

## **Appendix 2. List of Submission Points with Recommended Decision**

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
7.1		Sue Knowles		Oppose	That all properties within the High Density Residential Zone having access off the York Street right of way (including numbers 11, 9, 3 and 1) be rezoned to Low Density Residential.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
7.1	FS1279.5	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The submission of S Knowles (#7) has been deferred to the hearing on mapping. The submitters concerns around heights are limited to the HDR at York Street, and unrelated to land west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.
7.2		Sue Knowles		Oppose	Opposes the chapter generally	Reject		
7.2	FS1279.6	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The submission of S Knowles (#7) has been deferred to the hearing on mapping. The submitters concerns around heights are limited to the HDR at York Street, and unrelated to land west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.
9.5		Terry Drayton		Oppose	To not increase the height of buildings on flat land in Wanaka above 2 stories but nominate an area in 3 Parks where this is permissible	Accept		No changes recommended to height limits in Wanaka. Three Parks is not within the HDRZ.
19.14		Kain Fround		Oppose	Opposes the chapter generally	Reject		
20.2		Aaron Cowie		Other	Submitter requests consideration to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•significantly higher property heights, especially towards the centre of Queenstown. Would like to see houses of 4-5 stories as the norm, with hotel complexes even higher.</li> <li>•increased density</li> <li>•inclusion of PassivHaus standards</li> </ul>	Reject		
20.2	FS1059.3	Erna Spijkerbosch		Oppose	We oppose this submission to increase building heights in the centre of town.	Accept in Part		Amendments are recommended to the RD status for building height for flat sites
22.10		Raymond Walsh		Support	Supports the chapter provisions generally	Accept in Part		
76.1		Angela Waghorn		Oppose	1. That York Street properties numbered 1 – 11 be included in the Low Density zone designation. 2. High density zoning be designated to properties south west side of Hallenstein Street.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
102.4		PR Queenstown Ltd		Support	That the subject land comprising 5 adjoining sites at 30-46 Gorge Road, proposed to be zoned High Density Residential, is alternatively zoned Business Mixed Use in accordance with the Business Mixed Use Zone purpose..		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
102.4	FS1059.52	Erna Spijkerbosch		Support	Support	Accept in Part		
102.4	FS1118.13	Robins Road Limited		Support	Seeks that the whole of the submissions be allowed. Even though the Robins Road and Huff Street High Density Residential Zone has not yet been notified these transitional areas should be considered along with, and in the context of, the other nearby areas of similar character such as the southern end of Gorge Road.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
103.3		Neki Patel		Support	That the subject land comprising 5 adjoining sites at 30-46 Gorge Road, proposed to be zoned High Density Residential, is alternatively zoned Business Mixed Use in accordance with the Business Mixed Use Zone purpose.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
103.3	FS1059.54	Erna Spijkerbosch		Support	Support		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
103.3	FS1118.16	Robins Road Limited		Support	Seeks that the whole of the submissions be allowed. Even though the Robins Road and Huff Street High Density Residential Zone has not yet been notified these transitional areas should be considered along with, and in the context of, the other nearby areas of similar character such as the southern end of Gorge Road.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
104.3		Hamish Munro		Support	That the subject land comprising 5 adjoining sites at 30-46 Gorge Road, proposed to be zoned High Density Residential, is alternatively zoned Business Mixed Use in accordance with the Business Mixed Use Zone purpose.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
107.3		Barry Sarginson		Support	That the subject land comprising 5 adjoining sites at 30-46 Gorge Road, proposed to be zoned High Density Residential, is alternatively zoned Business Mixed Use in accordance with the Business Mixed Use Zone purpose.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
108.3		Clyde Macintyre		Support	That the subject land comprising 5 adjoining sites at 30-46 Gorge Road, proposed to be zoned High Density Residential, is alternatively zoned Business Mixed Use in accordance with the Business Mixed Use Zone purpose.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
110.12		Alan Cutler		Other	Supports the Policies and Objectives supporting and facilitating higher levels of residential living and commercial activities in the central area around Wanaka CBD. Considers there is potential for the area between Lakeside Rd and Lismore Streets to enable 'boutique' retail, and develop into a tourist boulevard including café's, fashion, arts and crafts, ice-cream parlours, chocolate /sweet shops etc.	Accept in Part		The HDR Zone provisions predominantly provide for residential development, however the potential for small scale commercial uses, such as those referenced by the submitter, is provided for under Rule 9.4.6 where these are integrated with a development of at least 20 units.
