

Amanda Leith for QLDC – Overview of all five Residential zones, summary of evidence and response to additional submissions on Subdivision provisions, 7 October 2016

Chapter 7 Low Density Residential – Hearing Stream 06

Overview of all five Residential zones

1. Legal counsel has asked me to provide an overview of the five residential zones in the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), in order to provide the Panel with a strategic overview before hearing from each of the s42A authors.
2. The PDP contains a number of urban zones which are to specifically provide for residential accommodation to house the majority of the District's population. All of these zones are located within the proposed Urban Growth Boundaries and each zone provides for a specific intensity of development taking into account its location in relation to town centres, local shopping areas and schools. All of the residential zones of the PDP are included within Hearing Stream 6.
3. The aim of the urban zones is to promote a compact urban form which utilises land and infrastructure in an efficient and sustainable manner, and to limit the need for urban sprawl in providing capacity to house the majority of the population anticipated within the District in the coming years.
4. The highest residential densities are proposed adjacent to the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres, with medium density areas being identified in areas further removed from town centres but with good access to town centres, public transport routes and community facilities. Both of these zones are intended to allow for increased densities which will increase housing supply and diversity in terms of dwelling size and typology.
5. Low density residential areas are identified where they are less connected to these amenities and services or where there are constraints identified such as hazards or proximity to Queenstown Airport. The Low Density Residential zone is the largest residential zone in the District with the majority already having been developed for traditional suburban densities and housing forms.

-
6. Increased density is proposed within the High and Low Density Residential zones compared to that allowed by the Operative District Plan (**ODP**). The Medium Density and Large Lot Residential zones are new zones in the PDP. They will also allow for increased residential development within the Urban Growth Boundaries.
 7. The Arrowtown Residential Historic Management zone covers the older part of the residential settlement of Arrowtown surrounding the Town Centre. The area has a distinctive character and development pattern which is sought to be protected and maintained. The provisions for this zone effectively replicate those in the ODP.
 8. The Large Lot Residential zone is located within the Urban Growth Boundary for Wanaka and provides for a lower intensity of residential development than in the remainder of the Urban Growth Boundary. The zone is a legacy of the ODP zoning regime and for the purposes of the PDP is intended as a buffer between the adjoining residential zones and the rural zones outside of the Urban Growth Boundaries and proposes a predominance of open space over built form. Higher densities are encouraged in this zone where it is compatible and practicable.

Low Density Residential Zone

9. The Low Density Residential zone provides for traditional suburban densities and housing forms, while also supporting some increased densities and community activities.
10. I have recommended a number of minor and also more substantive changes to the Low Density Residential chapter as a result of the submissions received.
11. The most significant amendments include:
 - a. Deletion and amendment of all of the density related provisions to clarify that the as-of-right net site area for the zone is 450m², however a 'gentle density' of 300m² net site area may occur via a controlled activity resource consent;

-
- b. Allowing one residential unit per 450m² net site area within the Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary of Queenstown Airport;
 - c. Inclusion of recession plane provisions for accessory buildings on both flat and sloping sites;
 - d. Exceptions are now provided for minor intrusions into the minimum boundary setbacks;
 - e. Change to the building separation distance within sites and the corresponding activity status;
 - f. Deletion of the car parking requirements for Residential Flats, on the basis that this is a matter to be considered when the Transport Chapter is notified in Stage 2; and
 - g. Modification to the non-notification clause to provide an exemption relating to developments accessed via State Highways.
12. Having read the evidence of Mr Taylor and Ms McMinn on behalf of the Southern District Health Board (678), I do not consider that any additional points have been presented to warrant a change in my recommendation in relation to the activity status of community activities. I also note that Ms McMinn states in paragraphs 14 – 16 of her evidence that under the ODP any additional development on the hospital site would require discretionary activity consent. Consequently, the recommended activity status is no more onerous.
13. In relation to Ms McMinn's evidence in support of my recommended retention of the definition of 'Community Facility' given no community facility subzones have been identified in Stage 1, I acknowledge the confusion that this has created. The intent of retaining the definition was in case any community facility subzones may need to be identified in the Stage 2 zones, however I acknowledge that if a sub-zone were required anywhere, the District hospital would be one of the most important. A definition can also be notified in Stage 2, alongside any community facility subzone (if there is one). I consequently, recommend that the definition be deleted from Chapter 2.
14. Of the evidence submitted by Mr MacColl on behalf of NZTA (719), I accept that a further modification could be made to redraft Rule 7.6.2.1 in relation to access on to the State Highway. I am however concerned about the removal of the word 'direct' as it could be misconstrued as to apply to properties which access on to a street that is located off the State Highway. An amended

wording may be acceptable referencing an access to a crossing point on to the State Highway instead. I will defer my final recommendation on this point until after the submitter presents his evidence.

