas) along the safest, most direct and convenient routes • is of a form and layout that encourages walking and cycling • provides a safe and convenient waiting area adjacent to the State Highway, which provides shelter from weather • provides a direct and legible network. Note: Attention is drawn to the need to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to determine compliance with this policy.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.9	FS1029.15	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.11.6	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.9	FS1092.22	NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11.6	Oppose	That submission 717.9 be disallowed.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.9	FS1270.115	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.6	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.50		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.11.6	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.11.6 as proposed.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.50	FS1061.57	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.6	Oppose	That the submission is rejected	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
847.9		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.11.6	Other	Delete note from 8.2.11.6 Note: Attention is drawn to the need to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to determine compliance with this policy.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
847.9	FS1270.15	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.6	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping

408.18		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.11.7	Support	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.18	FS1167.21	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.2.11.7	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.18	FS1270.47	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.11.7	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
110.20		Alan Cutler	8.2.12Objective 12	Support	Supports the objective and associated policies.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
269.3		David Barton	8.2.12Objective 12	Other	Add a policy that recognises and is sensitive to the character of central Wanaka.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
504.1		Virginia Barbara Bush	8.2.12Objective 12	Not Stated	Supports the Wanaka MDR Transition Overlay. Retain objective 8.2.12 and supporting policies 8.2.12.1, 8.2.12.2 and 8.2.12.3	Accept		Issue Reference 2
510.5		Wayne L Blair	8.2.12Objective 12	Not Stated	The proposed area set for the Town Centre Transition Overlay is the most suitable for visitor accommodation. The area currently zoned as High Density should remain unchanged. The areas of both sides of Russell St; south & north sides of Brownston between Russell & Bullock Creek and continue on north side of Brownston to current commercial buildings, are ideal locations for more dense buildings such as concentrated visitor accommodation. This area is right in town and close to public transport.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
511.5		Helen Blair	8.2.12Objective 12	Not Stated	The proposed area set for the Town Centre Transition Overlay is the most suitable for visitor accommodation. The area currently zoned as High Density should remain unchanged. The areas of both sides of Russell St; south & north sides of Brownston between Russell & Bullock Creek and continue on north side of Brownston to current commercial buildings, are ideal locations for more dense buildings such as concentrated visitor accommodation. This area is right in town and close to public transport.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.11		Patricia Swale	8.2.12Objective 12	Support	Agree with Wanaka Town Centre Overlay as shown on map. Providing commercial activities do not extend plan marked areas.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
505.19		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.12.2	Not Stated	Amend policy 8.2.12.2 as follows: Non-residential and mixed use activities provide a quality built form which supports the role of the Town Centre activates the street, minimises the dominance adverse effects of parking and adds visual interest to the urban environment.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
505.20		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.2.12.3	Not Stated	Delete Policy 8.2.12.3	Reject		Issue Reference 4
380.34		Villa delLago	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Supports the objective	Accept		Issue Reference 4
717.11		The Jandel Trust	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Retain Objective 8.2.13	Accept		Issue Reference 4
717.11	FS1029.17	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.13 Objective 13	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.11	FS1270.117	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
719.51		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Retain 8.2.13 Objective as proposed	Accept		Issue Reference 4
719.51	FS1061.58	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.13 Objective 13	Oppose	That the submission is rejected	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.10		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Retain Objective 8.2.13	Accept		Issue Reference 4
847.10	FS1270.16	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.13 Objective 13	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
177.3		Universal Developments Limited	8.2.13.1	Oppose	Amend so that the 80 meters is replaced with 15 metres with regard to noise sensitive activities and State Highways.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
177.3	FS1061.8	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.13.1	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
177.3	FS1092.1	NZ Transport Agency	8.2.13.1	Oppose	That Submission 177.3 to amend policy 8.2.13.1 be disallowed.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
177.3	FS1195.9	The Jandel Trust	8.2.13.1	Support	Allow relief sought. 80m setback is excessive considering current day acoustic insulation requirements.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
177.3	FS1189.10	FII Holdings Ltd	8.2.13.1	Support	Allow relief sought. 80m setback is excessive considering current day acoustic insulation requirements.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.12		The Jandel Trust	8.2.13.1	Not Stated	Amend as follows: 8.2.13.1 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within 80m of the State Highway or 100m from non residential activities shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/ NZ 2107:2000.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
717.12	FS1029.18	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.13.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept		Issue Reference 4

717.12	FS1270.118	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.13.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
719.52		NZ Transport Agency	8.2.13.1	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.13.1 as proposed	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.11		FII Holdings Limited	8.2.13.1	Other	Amend as follows: 8.2.13.1 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within 80m of the State Highway or 100m from non-residential activities shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/ NZ 2107:2000.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.11	FS1029.30	Universal Developments Limited	8.2.13.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that those parts of the submission that seek amendment to Policy 8.2.13.1 be disallowed	Accept		Issue Reference 4
847.11	FS1061.47	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.2.13.1	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
847.11	FS1270.17	Hansen Family Partnership	8.2.13.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
805.50		Transpower New Zealand Limited	8.3.1 District Wide	Other	Support with amendments. Add the following clause: Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters, particularly Chapter 30: Energy and Utilities for any use, development or subdivision located near the National Grid. All provisions referred to are within Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan, unless marked as Operative District Plan (ODP).	Reject		Chapter 30 is of no greater significance than the other chapters listed
171.2		The Wanaka Community House Charitable Trust	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	supports Rule 8.4.9	Accept in Part		
230.4		Loris King	8.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	I object to the following Rules: 8.4.10.2 8.4.11.2 8.4.17	Reject	Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	Issue Reference 1
230.4	FS1061.5	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
230.4	FS1251.7	Varina Pty Limited	8.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Opposes in part. The submitter opposes as it relates to matters on the Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones. The submitter considers that allowing for higher density housing, visitor accommodation and commercial activities in the residential zones of Wanaka is important to cater for growing population and tourist numbers.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
383.23		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to add privacy, screening and overlooking impacts as a matter of discretion	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.23	FS1265.12	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.23	FS1268.12	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.24		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to add privacy, screening and overlooking impacts as a matter of discretion.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.24	FS1059.27	Erna Spijkerbosch	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.24	FS1265.13	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.24	FS1268.13	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. Support the submission insofar as it provides for privacy provisions in the MDR Zone on the basis that these provisions may need further amendment to take into account the special characteristics of the Park St/ Brisbane St area.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
383.25		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to delete "residential flat"	Accept		Issue Reference 1
383.26		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to delete "residential flat"	Accept		Issue Reference 1
391.9		Sean & Jane McLeod	8.4 Rules - Activities	Other	See comments in the low density rules in regards to the definition of site and multi story units		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
602.1		N & B Teat Family Trust	8.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Supports the proposal of the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Area.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
571.13		Totally Tourism Limited	8.4.1	Oppose	Opposes the Non-Complying Activity status for VA within the proposed Medium Density Residential Zones in both Queenstown and Wanaka.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	

438.13		New Zealand Fire Service	8.4.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		Refer to entire s42A report
717.13		The Jandel Trust	8.4.5	Oppose	Alter activity status to discretionary for bulk material storage over 200m2 in area. Below this area is permitted if not directly visible from outside of the site.	Reject		Issue Reference 6
717.13	FS1029.19	Universal Developments Limited	8.4.5	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept		Issue Reference 6
717.13	FS1270.119	Hansen Family Partnership	8.4.5	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 6
847.12		FI Holdings Limited	8.4.5	Oppose	Amend as follows: Alter activity status to discretionary for bulk material storage over 200m2 in area. Below this area is permitted if not directly visible from outside of the site.	Reject		Issue Reference 6
847.12	FS1270.18	Hansen Family Partnership	8.4.5	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 6
792.12		Patricia Swale	8.4.6	Oppose	Opposes the provision.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.19		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.4.9	Other	Make amendments as follows: Community facilities and/or activities D RD Discretion is limited to all of the following: - The design, appearance, materials, impact on the street of the building containing the activity - The location, nature and scale of activities of site - Parking and Access; safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours - Hours of operation	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.19	FS1167.22	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.4.9	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
408.19	FS1270.48	Hansen Family Partnership	8.4.9	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
438.14		New Zealand Fire Service	8.4.9	Not Stated	Retain as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 3
524.25		Ministry of Education	8.4.9	Oppose	Relief sought: Change the activity status of community activities and facilities. A change to Permitted activity status is sought	Reject		Issue Reference 3
438.14	FS1125.3	New Zealand Fire Service	8.4.9	Support	Allow. The Commission supports the change in activity status proposed by the submitter for Community Facilities and / or Activities. Communities have an expectation that an emergency will be responded to within a quick, efficient and timely manner. The adverse effects from a fire station are well understood and definable. They can be defined as relating to amenity including noise, traffic generation and on-site car parking. Given that there is a Community expectation around emergency services being able to respond quickly and efficiently, there should also be acknowledgement in the plan and by the community that a level of adverse effect in relation to fire stations is therefore acceptable.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
524.25	FS1061.40	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.4.9	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
166.3		Aurum Survey Consultants	8.4.10	Oppose	Rule 8.4.10 be deleted as it will not achieve it's purpose. Consider a new controlled activity for more than one dwelling. .	Reject		Issue Reference 1
166.3	FS1061.51	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.4.10	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
586.12		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.4.10.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.10.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.40		Reddy Group Limited	8.4.10.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
775.12		H R & D A Familton	8.4.10.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.10.2	Accept		Issue Reference 1
792.15		Patricia Swale	8.4.10.2	Oppose	No licensed premises should be allowed in this residential area.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
803.12		H R Familton	8.4.10.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.10.2	Accept		Issue Reference 1
408.20		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.4.11	Other	Make amendments as follows: "Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat RD For land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and the Shotover River, provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment, Landscaping Plan and Maintenance Program, and extent of compliance with Rule 8.5.3."		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