117.10		Maggie Lawton		Support	Questions meaning of rule, please expand. Questions if it is about restricting high density below the specified datums.	Reject		This submission relates to rule 9.4.22 and retains the ODP rule 7.5.5.2 (xi) for Flood Risk. The rule prohibits construction of buildings with a ground floor level below the specified levels, as these areas are subject to flood risk.
159.7		Karen Boulay		Other	Ensure the aftermath of the weekend mess is tidied up in timely fashion		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
159.13		Karen Boulay		Oppose	Need more provision to provide adequate car parking		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
173.2		Gordon Girvan		Oppose	That the council leave the zoning in Wanaka as it is at present. Consider impacts on infrastructure.	Reject		The extent of the HDR zone in Wanaka remains as per the ODP.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
173.2	FS1251.2	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.	Accept		The extent of the HDR zone in Wanaka remains as per the ODP.
182.1		Millennium & Cophorne Hotels New Zealand Limited		Support	Retention of the proposed High Density Residential Zoning, or Some other zoning which provides for hotels at the height of the current development i.e., a visitor accommodation zone, and A definition of visitor accommodation / hotels which provide for all the activities likely to be associated with a hotel visitor accommodation ie conference facilities, restaurants, bars, gyms, guest retail, etc.	Accept in Part		HDR zoning has been retained for the submitters land. VA components of the submission are out of scope.
182.1	FS1063.1	Peter Fleming and Others		Oppose	All Disallowed	Accept in Part		HDR zoning has been retained for the submitters land. VA components of the submission are out of scope.
182.1	FS1244.1	Three Beaches Limited		Support	Considers that with the imposition of a visitor accommodation sub-zone that specifically caters for large scale hotels, combined with greater building height as proposed under the PDP the Council will enable the establishment of hotels in close proximity to central Queenstown. The submitter also agrees with the submission in relation to the definition of visitor accommodation.	Accept in Part		HDR zoning has been retained for the submitters land. VA components of the submission are out of scope.
208.6		Pouanamu Body Corporate Committee		Other	The Body Corporate is concerned by proposed changes to the High Density Residential Zone, particularly in so far as they relate to the former site for the Hilton Hotel Complex on land to the rear of and immediately adjoining the Pouanamu Apartments, legally described as Lot 5 DP 351561, Certificate of Title reference 211090 (Lot 5). There is currently an easement in place that runs through the centre of Lot 5 (refer attached plan) which is used for access purposes between the Apartments. The future development of Lot 5 will need to take account of and provide for this easement. The Body Corporate is concerned that if the High Density Residential Zone is confirmed as notified, the close relationship of Lot 5 and the Pouanamu Apartments may not be appropriately recognised and provided for, and the amenity of the Apartments may be significantly affected. the Body Corporate is particularly concerned by the following proposed changes to the High Density Residential Zone: (a) the watering down of the focus in the objectives and policies on protection of amenity values; (b) increased building height; (c) relaxed site coverage controls; (d) changes to recession plane requirements; (e) reduced front and side boundary setbacks; (f) no outdoor living requirements; (g) removal of specific urban design considerations, assessment criteria and the urban design review process; and (h) the Floor Area Ratio requirement. The Body Corporate considers that the history of Lot 5 and its relationship to the Pouanamu Apartments, should be recognised and provided for in the Proposed Plan, as should the existing character of the Apartments and the amenity enjoyed by the Apartment's residents. To this extent, the Body Corporate considers that the new zoning should encourage visitor accommodation development on Lot 5 that integrates with and recognises the historical relationship between development on the Pouanamu Apartments' site and Lot 5.	Accept in Part		Refer to s42A report
208.6	FS1231.7	Plaza Investments Limited		Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept		
208.6	FS1242.7	Antony & Ruth Stokes		Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		
208.6	FS1279.12	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.22		Pouanamu Body Corporate Committee		Oppose	New Rule Oppose There are no controls relating to outdoor living space requirements. Insert the Operative Plan Rule 7.5.5.2 (viii) relating to Outdoor Living Space into the Proposed Plan	Reject		
208.22	FS1242.23	Antony & Ruth Stokes		Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept		
208.22	FS1279.28	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.23		Pouanamu Body Corporate Committee		Oppose	New Rule Oppose There are no controls relating to maximum building footprint size Reinstate the Operative Plan Rule 7.5.3.3(ii) which requires a maximum building footprint of 500m2	Reject		Maximum building footprints have been removed from the PDP alongside integration of the HDR Sub Zones A & B; and conversion of subzone C to the Medium Density Zone. Such controls have been removed in the interests of removing unnecessary regulation, and recognising that other controls can address bulk effects, such as site coverage, density, continuous building length, recession planes (where applicable).