15. Mr MacColl's proposed wording to require 'written approval' rather than being 'notified' is not supported as it is anticipated that some developments may not be able to obtain the NZTA's written approval and therefore notification would be more appropriate.
16. Having read the evidence of Mr Beckett and Mr Morgan representing BARNZ (271), I note that this evidence appears to be attempting to relitigate Plan Change 35 (**PC35**) in relation to retention of existing development rights. Although I acknowledge that the Environment Court's decision on PC35 is not binding on the Council and submitters are entitled to bring evidence to this hearing on notified (and submitted on) PDP provisions, I do not accept these points. I however wish to hear the submitter's presentation in relation to the need for notification of Queenstown Airport Corporation (**QAC**) in relation to breaches of rules for acoustic insulation and ventilation before I make a recommendation in this regard.
17. I agree to all of the points raised by Mr Kyle representing QAC (433) subject to minor wording changes.
18. I wish to hear the presentation of Ms McLeod on behalf of the New Zealand Fire Service Commission (438) before I determine whether I recommend supporting or not supporting these points. I consider there is some ambiguity as to the relief sought, given that paragraph 5.1 of Ms McLeod's evidence seeks the inclusion of a definition of "Emergency Services Facilities" in the relevant objectives and policies of notified chapter 7, but paragraph 5.9 acknowledges that fire stations are included in the definition of "Community Activity", and paragraph 7.1 states that the definition of "Emergency Service Facility" is not essential. I do however agree with Ms McLeod in relation to the changes made to Objective 7.2.4. This change to the objective was made given that the policies did not appear to align with the intent of the objective; however I acknowledge that the location of the community services within the zone is important and that the intent of the objective has changed.

-
19. Having read the evidence filed by Mr Geddes on behalf of the Middleton Family Trust (336), I do not suggest any further modifications to my recommendation at this stage. The submitter notes that the section 32 report does not justify the reduction in density over the Queenstown Heights Sub-zone. Although I am not the author of the section 32 report, my understanding of the reasoning for this is that the density within Chapter 15 of the ODP has been replicated within the chapter. I agree with the submitter that steepness is not prohibitive to residential development; however I consider that this steepness in conjunction with the identified hazard is a significant constraint. Furthermore, I do not agree that the chapter should reference a maximum of 749 residential units for the sub-zone given that this number does not represent the realistic capacity of the sub-zone under the ODP, as it does not even take into account basic calculations such as the land which would be required for roading, open space and the like.
 20. The evidence of Mr Greaves on behalf of submitter 269 has been covered in the Council's legal submissions.

Subdivision – consideration of additional submission points

21. The 42A report addresses subdivision within paragraphs 9.75 – 9.79 in response to a submission received from Aurum Survey Consultants (166). As a result of the Memorandum from QAC counsel dated 21 September 2016 it has become apparent that not all of the submissions relating to minimum lot size on the Subdivision chapter have been considered.
22. The Hearing Panel has therefore directed Council officers to provide their opinions and advice on these submissions when the s42A reports are presented to the Panel. To assist the Panel a response to these additional submission points is provided below and an addendum to Appendix 2 has also been provided in **Appendix 2** setting out my recommendation on each submission point.

Minimum Lot Area – Notified Rule 27.5.1 (Redrafted Rule 27.6.1¹)

23. Notified Rule 27.5.1 (redraft rule 27.6.1)² specifies a minimum lot area of 450m² for the Low Density Residential zone.
24. As outlined in the s42A report, Aurum Survey Consultants (166) has sought for the minimum lot size to be reduced to 300m² to align with the maximum site density of one residential unit or dwelling per 300m² net site area in notified Rule 7.5.6. Conversely, Pounamu Body Corporate Committee (208) support the notified 450m² minimum lot area and Willowridge Developments Limited (249) seek an increase to 700m² on the basis that 450m² is significantly smaller than the current 700m² minimum lot size for Wanaka and adverse effects on the character of the town may result. In addition, a number of submitters³ have outlined their general support of the notified Rule 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1).⁴
25. I support the notified 450m² minimum lot size on the basis that notified Rules 27.5.2 (redraft Rule 27.7.13)⁵ and 27.5.3 (redraft Rule 27.7.14)⁶ allow for subdivision associated with infill developments on sites less than 450m² to align with the density proposed within Chapter 7.⁷ With specific regard to Wanaka, I note that ODP Zone Standard 7.5.5.3(iii) already allows developments with a minimum net site area of 450m². Consequently, although the minimum lot area for subdivision is proposed to be reduced under the PDP, this is at a density which is already allowed under the ODP. Consequently, I do not anticipate that an adverse effect on the character of Wanaka will occur.
26. Notified Rule 27.5.2 (redraft Rule 27.7.13)⁸ allows the subdivision of lots with a smaller minimum lot size and minimum dimensions in a number of zones where each allotment to be created contains one established residential unit. Paterson Pitts Group (370) and Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd (453)