408.20	FS1092.9	NZ Transport Agency	8.4.11	Oppose	That the submission 408.20 requesting the deletion of the bullet point "For land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Shotover River, provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment....." be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.20	FS1167.23	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.4.11	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.20	FS1270.49	Hansen Family Partnership	8.4.11	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
512.4		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.4.11.2	Other	Amend rule 8.4.11.2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point 1 - The extent to which the location, external appearance, site layout and design of buildings and fences addresses the site context and conditions. and contributes positively to residential character and amenity. • Bullet Point 2 - The extent to which the development positively addresses the street environment. • Bullet Point 6 - The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce visual impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm. • Bullet Point 7 - The extent to which parking and access safety, efficiency and impacts to arrangements are considered integrally with the overall site design, are safe, efficient and minimise adverse effects on the continued use of on-street parking and neighbours opportunities and the streetscape environment. 	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
512.4	FS1315.8	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.4.11.2	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
536.4		Wanaka Trust	8.4.11.2	Other	Amend rule 8.4.11.2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet Point 1 - The extent to which the location, external appearance, site layout and design of buildings and fences addresses the site context and conditions. and contributes positively to residential character and amenity. • Bullet Point 2 - The extent to which the development positively addresses the street environment. • Bullet Point 6 - The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce visual impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm. • Bullet Point 7 - The extent to which parking and access safety, efficiency and impacts to arrangements are considered integrally with the overall site design, are safe, efficient and minimise adverse effects on the continued use of on-street parking and neighbours opportunities and the streetscape environment. 	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
536.4	FS1315.19	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.4.11.2	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
586.13		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.4.11.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.11.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.41		Reddy Group Limited	8.4.11.2	Support	Rule: Retain as notified	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.42		Reddy Group Limited	8.4.11.2	Not Stated	Matters of restricted discretion: Discretion is restricted to all of the following: - The location, external appearance, site layout and design of buildings and fences - The extent to which the development positively addresses relationship to the street - The extent to which the design advances housing diversity and promotes sustainability either through construction methods, design or function. - In Arrowtown, the extent to which the development responds positively to Arrowtown's character, utilising consistency with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006 as a guide - For land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and the Shotover River, traffic and landscaping provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment, Landscaping Plan and Maintenance Program, and extent of compliance with Rule 8.5.3 - The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm - Design of Pparking and access: safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours - Design of landscaping The extent to which landscaped areas are well integrated into the design of the development and contribute meaningfully to visual amenity and streetscape, including the use of small trees, shrubs or hedges that will reach at least 1.8m in height upon maturity - natural hazards Where a site is subject to any natural hazard and the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property, whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and the extent to which such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
719.53		NZ Transport Agency	8.4.11.2	Other	Support and Amend Retain Policy 8.4.11.2 with the following amendment to the 7th bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking and access: safety, and efficiency of the roading network, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours 	Reject		Issue Reference 5
775.13		H R & D A Familton	8.4.11.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.11.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
792.14		Patricia Swale	8.4.11.2	Oppose	Confusing statement conflicting numbers per site (8.4.10.2)	Reject		Different activity status between 8.4.10 and 8.4.11
803.13		H R Familton	8.4.11.2	Support	Retain Activity rule 8.4.11.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1

510.7		Wayne L Blair	8.4.17	Not Stated	There should be NO Licensed premises within Medium or Low Density housing areas at all. To do so would compromise the relatively safe environment for families. It has already been demonstrated by the small number of transient workers who live in the area, that the damage to property within the proposed area would increase by the more available facilities to consume liquor and therefore put more properties, older residents and families at risk.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
511.7		Helen Blair	8.4.17	Not Stated	There should be NO Licensed premises within Medium or Low Density housing areas at all. To do so would compromise the relatively safe environment for families. It has already been demonstrated by the small number of transient workers who live in the area, that the damage to property within the proposed area would increase by the more available facilities to consume liquor and therefore put more properties, older residents and families at risk.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.17		Patricia Swale	8.4.17	Oppose	Oppose if this statement in residential area.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
300.5		Rob Jewell	8.4.22	Oppose	Visitor accommodation should not be permitted within this zone.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
61.5		Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.4.23	Other	Insert after 8.4.23 '8.4.24 - Visitor accommodation (not otherwise identified)' as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Discretion is restricted to all the following: - The location, external appearance and design of buildings; - The extent to which the development positively addresses the street; - The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm; - Parking and access arrangements: safety and efficiency, and potential impacts on neighbours' amenity and on-street parking; - Where a site is subject to any natural hazard and the proposed results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property, whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and the extent to which such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated.' - and renumber as required. -		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
97.4		Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited	8.4.23	Other	Insert after 8.4.23 '8.4.24 - Visitor accommodation (not otherwise identified)' as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Discretion is restricted to all the following: - The location, external appearance and design of buildings; - The extent to which the development positively addresses the street; - The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties and the public realm; - Parking and access arrangements: safety and efficiency, and potential impacts on neighbours' amenity and on-street parking; - Where a site is subject to any natural hazard and the proposal results in an increase in gross floor area: an assessment by a suitably qualified person is provided that addresses the nature and degree of risk the hazard(s) pose to people and property, whether the proposal will alter the risk to any site, and the extent to which such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated.' and renumber as required		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
97.4	FS1059.57	Erna Spijkerbosch	8.4.23	Oppose	All visitor accommodation should be treated as a commercial venture.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
586.14		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.4.23	Oppose	Delete in full Activity Rule 8.4.23		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
719.54		NZ Transport Agency	8.4.23	Not Stated	Amend Rule 8.4.23 as follows: • Parking and access: safety, and efficiency of the roading network, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
775.14		H R & D A Familton	8.4.23	Oppose	Delete in full Activity Rule 8.4.23		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
803.14		H R Familton	8.4.23	Oppose	Delete in full Activity Rule 8.4.23		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
335.12		Nic Blennerhassett	8.4.25	Other	Rule 8.4.25 be amended to remove mention of specific materials, and possibly add wording to indicate that the palette of muted colours prescribed in the rural areas is not expected to be adhered to in residential zones.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
505.21		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.4.25	Other	Amend rule 8.4.25 as follows: Discretion is restricted to consideration of all of the following: external appearance, materials, signage platform, lighting, impact on the street, adequate on-site car parking and natural hazards...	Reject		Issue Reference 2
505.22		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.4.25	Not Stated	Amend rule 8.4.25 as follows: Discretion is restricted to consideration of all of the following: external appearance, materials, signage platform, lighting, impact on the street, adequate on-site car parking and natural hazards...	Reject		Issue Reference 5
719.55		NZ Transport Agency	8.4.26	Oppose	Change the activity status of Rule 8.4.26 to Non-complying	Reject		Commercial activities within the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay area are anticipated
524.26		Ministry of Education	8.4.27	Support	Retain Include the term Community Facilities as if this term is retained then it should occur alongside the term Community Activities.	Reject		Issue Reference 3
719.56		NZ Transport Agency	8.4.28	Oppose	Delete Rule 8.4.28		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.16		Patricia Swale	8.4.29	Oppose	Oppose if this statement in residential area.	Accept		This rule applies to the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay area only