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.23	FS1242.24	Antony & Ruth Stokes		Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept		
208.23	FS1279.29	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.24		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee		Oppose	New provisions – Assessment Matters Oppose All of the assessment matters have been removed from the Operative ePlan. These provide valuable guidance and should be reinstated. Reinstate all of the Assessment Matters that are contained at 7.7 of the Operative Plan	Reject		
208.24	FS1242.25	Antony & Ruth Stokes		Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept		
208.24	FS1279.30	Lakes Edge Development Limited		Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
300.6		Rob Jewell		Oppose	Opposes the chapter in general	Reject		
300.7		Rob Jewell		Oppose	High Density Residential housing areas should not be introduced into the Wanaka town area.	Reject		
327.2		Lismore Estates Ltd		Support	Approve the proposed Objectives, Policies and Rules in the High Density Residential zone as notified.	Accept in Part		
335.14		Nic Blennerhassett		Support	Support the zone as shown on planning map 21		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
344.3		Sam Flewellen		Oppose	That the High Density Residential portion of the Mico Queenstown site be rezoned to Business Mixed Use as shown on Planning Map 32, as shown on Appendix C of the submission.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
363.1		Body Corp 27490		Oppose	That the zoning for all of the York Street right of way (serving 1 to 17) be Low Density		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
366.2		Robins Road Limited		Other	sub zone or transition zone of Robins Road between Fryer Street and Robins road		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
366.2	FS1059.75	Erna Spijkerbosch		Not Stated	Agree in principle, but more information needed. This matter should not be included in this stage, but at later date.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
366.2	FS1059.76	Erna Spijkerbosch		Oppose	Agree in principle, but more information needed. This matter should not be included in this stage, but at later date.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
391.17		Sean & Jane McLeod		Support	supports the chapter generally	Accept in Part		
410.1		Alps Investment Limited		Support	Supports all notified provisions of the proposed High Density Residential Zone	Accept in Part		
410.5		Alps Investment Limited		Support	Confirm the High Density Zoning of Secs 2 Pt 1 Blk XXXVII Queenstown, as identified on the map contained within the submission.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
435.8		Catherine Fallon		Support	supports the chapter generally	Accept in Part		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
470.3		Queenstown Playcentre		Other	Requests that guidelines are introduced and plans are reviewed by an appropriate panel. Requests safeguards are put in place to protect residential or community amenity.	Accept in Part		refer s42A report
506.8		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.	Accept in Part		
506.8	FS1063.17	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		
514.3		Duncan Fea		Support	Retain Chapter 9 in its entirety	Reject		
516.3		MacFarlane Investments		Oppose	Amend the proposed plan and Map 36 as follows:  1. Withdraw the High Density Residential zoning for the Isle Street Block (identified as hatched on the map attached to this submission at Appendix 1; So that it is not part of the District Plan Review, enabling PC 50 to run its course.  OR  2. Insert the PC 50 provisions, or provisions that have the same effect as the PC 50 provisions, in a manner that applies to all activities in the Isle Street Block.  AND  3. Remove any provisions in the Town Centre, High Density Residential, Historic Heritage and Subdivision chapters which are in conflict with PC 50 or have a different effect to PC 50, and replace them with provisions the same effect as PC 50, for the Isle Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
517.3		John Thompson		Oppose	Amend the proposed plan and Map 36 as follows:  1. Withdraw the High Density Residential zoning for the Isle Street Block (identified as hatched on the map attached to this submission at Appendix 1; So that it is not part of the District Plan Review, enabling PC 50 to run its course.  OR  2. Insert the PC 50 provisions, or provisions that have the same effect as the PC 50 provisions, in a manner that applies to all activities in the Isle Street Block.  AND  3. Remove any provisions in the Town Centre, High Density Residential, Historic Heritage and Subdivision chapters which are in conflict with PC 50 or have a different effect to PC 50, and replace them with provisions the same effect as PC 50, for the Isle Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
520.2		Fred van Brandenburg		Not Stated	Add the following new rule with references to Operative District Plan rules updated: <u>iv Height and Elevation Restrictions along Frankton Road</u> <u>The intrusion of a single building element on the south side of Frankton Road (SH6A) in the High Density Residential Zone of no more than one story, in height above the centreline of Frankton Road and limited to a length parallel to the road of not more than 10% of the length of the road frontage (to a maximum of 16 metres), used solely for access, reception and lobby uses related to the predominant use of the site shall be a Restricted Discretionary Activity in respect of Assessment Matter 7.7.2 xiii Urban Design Protocol.</u> <u>This rule applies to those properties from Cecil Road (Paper Road) to, and including, Lot 1 DP 12665.</u>	Accept in Part		refer s42A report