¹ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
² Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
³ Body Corporate 22362 (389), S & J McLeod (391), The Jandel Trust (717) (opposed generally by FS1029 and supported by FS1270) and FII Holdings Ltd (847) (supported by FS1270)
⁴ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
⁵ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
⁶ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
⁷ With the exception of Queenstown Heights and the Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary of Queenstown Airport
⁸ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

support this rule however QAC (433)⁹ seeks its deletion. The specific relief sought by the QAC submission is addressed below in relation to the ANB and OCB and overall, I support the notified (and redrafted) rule.

27. Notified Rule 27.5.3 (redraft Rule 27.7.14)¹⁰ allows the subdivision of lots with a smaller minimum lot size in the LDRZ where a certificate of compliance or resource consent has been granted for the development and a number of matters are registered on the Computer Freehold Register of the lots. Both Aurum Survey Consultants (166) and the QAC (433)¹¹ seek deletion of the rule. As above, the QAC submission will be addressed below in specific reference to the ANB and OCB and I note that Mr Bryce has addressed the Aurum Survey Consultants (166) submission point in paragraphs 15.1-15.6 of his s42A evidence. I concur with Mr Bryce's recommendation.

Queenstown Heights Overlay Area

28. Notified Rule 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1)¹² specifies a minimum lot area of 1500m² for the Queenstown Heights Sub Zone. Submissions have been received from Middleton Family Trust (336¹³ and 354) seeking that any references to the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area be removed. This would in effect result in the underlying Low Density Residential zone applying with a minimum lot size of 450m².
29. I have already addressed the density of development within the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area in paragraphs 9.42 – 9.47 of my s42A report in relation to notified Rule 7.5.6 and consider that the same arguments are also applicable to the minimum lot size within notified Rule 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1¹⁴). As a result, I do not support the relief requested by the submitters and recommend that the minimum lot area for the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area should remain 1500m² as specified in notified Rule 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1)¹⁵.

⁹ Opposed by FS1097 and FS1117

¹⁰ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

¹¹ Opposed by FS1097 and FS1117

¹² Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

¹³ Opposed by QAC (FS1340)

¹⁴ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

¹⁵ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

Density within the Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary of Queenstown Airport – Notified Rules 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1)¹⁶, 27.5.2 (redraft Rule 27.7.13)¹⁷ and 27.5.3 (redraft Rule 27.7.14)¹⁸

30. The Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (271)¹⁹ and QAC (433)²⁰ have sought for the minimum allotment size within the ANB and OCB to be increased to 600m². In addition, QAC (433)²¹ seeks the deletion of notified Rules 27.5.2 and 27.5.3 which relate to subdivision associated with infill development and subdivision associated with residential development on sites less than 450m² in the LDRZ respectively.
31. Mr Nigel Bryce has addressed these matters within paragraphs 16.1 – 16.11 of his s42A report on Chapter 27 – Subdivision and Development and has supported the relief requested by the submitters in part, which has resulted in the application of a minimum lot size of 600m² for properties within the ANB and OCB and an amendment to notified Rule 27.5.3 (redraft Rule 27.7.14)²². I concur with Mr Bryce's assessment and the amendments in relation to Rules 27.5.1 (redraft Rule 27.6.1)²³, 27.5.2 (redraft Rule 27.7.13)²⁴ and Rule 27.5.3 (redraft Rule 27.7.14)²⁵.

Conclusion

32. As a result, I do not recommend any additional changes to Chapter 27 beyond those recommended by Mr Bryce in his Right of Reply, which are copied below in **Appendix 1**.

¹⁶ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
¹⁷ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
¹⁸ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
¹⁹ Opposed by Remarkables Park Limited (FS1117) and Queenstown Park Limited (FS1097)
²⁰ Opposed by Remarkables Park Limited (FS1117) and Queenstown Park Limited (FS1097)
²¹ Opposed by Remarkables Park Limited (FS1117) and Queenstown Park Limited (FS1097)
²² Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
²³ Page 27-27 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
²⁴ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development
²⁵ Page 27-41 of Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply in relation to Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development

**Appendix 1 – Redrafted rules from Mr Nigel Bryce's Right of Reply on Chapter 27
– Subdivision and Development**

27.6 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities

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 specified.

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Residential	High Density	450m ²
	Medium Density	250m ²
	Lot Density	450m ² <u>Within the Queenstown Airport Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary</u> <u>600m²</u>
	Queenstown Heights Sub Zone	1500m ²
	Arrowtown Residential Historic Management	800m ²
	Large Lot Residential	4000m ² 2000m ² in the following locations: Between Studholme Road and Meadowstone Drive.