73.2		Margaret Prescott	8.5.1 Rules - Standards	Other	Impose a maximum building height restriction along the Scurr Heights Walkway to protect the scenic views from the walkway.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
172.2		Peter Roberts	8.5.8 & 8.5.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Opposes the scale and intensity of proposed medium density housing provisions, specifically relating to density, homestar and boundary setbacks. Council reduce the intensity and scale of the Arrowtown middle density zone as follows: •Lift the proposed boundary setbacks from 1.5 to 2.5 metres. •Increase the minimum section size for standalone homes from 250 square metres without Homestar 6 certification to 350 square metres and fix a minimum size for Homestar 6 certification projects to 300 square metres. Suspend the introduction of terrace housing until agreement is reached with the Arrowtown community as to whether it is desirable and what design features are necessary to protect the towns character, heritage and appeal.	Reject		Issue Reference 1 and 2
264.11		Philip Winstone	8.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown. If the MDHP proposal was adopted building height should be limited to 5m	Reject		Issue Reference 2
383.27		Queenstown Lakes District Council	8.5.10 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.10 so it relates to windows associated with habitable spaces	Reject		Issue Reference 2
383.27	FS1059.28	Erna Spijkerbosch	8.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Support	Reject		Issue Reference 2
391.10		Sean & Jane McLeod	8.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	That the area of land opposite Glenda Drive be zoned low density residential instead of medium density due to conflicting with objectives.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
479.3		Mr Trevor William Oliver	8.5 Rules - Standards	Not Stated	Submits that a change in the height and density of the proposed land zoned as Medium Density between Wynyard Crescent and Fernhill Road as sought does not achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act being the sustainable management of natural and physical resources as it adversely affects our social and cultural well-being and the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values in our area.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
479.3	FS1271.7	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that local authority approve the areas identified as MDR zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
620.1		Bailantyne Investments Ltd	8.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Change to Proposed Rule 8.8.5 Requiring land zoned Medium Density to be developed to a density of 25 to the hectare			Submission withdrawn
727.2		Belfast Corporation Limited	8.5.5 Rules - Standards	Not Stated	Amend provisions to allow for an increase in density within the Medium Density Zone	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
731.2		Mulwood Investments Limited	8.5 Rules - Standards	Not Stated	Amend provisions to allow for an increase in density within the Medium Density Zone	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
842.5		Scott Crawford	8.5 Rules - Standards	Not Stated	Submitter requests the inclusion of transport standards for the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
842.5	FS1276.2	JWA and DV Smith Trust	8.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Seeks to allow the Submission insofar as it seeks to include transport provisions within Chapter 8.	Reject		Issue Reference 5
58.1		Sue Wilson	8.5.1	Oppose	Do not increase building height	Reject		Issue Reference 2
58.1	FS1125.7	New Zealand Fire Service	8.5.1	Oppose	Disallow. The operative District Plan permits only a 6m building height. The Proposed Plan is proposing 7m in Wanaka and 8m in other Medium Density zone areas. Fire station buildings can be designed to meet these proposed height limits while still meeting operational requirements (the Commission in its submission sought an exemption to the height controls in relation to fire station towers). A lower building height, such as the operative 6m height, would be more problematic for the Commission and would result in the unnecessary requirement to obtain resource consent.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
58.1	FS1260.3	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.1	Oppose	Retain the height limits for the MDR Zone as notified. Retaining building height at the levels specified in the Operative District Plan will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes that respond to the site and its content, and which ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the MDR Zone, and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
58.1	FS1271.27	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.1	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to retain the height limits for the MDR Zone as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
58.1	FS1331.30	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.1	Oppose	Retain the height limits for the MDR Zone as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
408.21		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.1	Other	Supports the height limits but requests the addition of the following: "8.5.1.2 A maximum height of 12 metres for a church (Community Activity) on the land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive"	Reject		Issue Reference 2
408.21	FS1167.24	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.1	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
408.21	FS1270.50	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
438.15		New Zealand Fire Service	8.5.1	Not Stated	The NZFS wishes to exempt drying towers from rules 8.5.1.1 and 8.5.1.2. Amend to add <i>Exemption: Fire station towers are exempt from this rule</i>	Reject		Issue Reference 2

505.23		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.5.1	Support	Retain Rule 8.5.1	Accept		Issue Reference 2
512.5		The Estate of Norma Krefl	8.5.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.1 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this height, discretion is restricted to all of the following: - The extent to which variation in the building form, including the use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof form, and variety of materials and colour, mitigates the effects of the additional height. - Whether the scale of development is appropriate for the context taking into account the extent of any effects on the balance of open space and building. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any visual impacts. - The extent to which the additional height of the building influences its overall visual dominance. Exemption: The proposed change to activity status shall not apply to the area of the MDR zone adjoining the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay contained within Brownston, Helwick, Chalmers and Upton Streets.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.5	FS1315.9	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.1	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.5	FS1260.27	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.1	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8.5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS. The non-complying status for breach of standards set out in Rule 8.5 does not allow for innovative designs which would otherwise be able to respond to specific site characteristics and optimise the development potential of the Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.5	FS1331.12	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.1	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8.5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS;	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.5		Wanaka Trust	8.5.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.1 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this height, discretion is restricted to all of the following: - The extent to which variation in the building form, including the use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof form, and variety of materials and colour, mitigates the effects of the additional height. - Whether the scale of development is appropriate for the context taking into account the extent of any effects on the balance of open space and building. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any visual impacts. - The extent to which the additional height of the building influences its overall visual dominance. Exemption: The proposed change to activity status shall not apply to the area of the MDR zone adjoining the Wanaka Town Centre Transition Overlay contained within Brownston, Helwick, Chalmers and Upton Streets.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.5	FS1172.1	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.1	Support	That submission point 536.5 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.5	FS1315.20	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.1	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
648.3		Gillian Kay Crooks	8.5.5	Oppose	Oppose increase in height limits for Arrowtown only due to concerns with loss of direct sunlight, privacy and views.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
648.3	FS1125.11	New Zealand Fire Service	8.5.1	Oppose	Disallow. The Proposed Plan is proposing a height limit of 7m. The submitter is seeking to revert to the Operative District Plan – 6m. Fire station buildings can be designed to meet the proposed height limit of 7m while still meeting operational requirements (the Commission in its submission sought an exemption to the height controls in relation to fire station towers). A lower building height, such as the operative 6m height, would be more problematic for the Commission and would result in the unnecessary requirement to obtain resource consent.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
792.18		Patricia Swale	8.5.1	Oppose	Wanaka height 7m - should be final height. See submission for further detail.	Reject		A breach of height will require Non-Complying resource consent which assesses effects of the proposed breach both on the environment and people
699.43		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.1.2	Not Stated	Retain as notified.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
719.57		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.2	Other	Amend Rules as follows: 8.5.2.1 For buildings located within 80m of a State Highway 6 between (between Hansen Road and the Shotover River) Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, and located within 80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway 6 between Lake Hayes and Frankton shall be designed, constructed and maintained to meet ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35dB LAeq (1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ22107:2000.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 4
719.57	FS1061.59	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.2	Support	That the submission is rejected	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 4
408.22		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3	Other	Redraft the Rule as following (or in a similar manner) in order to reflect 3.2(2) above and to achieve the outcome submitted: "Development on land fronting State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive shall provide the following:" Note: The requested amendments to sub-clauses 8.5.3.1 and 8.5.3.2 are outlined in points 408.24 and 408.25 below)		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

408.22	FS1167.25	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.22	FS1270.51	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.58		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3	Support	Retain Rules - Standard 8.5.3	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.58	FS1061.60	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.7		Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.1	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.3.1(a) & (b) should be deleted.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.7	FS1061.64	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.1	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.7	FS1270.64	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.23		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.1	Other	Amendments as follows: "Transport, parking and access design that: (a) Ensure connections to the State Highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive. (b) There is no new vehicular access to the State Highway."	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.23	FS1092.10	NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.1	Oppose	That the submission 408.23 requesting the deletion of Rule 8.5.3.1 be disallowed.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.23	FS1167.26	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.1	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
408.23	FS1270.52	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.14		The Jandel Trust	8.5.3.1	Oppose	Amend as follows: 8.5.3.1 Transport, parking and access design that: a. Ensures connections to the State Highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, or existing access locations. b. There is no new vehicular access to the State Highway Network.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.14	FS1029.20	Universal Developments Limited	8.5.3.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.14	FS1092.24	NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.1	Oppose	That submission 717.14 be disallowed.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
717.14	FS1270.120	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.59		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.1	Not Stated	Amend Rules - Standard 8.5.3.1a as follows: a Ensures connections to the State highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
719.59	FS1167.34	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.1	Oppose	Opposes in part. Agrees that it may be impossible for some land owners to comply or obtain access through adjoining properties to such roads and access points. Seeks that the relief sought be disallowed.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
847.13		FII Holdings Limited	8.5.3.1	Oppose	Amend as follows: 8.5.3.1 Transport, parking and access design that: a. Ensures connections to the State Highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, or existing access locations. b. There is no new vehicular access to the State Highway Network.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
847.13	FS1270.19	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.8		Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.2	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.3.2 should be deleted.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.8	FS1061.65	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.2	Support	That the submission is accepted.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping
399.8	FS1270.65	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Deferred to the hearing on mapping