520.3		Fred van Brandenburg		Not Stated	Add the following rule with references to Operative District Plan rules updated: The following applications shall be nonnotified: Applications in relation to land contained in, or formerly contained in Lot 1 DP12665 (commonly known as 595 Frankton Road) made pursuant to rules 7.5.3.3 ii Building Footprint: 7.5.3.3 (iv) Height and Elevation Restrictions along Frankton Road (intrusion of a single building element): 7.5.5.2 iv(d) Setback from Internal Boundaries: 7.5.5.2 vii Continuous Building Length, and 7.5.5.2 xvii Landscape Coverage, provided that the application is accompanied by a report from the Council's Urban Design Panel supporting the application in respect to breaches of the relevant rule, except that the owners of any adjoining properties may be serviced with a copy of any resource consent application pursuant to Section 94(1) of the Act. When forming an opinion as to whether an adjoining residential property owner may be adversely affected by the activity for the purpose of Section 94(1) the consent authority may disregard adverse effects of the activity if those effects are permitted by the development consented under RM040624 dated 13 May 2005 and RM081099 dated 29 April 2009 whether or not these consents have lapsed.	Accept in Part		refer s42A report
548.7		Maximum Mojo Holdings Limited		Not Stated	Incorporate Plan Change 50 into the Proposed District Plan. Also refer to submission 548.2 to the Queenstown Town Centre, and submissions 548.3 and 548.3 to maps 35 and 36		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
548.7	FS1097.519	Queenstown Park Limited		Not Stated	Support and oppose. Support the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Oppose the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
548.7	FS1117.218	Remarkables Park Limited		Not Stated	Support/Oppose. Support the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Oppose the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.1		Plaza Investments Limited		Support	Submitter supports the High Density Residential Zone objectives and provisions insofar as they support intensive residential and visitor accommodation activities.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
551.1	FS1260.4	Dato Tan Chin Nam		Support	Grant the relief set out in the submission. The HDR objectives, policies and rules provide an appropriate development framework. The objectives, policies and rules for visitor accommodation as RDIS are overly restrictive and there has been no justification provided for the change from controlled to discretionary status.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
551.1	FS1271.21	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others		Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to grant the relief set out of the submission.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
551.1	FS1331.26	Mount Crystal Limited		Support	Grant relief set out in clause 5.1 or original submitters submission	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
571.18		Totally Tourism Limited		Not Stated	Seek such further or consequential or alternative amendments necessary to give effect to this submission		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
575.1		Antony & Ruth Stokes		Other	Support in part. The Proposed District Plan as notified is confirmed as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that support intensive residential and visitor accommodation activities and provide a development framework where those actives are enabled, subject to the amendments outlined in this submission.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
579.3		Gem Lake Limited		Other	Support in part. The Proposed High Density Residential Zone is confirmed subject to the modifications requested in this submission as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that support intensive residential and visitor accommodation activities and provide a development framework where those actives are enabled.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
612.1		Skyline Enterprises Limited		Other	Support in part. The PDP as notified is confirmed as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that support intensive residential and visitor accommodation activities and provide a development framework where those actives are enabled (as outlined in Point 4.2).	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP
612.2		Skyline Enterprises Limited		Other	Oppose in part. The PDP is modified as per the points addressed in Point 4.3.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation is out of scope of stage 1 of the PDP. Site coverage for sloping site is recommended to be amended - refer s42A report
627.2		HW Holdings Ltd		Not Stated	Confirm all provisions as notified in Section 9 of the Proposed Plan unless otherwise submitted upon in this submission.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
628.2		reception@jea.co.nz		Not Stated	Confirm all provisions within the Proposed High Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
628.2	FS1265.8	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch		Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
628.2	FS1268.8	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc		Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
641.1		Aws Trustees No 31 Limited		Support	Supports the proposed High Density Residential zone as it applies to the properties at 53, 57, 61 and 65 Frankton Road, shown on planning map 35.	Accept		
641.1	FS1260.16	Dato Tan Chin Nam		Support	That the land identified in the submission be zoned High Density Residential. The land identified in the submissions, and in fact all of the land bounded by Adelaide and Suburb Streets, and Frankton Road is suited for intensive use given its proximity to the town centre and public transport routes.	Accept	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Land between Adelaide and Suburb Streets, and Frankton Road referred to in this further submission was identified by original submission #61, and has been deferred to the hearing stream on mapping.