27.7.13 Subdivision associated with infill development

- a. The specified minimum allotment size in Rule 27.56.1, and minimum dimensions in Rule ~~27.5.1.2~~ 27.7.12.2 shall not apply in the High Density Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone and Low Density Residential Zone where each allotment to be created, and the original allotment, all contain at least one established residential unit (established meaning a Building Code of Compliance Certificate has been issued or alternatively where a Building Code of Compliance Certificate has not been issued, construction shall be completed to not less than the installation of the roof).

27.7.14 Subdivision associated with residential development on sites less than 450m² in the Low Density Residential Zone

27.7.14.1 In the Low Density Residential Zone, the specified minimum allotment size in Rule 27.5.6.1 shall not apply in cases where the residential units are not established, providing;

- a. A certificate of compliance is issued for a residential unit(s) or,
- b. A resource consent has been granted for a residential unit(s).

In addition to any other relevant matters, ~~prior to certification under S224(e)~~, pursuant to s221 of the Act, the consent holder shall register ~~on the certificate of title on the computer freehold register~~ of the applicable allotments:

- c. That the construction of any residential unit shall be undertaken in accordance with the applicable certificate of compliance or resource consent (applies to the additional undeveloped lot to be created).
- d. The maximum building height shall be 5.5m (applies to the additional undeveloped lot to be created).
- e. There shall be not more than one residential unit per lot (applies to all lots).

27.7.14.2 Rule 27.7.14.1 shall not apply to the Low Density Residential Zone within the Queenstown Airport Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary.

Appendix 2

Addendum to Accept / Reject table

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
208.38		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Support	Retain the rule (Minimum lot size of 450m ² for high density and low density zones)	Accept in Part		As it relates to the LDRZ
389.9		Body Corporate 22362	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Support	Generally support the subdivision standards.	Accept in Part		
391.15		Sean & Jane McLeod	27.5 Rules - Standards for Subdivision Activities	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept in Part		
166.10		Aurum Survey Consultants	27.5.1	Oppose	Amend the minimum lot sizes: High Density - no minimum Low Density Residential - 300m ² Large Lot Residential - 2000m ² across the zone Rural Lifestyle - reject capping average calculations at 4 hectares.	Reject		As it relates to the LDRZ
166.10	FS1111.6	Colin Mantel	27.5.1	Support	That changes to the District Plan that allow reduction of minimum lot size from 4000sqm to 2000sqm for Large Lot Residential sites be strongly supported.	Reject		Not of relevance to this chapter
249.16		Willowridge Developments Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	Increase the minimum lot size for low density residential development in table 27.5.1 to 700m ² .	Reject		
271.18		Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	27.5.1	Other	Add a new line to the activity table at 27.5.1 providing that land within the Queenstown Airport outer control boundary (which includes land within the air noise boundary) should have a minimum lot area of 600m ² .	Accept		

271.18	FS1117.38	Remarkables Park Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
271.18	FS1097.121	Queenstown Park Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
336.2		Middleton Family Trust	27.5.1	Oppose	Remove any references to the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area.	Reject		
336.2	FS1340.77	Queenstown Airport Corporation	27.5.1	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.	Accept in Part		
354.2		Middleton Family Trust	27.5.1	Oppose	Remove reference to the Queenstown Heights Overlay Area from 27.5.1.	Reject		
433.96		Queenstown Airport Corporation	27.5.1	Oppose	Retain the operative minimum allotment size of 600m ² .	Accept		

433.96	FS1097.382	Queenstown Park Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
433.96	FS1117.144	Remarkables Park Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
717.18		The Jandel Trust	27.5.1	Support	Retain Rule 27.5.1 – Standards for Subdivision	Accept in Part		
717.18	FS1029.24	Universal Developments Limited	27.5.1	Oppose	Universal seeks that the entire submission be disallowed	Reject		
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		
847.17		FII Holdings Limited	27.5.1	Support	Retain Rule 27.5.1 – Standards for Subdivision	Accept in Part		
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		

370.7		Paterson Pitts Group	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept in Part		
433.97		Queenstown Airport Corporation	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Oppose	Delete the rule.	Reject		
433.97	FS1097.383	Queenstown Park Limited	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
433.97	FS1117.145	Remarkables Park Limited	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
453.4		Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	27.5.2 Subdivision associated with infill development	Support	This rule is supported.	Accept		
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		
433.98		Queenstown Airport Corporation	27.5.3 Subdivision associated with residential	Oppose	Delete the rule.	Accept in Part		

433.98	FS1097.384	Queenstown Park Limited	27.5.3 Subdivision associated with residential	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		
433.98	FS1117.146	Remarkables Park Limited	27.5.3 Subdivision associated with residential	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		