717.15		The Jandel Trust	8.5.3.2	Oppose	Delete Rule 8.5.3.2		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.15	FS1029.21	Universal Developments Limited	8.5.3.2	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.15	FS1092.25	NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.2	Oppose	That submission 717.15 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
717.15	FS1270.121	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.60		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.2	Not Stated	Add another traffic impact assessment matter to Rules - Standard 8.5.3.2 as follows: q Integration with pedestrian and cycling networks, particularly the cross SH6 connections.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.60	FS1061.61	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.2	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.61		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.2	Not Stated	Amend Rules - Standard 8.5.3.2c as follows: c. An access network design via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, and the avoidance of any new access to the State Highway network		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
719.61	FS1167.35	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.2	Oppose	Opposes in part. Agrees that it may be impossible for some land owners to comply or obtain access through adjoining properties to such roads and access points. Seeks that the relief sought be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.14		FII Holdings Limited	8.5.3.2	Oppose	Delete rule 8.5.3.2		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.14	FS1061.48	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.2	Support	That the submission is accepted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
847.14	FS1270.20	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.2	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
399.9		Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.3	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.3.3 should be deleted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
399.9	FS1061.66	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.3	Support	That the submission is accepted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
399.9	FS1270.66	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.24		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.3.3	Other	Amend as follows: "A Traffic Impact Assessment which addresses all of the following: (a) Potential traffic effects to the local and State Highway network (including outlines of consultation with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) (b) Potential effects of entry and egress to the local and State Highway network (including outcomes of consultation with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) (c) An access network design via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Roundabout , and/or Ferry Hill Drive, and the avoidance of any access to the Stage Highway Network (d) Integration with existing transport networks and cumulative effects of traffic demand with knowncurrent or future developments (e) Integration with public access networks (f) Methods of Traffic Demand Management A Landscape Plan and Maintenance Program which provides a planting buffer fronting State Highway 6 and shall include all of the following: (a) The retention of exiting vegetation (where practicable) (b) A minimum of 2 tiered planting (inclusive of tall trees and scrubs) made up of species listed as follows: (c) Planting densities and stock sizes which are based on achieving full coverage of the planting areas within 2 years, species locations on the site in order to soften not screen development (d) Use of tree species having a minimum height at maturity of 1.8m (e) Appropriate planting layout which does not limit solar access to new buildings or roads"		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.24	FS1092.11	NZ Transport Agency	8.5.3.2	Oppose	That the submission 408.24 requesting the deletion of Rule 8.5.3.2 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.24	FS1167.27	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.3.3	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.24	FS1270.53	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.3.3	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
166.25		Aurum Survey Consultants	8.5.4	Oppose	Rule 8.5.4 Increase coverage to at least 50%	Reject		Issue Reference 2
438.16		New Zealand Fire Service	8.5.4	Not Stated	Requests fire stations are exempt from this rule. <i>Exemption: Fire stations are exempt from this rule</i>	Reject		Issue Reference 2

510.9		Wayne L Blair	8.5.4	Not Stated	To contemplate 1 x residential unit per 250 sq.m.(with 45% coverage) or obtaining a Homestar certification which allows a no density limit, and to make the process for 3 or less residential units per site not requiring resource consent, opens a door for some developers to compromise the whole area for their gain and not the betterment of Wanaka. What provision will be made regarding parking as each visitor accommodation unit could attract 2-3 cars per unit. Wanaka streets are not wide enough to safely carry parked cars on both sides as well as two way traffic which then becomes a safety issue.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
511.9		Helen Blair	8.5.4	Not Stated	To contemplate 1 x residential unit per 250 sq.m.(with 45% coverage) or obtaining a Homestar certification which allows a no density limit, and to make the process for 3 or less residential units per site not requiring resource consent, opens a door for some developers to compromise the whole area for their gain and not the betterment of Wanaka. What provision will be made regarding parking as each visitor accommodation unit could attract 2-3 cars per unit. Wanaka streets are not wide enough to safely carry parked cars on both sides as well as two way traffic which then becomes a safety issue.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.6		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.4	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.4 as follows: Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal exceeds this coverage, discretion is restricted to all of the following: - 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 dominance of the building - The extent to which topography or landscaping mitigates any dominance impacts	Accept		Right of Reply
512.6	FS1315.10	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.4	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
536.6		Wanaka Trust	8.5.4	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.4 as follows: Add: Except for land contained in, or formerly contained in Lot 3 DP 25998 and Section 2 Blk XLII of Wanaka where the maximum building coverage shall be 50%. Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal exceeds this coverage, discretion is restricted to all of the following: - Whether the scale of development is appropriate for the context taking into account the extent of any effects on the balance of open space and building - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any visual dominance impacts	Accept		Right of Reply
536.6	FS1172.2	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.4	Support	That submission point 536.6 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Accept		Right of Reply
536.6	FS1315.21	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.4	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
586.15		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.4	Support	Retain Building Coverage 8.5.4	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
699.44		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.4	Not Stated	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
775.15		H R & D A Familton	8.5.4	Support	Retain Building Coverage 8.5.4	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
792.19		Patricia Swale	8.5.4	Oppose	Building coverage - 45%. See submission for further detail.	Reject		The 45% standard is what can occur on site without the need for resource consent. Any greater and resource consent is required.
803.15		H R Familton	8.5.4	Support	Retain Building Coverage 8.5.4	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
61.6		Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.5	Other	delete last three lines commencing 'Notwithstanding the above...' relating to the expiry clause for Homestar	Accept		Issue Reference 1
97.6		Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited	8.5.5	Other	Rule 8.5.5 - delete last three lines commencing 'Notwithstanding the above...' relating to the expiry of Homestar incentives	Accept		Issue Reference 1
97.6	FS1260.24	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.5	Support	Delete the sunset clause from Rule 8.5.5. Land that has been zoned Medium Density Residential is inherently suitable for higher density residential, irrespective of whether it is developed now, or in 2, 5 or 7 years' time. There is no sound resource management reason for imposing a time limit on higher density development.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
117.4		Maggie Lawton	8.5.5	Other	If Homestar is used then it needs to be checked at the design stage and then certified when built. Incentivisation to use Homestar for all densities should be considered given the benefits of housing achieving a 6 star rating.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
199.17		Craig Douglas	8.5.5 & 8.5.8	Oppose	The proposed Arrowtown Medium Density zone is dropped. Opposes rule 8.5.5 as it relates to Homestar.	Reject	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Issue Reference 1
273.4		The Full & Bye Trust	8.5.5	Oppose	Opposes density incentives for Homestar. Requests Homestar tool be abandoned. Questions conflict of density incentives with plan objectives, and potential implications on parking, building coverage, density, recession planes and boundary setbacks. Questions the benefit of the 6 year window after which the Homestar incentives expire.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1

300.9		Rob Jewell	8.5.5	Oppose	A section size should not be less than 400sqm.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
362.1		Philip Thoreau	8.5.5	Oppose	Oppose the proposal that "this rule shall not apply where the development can achieve specification to a minimum 6- star level using the NZ Green Building Council Home Star rule". Unclear what density does apply, if any. Further work and reconsideration is required.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
503.3		DJ and EJ Cassells, The Bulling Family, The Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.5.5	Oppose	delete rule 8.5.5	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
503.3	FS1063.6	Peter Fleming and Others	8.5.5	Support	All allowed	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
510.10		Wayne L Blair	8.5.5	Not Stated	To contemplate 1 x residential unit per 250 sq.m.(with 45% coverage) or obtaining a Homestar certification which allows a no density limit, and to make the process for 3 or less residential units per site not requiring resource consent, opens a door for some developers to compromise the whole area for their gain and not the betterment of Wanaka. What provision will be made regarding parking as each visitor accommodation unit could attract 2-3 cars per unit. Wanaka streets are not wide enough to safely carry parked cars on both sides as well as two way traffic which then becomes a safety issue.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 5
510.10	FS1251.11	Varina Pty Limited	8.5.5	Oppose	Oposes. The submitter opposes and considers that expansion / amendments to residential and commercial zones in Wanaka are required given the growing population and tourist numbers in Wanaka.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 5
511.10		Helen Blair	8.5.5	Not Stated	To contemplate 1 x residential unit per 250 sq.m.(with 45% coverage) or obtaining a Homestar certification which allows a no density limit, and to make the process for 3 or less residential units per site not requiring resource consent, opens a door for some developers to compromise the whole area for their gain and not the betterment of Wanaka. What provision will be made regarding parking as each visitor accommodation unit could attract 2-3 cars per unit. Wanaka streets are not wide enough to safely carry parked cars on both sides as well as two way traffic which then becomes a safety issue.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 5
511.10	FS1251.13	Varina Pty Limited	8.5.5	Oppose	Oposes. The submitter opposes and considers that expansion / amendments to residential and commercial zones in Wanaka are required given the growing population and tourist numbers in Wanaka.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 5
512.7		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.5	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.5 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds the density rule, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which the development promotes medium density housing. - The extent to which any adverse effects on local infrastructure and the ability to provide adequate vehicle parking and outdoor living space on the site are mitigated - The extent to which topography or landscaping mitigates any density impacts	Accept		Right of Reply
512.7	FS1260.28	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.5	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS. The non-complying status for breach of standards set out in Rule 8. 5 does not allow for innovative designs which would otherwise be able to respond to specific site characteristics and optimise the development potential of the Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.7	FS1315.11	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.5	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.7	FS1331.13	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.5	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS;	Accept		Right of Reply
536.7		Wanaka Trust	8.5.5	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.5 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds the density rule, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which the development promotes medium density housing. - The extent to which any adverse effects on local infrastructure and the ability to provide adequate vehicle parking and outdoor living space on the site are mitigated - The extent to which topography or landscaping mitigates any density impacts	Accept		Right of Reply
536.7	FS1315.22	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.5	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
586.16		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.5	Support	Retain Density Rule 8.5.5	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
604.1		Jackie Gillies & Associates	8.5.5	Not Stated	NZ Green Star 6 star is no better than compliance under the NZ Building Code and therefore does not encourage better quality building and improved thermal efficiency. A NZ Green Star 8 star rating would be more appropriate and would achieve the intended improvements of thermal efficiency.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
651.4		David & Vivki Caesar	8.5.5	Oppose	Minimum Medium Density section sizes should be increased to 350m2 in Arrowtown	Reject		Issue Reference 1
668.1		Philip Thoreau	8.5.5	Other	Reconsideration of provisions under 8.5.5, in particular in the light of the fact that the area or proposed to be zoned as medium density is essentially almost exclusively a residential zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1

668.1	FS1260.1	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.5	Oppose	Seeks that the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan. The suite of development controls, and density rules will allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes responding to a site and its particular context - and ultimately promoting the objectives and policies of the MDR Zone whilst allowing for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
668.1	FS1271.28	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.5	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.45		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.5	Other	The maximum site density shall be one residential unit or dwelling per 250m2 net site area. However, this rule shall not apply where the development can achieve certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool. Notwithstanding the above, the exceptions applying to developments achieving certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool shall cease to apply at a date being five years after the date the Medium Density Residential Zone is made operative.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.45	FS1271.1	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.5	Support	Supports. Believes that there is no sound resource management reason for imposing a time limit on higher density development. Seeks the delete of the sunset clause from Rule 8. 5. 5.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.45	FS1260.25	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.5	Support	Delete the sunset clause from Rule 8.5.5. Land that has been zoned Medium Density Residential is inherently suitable for higher density residential, irrespective of whether it is developed now, or in 2, 5 or 7 years' time. There is no sound resource management reason for imposing a time limit on higher density development.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
699.45	FS1331.10	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.5	Support	Delete of the sunset clause from Rule 8.5.5.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
775.16		H R & D A Familton	8.5.5	Support	Retain Density Rule 8.5.5	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
803.16		H R Familton	8.5.5	Support	Retain Density Rule 8.5.5	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
130.2		Richard & Lynn Kane	8.5.6	Other	Notes that the development of the previous Wanaka primary school is at the 25 degree building in relation to boundary, and houses are very close. Submitter considers there will be an even greater loss of sun with the proposed change to 45 degrees. Requests this be considered and amendments made.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
268.1		Mark Kramer	8.5.6	Other	The removal of provisions in the proposed district plan for an increase in the height recession plane in the proposed medium density area in Arrowtown. Retention of the existing height recession plane.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
268.2		Mark Kramer	8.5.5	Other	Notes that Section 8.5.5 states maximum site density shall be 250m2, but only if the development doesn't attain a 6 star rating, which is not much more than is required under the existing building code.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
273.3		The Full & Bye Trust	8.5.6	Other	Requests reconsideration of the recession plane rules. Clarification of exemptions for a park, reserve and fronting the road or a significant reduction in the area of the zone where an exemption could apply.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
362.2		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6	Oppose	Oppose the extremely aggressive recession planes and will only lead to a very significant loss of amenity value to any neighbouring users and will seriously leave exposed or fail to protect the privacy and amenity of residential users and guests, directly in conflict with the plan objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.8		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.6	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.6 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this recession plane, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which the recession plane protection has adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any visual dominance of buildings.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.8	FS1260.29	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.6	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS. The non-complying status for breach of standards set out in Rule 8. 5 does not allow for innovative designs which would otherwise be able to respond to specific site characteristics and optimise the development potential of the Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.8	FS1315.12	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.6	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.8	FS1331.14	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.6	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS;	Accept		Right of Reply
536.8		Wanaka Trust	8.5.6	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.6 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this recession plane, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which the recession plane protection has adverse effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any visual dominance of buildings.	Accept		Right of Reply

536.8	FS1172.3	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.6	Support	That submission point 536.8 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Accept		Right of Reply
536.8	FS1315.23	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.6	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
586.17		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.6	Support	Retain Recession Plan rules 8.5.6.1- 8.5.6.5	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
591.6		Varina Propriety Limited	8.5.6	Other	Sloping sites (as defined by the PDP) are excluded from the recession plane requirements specified in Rule 8.5.6.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
648.4		Gillian Kay Crooks	8.5.6	Oppose	Oppose increase in height recession plane for Arrowtown only due to concerns with loss of direct sunlight, privacy and views.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.4		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6	Oppose	Reduce recession plane angle	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.4	FS1271.30	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
699.46		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.6	Not Stated	Retain as notified	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
775.17		H R & D A Familton	8.5.6	Support	Retain Recession Plan rules 8.5.6.1- 8.5.6.5	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
792.20		Patricia Swale	8.5.6	Other	Submitter seeks clarification.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
803.17		H R Familton	8.5.6	Support	Retain Recession Plan rules 8.5.6.1- 8.5.6.5	Accept in Part		Right of Reply
362.9		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.1	Oppose	Oppose the recession plane proposed	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.5		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.1	Oppose	Reduce recession plane angle	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.5	FS1271.31	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6.1	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.46		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.5.6.2	Other	Requests deletion of rules 8.6.2.1 and 8.6.2.2 relating to certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool and the expiry of the rule after five years. Requests all medium density projects should be assessed on high quality design including sustainable design principles.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1107.51	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.5.6.2	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1226.51	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.5.6.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1234.51	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	8.5.6.2	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1239.51	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.5.6.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1241.51	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.5.6.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1242.74	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.5.6.2	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1248.51	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.5.6.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1249.51	Tweed Development Limited	8.5.6.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2

238.46	FS1260.26	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.6.2	Support	Delete the sunset clause from Rule 8.5.5. Land that has been zoned Medium Density Residential is inherently suitable for higher density residential, irrespective of whether it is developed now, or in 2, 5 or 7 years' time. There is no sound resource management reason for imposing a time limit on higher density development.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1271.26	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6.2	Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to delete the sunset clause from Rule 8. 5. 5.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
238.46	FS1331.11	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.6.2	Support	Delete of the sunset clause	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1 and 2
362.10		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.2	Oppose	Oppose the recession plane proposed.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.6		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.2	Oppose	Reduce recession plane angle	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.6	FS1271.32	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6.2	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
668.7		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.3	Oppose	Reduce recession plane angle	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.7	FS1271.33	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6.3	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
362.8		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.5	Oppose	Oppose the provision that recession planes do not apply to sites adjoining the Town Centre zone, fronting the road or reserves.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.8		Philip Thoreau	8.5.6.5	Oppose	It is submitted that 8.5.6 requires significant rework, a reduction of the highly aggressive Recession planes and reconsideration of 8.5.6.5 to more appropriate, or a significant reduction in the area of the zone where such an exemption could apply, taking specifically into account the amenities value of the residential users and visitors in the area in accordance with the proposed objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
668.8	FS1271.34	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.6.5	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to the development controls specified in Rule 8. 5 remain as per the notified plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
512.9		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.7	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.7 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this landscaped permeable surface. discretion is restricted to the following: - The effects of any reduced landscape provision on the visual appearance or dominance of the site and buildings from adjacent sites and the public realm.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
512.9	FS1260.30	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.7	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS. The non-complying status for breach of standards set out in Rule 8. 5 does not allow for innovative designs which would otherwise be able to respond to specific site characteristics and optimise the development potential of the Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
512.9	FS1315.13	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.7	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
512.9	FS1331.15	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.7	Support	The status of activities under Rule 8. 5 (Standards) be changed from N-C to RDIS;	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
536.9		Wanaka Trust	8.5.7	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.7 as follows: Non-compliance status: NC RD Where a proposal exceeds this landscaped permeable surface. discretion is restricted to the following: - The effects of any reduced landscape provision on the visual appearance or dominance of the site and buildings from adjacent sites and the public realm.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
536.9	FS1172.4	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.7	Support	That submission point 536.9 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
536.9	FS1315.24	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.7	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
586.18		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.7	Support	Retain Landscape Permeable Surface Rule 8.5.7	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.47		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.7	Not Stated	Retain as notified	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
775.18		H R & D A Familton	8.5.7	Support	Retain Landscape Permeable Surface Rule 8.5.7	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
803.18		H R Familton	8.5.7	Support	Retain Landscape Permeable Surface Rule 8.5.7	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
408.25		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.5.8	Other	If the Rural Zoning (within the Outer Control Boundary) is retained, support an exception to the minimum boundary setback rule so an additional 1.5 m of land is not lost from the development potential for the site (i.e. Section 130 Blk I Shotover SD, Section 31 Blk Shotover SD, Part of Section 132 Blk I Shotover SD).		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

408.25	FS1167.28	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.5.8	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.25	FS1270.54	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.8	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
505.24		JWA & DV Smith Trust	8.5.8	Not Stated	Amend Rule 8.5.8 as follows: Add the following: On the Southern boundary of the Town Centre Overlay Zone, there must be a setback of 4.5m.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
512.10		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.8	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.8 as follows: Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal exceeds this minimum boundary setback, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which intrusion towards the boundary is necessary to enable the efficient development of the site including retention of natural features and significant trees. - Any adverse effects of the proximity of the building to adjoining sites and streets, in terms of visual dominance, or loss of privacy or sunlight. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any reduced setback area.	Accept		Right of Reply
512.10	FS1315.14	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.8	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
536.10		Wanaka Trust	8.5.8	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.8 as follows: Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal exceeds this minimum boundary setback, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which intrusion towards the boundary is necessary to enable the efficient development of the site including retention of natural features and significant trees. - Any adverse effects of the proximity of the building to adjoining sites and streets, in terms of visual dominance, or loss of privacy or sunlight. - The extent to which topography or landscape mitigates any reduced setback area.	Accept		Right of Reply
536.10	FS1172.5	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.8	Support	That submission point 536.10 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Accept		Right of Reply
536.10	FS1315.25	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.8	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Accept		Right of Reply
586.19		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.8	Support	Retain Minimum Boundary Setback Rules 8.5.8.1 and 8.5.8.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
651.5		David & Vivki Caesar	8.5.8	Oppose	Boundary Setbacks should be increased from 1.5 metres to 2.5 metres	Reject		Issue Reference 2
657.1		Lorraine Cooper	8.5.8	Oppose	Retain the current road boundary setback of 4.5 metres.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1063.9	Peter Fleming and Others	8.5.8	Support	We support all of their submission. QLDC have provided little or no relevant section 32 reports that is it is lacking in section 32 reports that are of any use. It is unacceptable that submissions on A4 paper all stacked on top of one another would be over 1 metre height and that they can be cross referenced by us mere mortals in 3 weeks. They are closed off less than a week before Christmas New Year which is stupid. We wish to comment further on this at Hearings. We wish to object to all submissions that in fact amount to private plan changes. They are undemocratic and most likely illegal. The maps are unreadable.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1260.6	Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.5.8	Oppose	Retain the road boundary setback at 3m. Requiring a minimum road setback of 4.5m does not allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes that respond to a site and its context, and which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the MDR Zone, and allow for the more efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1265.3	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.5.8	Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any changes to road boundary setbacks in the Medium Density Residential Chapter.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1268.3	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc	8.5.8	Support	That the Submission be allowed insofar as it seeks to oppose any changes to road boundary setbacks in the Medium Density Residential Chapter.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1271.17	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	8.5.8	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to retain the road boundary setback at 3m.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
657.1	FS1331.32	Mount Crystal Limited	8.5.8	Oppose	Retain the road boundary setback at 3m.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.48		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.8	Not Stated	Retain as notified	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
775.19		H R & D A Familton	8.5.8	Support	Retain Minimum Boundary Setback Rules 8.5.8.1 and 8.5.8.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
792.21		Patricia Swale	8.5.8	Oppose	Opposes restriction on window size and restriction of 1.5m	Reject		Issue Reference 2

803.19		H R Familton	8.5.8	Support	Retain Minimum Boundary Setback Rules 8.5.8.1 and 8.5.8.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
717.16		The Jandel Trust	8.5.8.1	Support	Retain Rule 8.5.8.1 – Minimum Boundary Setback	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
717.16	FS1029.22	Universal Developments Limited	8.5.8.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
717.16	FS1270.122	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.8.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
719.62		NZ Transport Agency	8.5.8.1	Not Stated	Amend Rules - Standard 8.5.8.1 as follows: 8.5.8.1 Road boundary setback: 3m, except for state highway boundaries which shall be 4. 5m.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
847.15		FIH Holdings Limited	8.5.8.1	Support	Retain Rule 8.5.8.1 – Minimum Boundary Setback	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
847.15	FS1270.21	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.8.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
238.44		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.5.9	Other	supports the rule in part. Requests addition of an interpretive diagram to assist in clarifying how the rule applies to a double level building.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1107.49	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.5.9	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1226.49	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.5.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1234.49	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	8.5.9	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1239.49	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.5.9	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1241.49	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.5.9	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1242.72	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.5.9	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1248.49	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.5.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.44	FS1249.49	Tweed Development Limited	8.5.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
268.3		Mark Kramer	8.5.9	Support	Noted that continuous building length is set at 16m, which is restricted discretionary, does not need consent from affected parties, and doesn't need to be notified if a 6 star rating is achieved. With the discretion being controlled by a series of bullet points which are both ambiguous and subjective.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
586.20		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.9	Support	Retain Continuous Building Length Rule 8.5.9	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
699.49		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.9	Not Stated	Continuous Building Length: The continuous length of any building facade above one storey shall not exceed 16 24m.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
699.50		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.9	Not Stated	Matters of restricted discretion Where a proposal exceeds this length, discretion is restricted to all of the following: - building dominance - building form and appearance - 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 dominance of the building - The extent to which topography or landscaping 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	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
775.20		H R & D A Familton	8.5.9	Support	Retain Continuous Building Length Rule 8.5.9	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2

803.20		H R Familton	8.5.9	Support	Retain Continuous Building Length Rule 8.5.9	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 2
238.45		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	8.5.10	Other	Requests deletion of rule. OR, requests insertion of translucent glass rather than opaque.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1107.50	Man Street Properties Ltd	8.5.10	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1226.50	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission. Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1234.50	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1239.50	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1241.50	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	8.5.10	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1242.73	Antony & Ruth Stokes	8.5.10	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1248.50	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission. Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
238.45	FS1249.50	Tweed Development Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission. Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
335.13		Nic Blennerhassett	8.5.10	Other	Clarification is needed for Rule 8.5.10 - is the 'first storey' what we would call the ground floor, or is it the first floor above the ground floor (as we would usually understand the label)? A sill height of 1.5m seems high, although maybe reasonable if closer than 4m from the boundary.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.11		The Estate of Norma Kreft	8.5.10	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.10 as follows: Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal breaches the window sill height, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which building elevations and materials. orientation of windows and proposed landscape mitigate any adverse effects of overlooking on streets, parks and adjacent residential properties.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
512.11	FS1315.15	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.10	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.11		Wanaka Trust	8.5.10	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.5.10 as follows: Non-compliance status: D RD Where a proposal breaches the window sill height, discretion is restricted to the following: - The extent to which building elevations and materials. orientation of windows and proposed landscape mitigate any adverse effects of overlooking on streets, parks and adjacent residential properties.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.11	FS1172.6	Reddy Group Limited	8.5.10	Support	That submission point 536.11 to amend the infringing activity status to RD is accepted	Reject		Issue Reference 2
536.11	FS1315.26	Greenwood Group Ltd	8.5.10	Support	Greenwood supports those parts of the submission that seek changes to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
586.21		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.5.10	Support	Retain Window Sill Heights Rule 8.5.10	Reject		Issue Reference 2
604.2		Jackie Gillies & Associates	8.5.10	Not Stated	The definition is ambiguous. Change the wording to ".... heights ABOVE GROUND FLOOR"	Reject		Issue Reference 2
699.51		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.10	Other	Window sill heights above the first storey shall not be set lower than 1.5m above the floor level where the external face of the window is within 1.5m 4m of the site boundary. Exceptions to this rule are where building elevations face the street or reserves, or where opaque glass is used for windows. In these scenarios the rule does not apply.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
717.17		The Jandel Trust	8.5.10	Oppose	Delete Rule 8.5.10 – Window Sill Heights	Accept		Issue Reference 2
717.17	FS1029.23	Universal Developments Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Reject		Issue Reference 2
717.17	FS1270.123	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.10	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Issue Reference 2

775.21		H R & D A Familton	8.5.10	Support	Retain Window Sill Heights Rule 8.5.10	Reject		Issue Reference 2
803.21		H R Familton	8.5.10	Support	Retain Window Sill Heights Rule 8.5.10	Reject		Issue Reference 2
847.16		FII Holdings Limited	8.5.10	Oppose	Delete Rule 8.5.10 – Window Sill Heights	Accept		Issue Reference 2
847.16	FS1270.22	Hansen Family Partnership	8.5.10	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept		Issue Reference 2
117.36		Maggie Lawton	8.5.11	Other	About time Green Waste was considered other than through composting education	Accept		Refer to entire S42A report
699.52		Reddy Group Limited	8.5.11	Not Stated	Retain as notified.	Accept		Refer to entire S42A report
810.32		Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua	8.5.13	Not Stated	Setback of buildings from water bodies: Add a further matter of discretion: Manawhenua values.	Reject		Issue Reference 2
166.26		Aurum Survey Consultants	8.5.14	Support	Revise the rule it makes no sense	Reject		Issue Reference 3
230.7		Loris King	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	I am totally against Controlled activities not requiring the s-written consent of other persons, and shall not be notified or limited notified". Every ratepayer deserves to be treated with respect and be able to give consent or otherwise, if their property, or their neighbourhood has potential to be affected in any way. I am also totally against Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary activities not requiring the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited notified.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
230.7	FS1251.8	Varina Pty Limited	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Opposes in part. The submitter opposes as it relates to matters on the Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones. The submitter considers that allowing for higher density housing, visitor accommodation and commercial activities in the residential zones of Wanaka is important to cater for growing population and tourist numbers.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
230.7	FS1061.49	Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	That the submission is rejected.	Accept		Issue Reference 1
264.12		Philip Winstone	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Do not adopt the Medium Density Zone in Arrowtown		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
586.22		J D Familton and Sons Trust	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain Non- Notification Rules 8.6.1 and 8.6.2, including 8.6.2.1 and 8.6.2.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
775.22		H R & D A Familton	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain Non- Notification Rules 8.6.1 and 8.6.2, including 8.6.2.1 and 8.6.2.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
803.22		H R Familton	8.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain Non- Notification Rules 8.6.1 and 8.6.2, including 8.6.2.1 and 8.6.2.2	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
408.26		Otago Foundation Trust Board	8.6.1	Other	Regarding the non notification of applications, the proposed Medium Density Zone located fronting State Highway 6 (between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive) should be added to 8.6.2.2 (noting that the subject site is legally described as Section 130 Blk I Shotover SD, Section 31 Blk Shotover SD, Part of Section 132 Blk I Shotover SD).	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
408.26	FS1167.29	Peter and Margaret Arnott	8.6.1	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 1
408.26	FS1270.55	Hansen Family Partnership	8.6.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
719.63		NZ Transport Agency	8.6.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 8.6.1 to read as follows: Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited- notified.~ except for 8.6.1. 1 visitor accommodation adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall he deemed an affected party.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
792.22		Patricia Swale	8.6.1	Oppose	Oppose strongly.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
199.18		Craig Douglas	8.6.2	Oppose	Opposes the rule and requests that it be removed from the plan	Reject		Issue Reference 1
792.23		Patricia Swale	8.6.2	Oppose	Affected people should by notified.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
503.5		DJ and EJ Cassells, The Bulling Family, The Bennett Family, M Lynch	8.6.2.1	Oppose	delete rule 8.6.2.1	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
503.5	FS1063.8	Peter Fleming and Others	8.6.2.1	Support	All allowed	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1

506.4		Friends of the Wakatiou Gardens and Reserves Incorporated	8.6.2.1	Not Stated	Delete rule 8.6.2.1	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
506.4	FS1063.13	Peter Fleming and Others	8.6.2.1	Support	We support all of their submission. QLDC have provided little or no relevant section 32 reports that are of any use. It is unacceptable that submissions on A4 paper all stacked on top of one another would be over 1 metre height and that they can be cross referenced by us mere mortals in 3 weeks. They are closed off less than a week before Christmas New Year which is stupid. We wish to comment further on this at Hearings. We wish to object to all submissions that in fact amount to private plan changes. They are undemocratic and most likely illegal. The maps are unreadable.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
61.7		Dato Tan Chin Nam	8.6.2.2	Other	Delete 8.6.2.2 relating to the expiry of Homestar clauses. Replace 8.6.2.2 with "Visitor Accommodation"	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 1
97.5		Hurtell Proprietary Limited, Landeena Holdings Limited, Shellmint Proprietary Limited	8.6.2.2	Other	Delete 8.6.2.2 - Add as replacement for 8.6.2.2 '8.6.2.2 Visitor Accommodation'		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
230.5		Loris King	13 Wanaka Town Centre	Support	I agree with the Wanaka Town centre Transition Overlay location, as the Brownston Street area from Dunganvon Street through to Ardmore Street is already commercial on the left hand side going to Ardmore Street, and on the right hand side which is residential, we already have approximately six businesses operating. Because of the proximity to the commercial area both sides of Russell Street are the natural progression of commercial zoning, and, as well, businesses are already operating there.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
408.2		Otago Foundation Trust Board	2.2 Definitions	Other	Change the definition of "Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN)" to strikeout "community activity" in relation to the subject site (Section 130, Blk 1 Shotover SD, 2.0023ha, Section 31, Blk Shotover SD, 2.0.34ha and Part of Section 132, Blk 1 Shotover SD, 2.0.34ha). I.e. "Means any residential activity, visitor accommodation activity, community activity and day care facility activity as defined in this District Plan including all outdoor spaces associated with any educational facility, but excludes activity in police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices."	Reject		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1167.5	Peter and Margaret Arnott	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	Conditionally opposes. Agrees that no provision has been made within the submitters proposal to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road and the Proposed District Plan states that access should be encouraged. Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed unless provision is made to enable access through the site from the submitters land to the roundabout on the Eastern Arterial Road.	Accept in Part		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1340.2	Queenstown Airport Corporation	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	It would be inappropriate to remove the term "Community Activity" (in so far as it relates to the submitters site) from the definition as it would undermine the intent and purpose of the definition and how it is applied throughout the Proposed Plan.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1077.16	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	Retain community activity within the definition of ASAN.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1077.17	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	To the extent that any of this land falls within the Queenstown Airport ANB or OCB BARNZ opposes the change and asks that the land be retained in its proposed zone.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1270.31	Hansen Family Partnership	2.2 Definitions	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Reject		Issue Reference 4
408.2	FS1097.274	Queenstown Park Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	Requests that 'community activity' is deleted from definition of ASANs	Reject		Issue Reference 4
728.3		Wanaka Residents Association	27.5.1	Oppose	That the Council increase the minimum lot size for the proposed medium density residential zone	Reject		Issue Reference 1
13 Wanaka Town Centre	110	Alan Cutler	110.1	Other	Supports proposal to concentrate and extend Wanaka CBD. Opportunities for café and specialized retail extending towards the toe of the old lake terrace, especially alongside Bullock Creek should be explored.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
13 Wanaka Town Centre	110	Alan Cutler	110.11	Other	Supports proposal to concentrate and extend Wanaka CBD. Opportunities for café and specialized retail extending towards the toe of the old lake terrace, especially alongside Bullock Creek should be explored.	Accept		Issue Reference 4
13 Wanaka Town Centre	230	Loris King	230.5	Support	I agree with the Wanaka Town centre Transition Overlay location, as the Brownston Street area from Dunganvon Street through to Ardmore Street is already commercial on the left hand side going to Ardmore Street, and on the right hand side which is residential, we already have approximately six businesses operating. Because of the proximity to the commercial area both sides of Russell Street are the natural progression of commercial zoning, and, as well, businesses are already operating there.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
389.9		Body Corporate 22362	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Support	Generally support the subdivision standards.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
391.15		Sean & Jane McLeod	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
586.3		J D Familton and Sons Trust	27.5.1	Support	Retain 250 m2 minimum lot size	Accept		Summary of Evidence
717.18		The Jandel Trust	27.5.1	Support	Retain Rule 27.5.1 – Standards for Subdivision	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence

717.18	FS1029.24	Universal Developments Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Reject		Summary of Evidence
717.18	FS1270.124	Hansen Family Partnership	27.5.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
728.3		Wanaka Residents Association	27.5.1	Oppose	That the Council increase the minimum lot size for the proposed medium density residential zone	Reject		Summary of Evidence
775.3		H R & D A Familton	27.5.1	Support	Retain 250 m2 minimum lot size	Accept		Summary of Evidence
803.3		H R Familton	27.5.1	Support	Retain 250 m2 minimum lot size	Accept		Summary of Evidence
847.17		FII Holdings Limited	27.5.1	Support	Retain Rule 27.5.1 – Standards for Subdivision	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
847.17	FS1270.23	Hansen Family Partnership	27.5.1	Support	Supports. Seeks the submission be allowed, subject to a consistent zoning regime being applied to the land north of and adjoining State Highway 6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Road.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
586.5		J D Familton and Sons Trust	27.5.1.2	Support	Retain minimum dimensions of 12m X 12 for medium density housing	Accept		Summary of Evidence
775.5		H R & D A Familton	27.5.1.2	Support	Retain minimum dimensions of 12m X 12 for medium density housing	Accept		Summary of Evidence
803.5		H R Familton	27.5.1.2	Support	Retain minimum dimensions of 12m X 12 for medium density housing	Accept		Summary of Evidence
208.40		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Oppose	Delete the rule 27.5.2 Lot size exemption	Reject		Summary of Evidence
370.7		Paterson Pitts Group	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
453.4		Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Support	This rule is supported.	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
586.7		J D Familton and Sons Trust	27.5.2.1	Support	Retain 27.5.2.1	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
775.7		H R & D A Familton	27.5.2.1	Support	Retain 27.5.2.1	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
803.7		H R Familton	27.5.2.1	Support	Retain 27.5.2.1	Accept in Part		Summary of Evidence
166.12		Aurum Survey Consultants	27.5.3 Subdivision associated with residential	Oppose	Delete rule 27.5.3 and seek to revise a more enabling wording across more zones.	Reject		Summary of Evidence

APPENDIX 4
ECONOMIC REVIEW OF MEDIUM DENSITY LEVEL PROVISIONS BY PHILIP
OSBORNE

11 November 2016

Economic Review of density standards in High and Medium Density Residential Zones in Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan

At the request of the Hearing Panel, the following comments relate to the medium and high density residential zone intensities provided for in the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (PDP), and the potential associated economic costs and benefits associated with the proposed densities.

From an economic viewpoint, it is fundamental firstly to set the context in which these permitted densities lie. As per my evidence before the hearing panel the Queenstown District's residential property market has experienced, and continues to experience, the most dramatic increases in residential land prices in New Zealand. Subsequently this has led to a rapid fall in affordability and home ownership that ultimately threatens to destabilise the District's economy and impact undesirably upon community well-being. It is crucial therefore that the PDP seeks to address these issues.

As outlined in my evidence, and also alluded to in the report accompanying the section 32a analysis,¹ an underlying issue is not necessarily the supply of residential land but the provision of appropriate built form.

To assist in its understanding of the potential outcomes of the residential provisions of the Operative District Plan (ODP), the Council has developed a dwelling capacity model (DCM). This model (based on ODP zones) seeks to quantify the potential capacity that is likely to be realised in the market given planning constraints as well as driving market factors. Previous research undertaken illustrated an average viability rate of approximately 70% for medium density and 10% for high density residential product in the District.

Further assessment undertaken by Property Economics has begun to highlight some additional factors that have the potential to materially drop these ODP DCM 'realisation' rates. These factors have the potential to also significantly impact upon the residential capacity 'enabled' by

¹ Insight Economics Re Queenstown Visitor Accommodation Projections, at <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/District-Plan/Hearings-Page/Hearing-Stream-6/Section-42A-Reports-and-Council-Expert-Evidence/Chapter-9-High-Density-Residential/Attachment-1-4-from-Chapter-9-S32a-Insight-Economics-Combined.pdf>

the PDP. A project is underway to update the DCM, so it reflects the PDP zoning and provisions.

As identified above a key issue is the provision of appropriate residential product at an affordable level to meet the current and projected future needs of the District in a manner that will provide for the wider community well-being and economic prosperity. This implies that the PDP must enable the development of actual built product that meets the needs of at least a mid-level socio-economic demographic. Therefore, a key objective should be the provision of residential product that requires a lower land cost input (i.e. medium to high density product). The PDP seeks to increase the quantum of this component of residential product in the market. However, preliminary assessments would suggest that within the short to medium term the viability levels of these product types are low, resulting in minimal levels of actual product reaching the market.

There are two approaches to addressing this issue. The first is one which was adopted in Auckland under the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. In recognition of the low (only 7% for high density product) viability rates the Independent Hearings Panel recommended significant increases to the THAB (high density) and medium density areas. This in effect increased the theoretically capacity significantly and in turn resulted in a higher level of nominal higher density residential product that was viable.

The residential market in Queenstown currently exhibits different pressures than that faced in Auckland. Although the resulting market has pushed prices in the same direction (at rates in the Queenstown District that now exceed Auckland and the rest of the country), Queenstown faces a significantly greater speculative market in residential land (as a proportion of the residential market as a whole). This pressure potentially limits the options available to the District in addressing the residential housing issues. This, coupled with the ongoing influence of visitor accommodation, is likely to dampen the stimulating effect of simply increasing residential land areas. A key tool that remains for the Council is the ability to increase residential density in appropriate areas.

Notified medium density provisions allow for minimum sites of 250m². It is my understanding that in the s42A report, a maximum net site area for areas zoned medium density residential (greenfield land in Frankton adjoining State Highway 6, and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road) was

changed to 400sqm. This has subsequently, through the reply, been deleted.

Additionally, it is my understanding that the Council's officer seeks to provide restricted discretionary activity status to this zone whereby a lower net site area would be allowed if it meet the criteria in standard 8.5.5.1. From an economic prospective this provides for residential developments that would meet economically significant criteria such as proximity and accessibility to markets and amenities.

The potential economic costs of not providing sufficient residential development capacity are evident in the current market. The true economic costs however have yet to be felt in the District with essential employment sectors priced out of housing and lower homeownership impacting upon social and economic stability.

Given the size of the District's economy and its reliance on natural and built form I consider a 250m² minimum site size appropriate, with the addition of a restricted discretionary status for developments to achieve greater densities where appropriate, for the areas identified as medium density zone in entirety.

In terms of the high density zone, the very low viability rates indicated both through the ODP DCM analysis and the subsequent assessments would suggest that the role these areas would play in the provision of appropriate residential product (and choice) in alleviating housing issues, is severely curtailed.

From a purely economic viewpoint it would be my economic position that the height limits (of 7m permitted on sloping sites and 12m permitted on flat sites) are reviewed in light of their ability not only to increase theoretical capacity but to improve the economic and financial feasibility of this product - I accept that there is a stepped height increase for restricted discretionary and non-complying activity status. Once again an option that was considered, and adopted, in the Auckland context was to significantly increase these areas, however this option is less likely to be beneficial to the QLD market. Although potentially beneficial, as previously identified this has a lower propensity to result in built form development in QLD and more likely, in such a small market, to result in the dispersal of higher density product away from appropriate locations.

In summary:

- Medium to high density product is what meets the needs of the mid-level socio-economic demographic;
- those products have low viability;
- One option to address that is to increase the area of land zoned high and medium density so as to produce more viable developments;
- 250m² is appropriate for all areas zoned medium density;
- High density as currently zoned will have low viability;
- One option to address that is to review the 7m and 12m height limits to make the product more feasible;
- Another option would be increasing the amount of high density zoned land, but that isn't likely to work well in Queenstown.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Phil Osborne'.

Phil Osborne

Economist