641.2		Aws Trustees No 31 Limited		Support	Confirms the HDR zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
641.2	FS1260.17	Dato Tan Chin Nam		Support	That the land identified in the submission be zoned High Density Residential. The land identified in the submissions, and in fact all of the land bounded by Adelaide and Suburb Streets, and Frankton Road is suited for intensive use given its proximity to the town centre and public transport routes.	Accept	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	Land between Adelaide and Suburb Streets, and Frankton Road referred to in this further submission was identified by original submission #61, and has been deferred to the hearing stream on mapping.
667.2		Cedric Hockey		Oppose	Include the block bound by Isle, Man, Brecon and Camp Streets as part of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
667.2	FS1043.3	Grand Lakes Management Limited		Oppose	GLML oppose the submission made by Cedric Hockey as they seek an extension of the existing Town Centre Zone to include the block of land bound by Isle, Man, Brecon and Camp Streets. This block of land is directly adjacent to the Sofitel Hotel and if rezoned it could provide the opportunity for increased noise levels in line with the noise provisions as they currently proposed. As outlined in the GLML original submission this has the potential for increased adverse effects from noise exposure.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
681.4		Gerard Auckram		Support	Confirm all other provisions not otherwise commented on.	Accept in Part		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
686.3		Garth Makowski		Support	Confirm all provisions within the Proposed High Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
718.3		Allium Trustees Limited		Not Stated	Confirm all provisions within the Proposed High Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
727.3		Belfast Corporation Limited		Support	Confirm all provisions within the Proposed High Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
731.3		Mulwood Investments Limited		Support	Confirm all provisions within the Proposed High Density Residential Zone.	Reject		Provisions have been amended to address submissions and are discussed in the s42A report.
785.1		A & K Zaki		Other	Support in part. The Proposed District Plan as notified is confirmed as it relates to: The zoning of A & K Zaki land as high density residential. Rule 9.4.10 Visitor Accommodation. Rule 9.4.7 Commercial Activities. Rule 9.5.4.2 Building Coverage on Sloping Sites.	Accept in Part	Transferred to the hearing on mapping	VA components of this submission are out of scope of Stage 1 of the PDP.
785.2		A & K Zaki		Other	Oppose in part. The Proposed District Plan is modified so: The maximum height limit as provided in the Operative District Plan applies to the Beach Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
785.3		A & K Zaki		Other	Oppose in part. (Alternatively) The objectives, policies and rules of the QLDC decisions version of PC 50 are applied to the Beach Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.1		C & L Holt		Other	Support in part. The Proposed District Plan as notified is confirmed as it relates to: The zoning of C & L Holt's land as high density residential. Rule 9.4.10 Visitor Accommodation Rule 9.4.7 Commercial Activities, and Rule 9.5.4.2 Building Coverage on Sloping Sites,		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.1	FS1097.711	Queenstown Park Limited		Not Stated	Support the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Oppose the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.1	FS1117.287	Remarkables Park Limited		Not Stated	Support/Oppose. Supports the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Opposes the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.2		C & L Holt		Other	Oppose in part.  The Proposed District Plan is modified so: The maximum height limit as provided in the Operative District Plan applies to the Beach Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.2	FS1097.712	Queenstown Park Limited		Not Stated	Support the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Oppose the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.2	FS1117.288	Remarkables Park Limited		Not Stated	Support/Oppose. Supports the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Opposes the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.3		C & L Holt		Other	Oppose in part. (Alternatively) The objectives, policies and rules of the QLDC decisions version of PC50 are applied to the Beach Street Block.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.3	FS1097.713	Queenstown Park Limited		Not Stated	Support the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Oppose the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
786.3	FS1117.289	Remarkables Park Limited		Not Stated	Support/Oppose. Supports the integration of Plan Change 50 into the District Plan. Opposes the overall extent and location of the Queenstown Town Centre when both Plan Change 50 and the District Plan Review are considered.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
1359.4		Keeley, Grant		Oppose	Rezone 8 residential sections located at the north end of Kent Street (Queenstown) comprising 37 - 51 Kent Street Low Density Residential Zone, rather than High Density Residential Zone.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
86.6		Jeff Aldridge	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Suggests that Gorge road should be looked at under this high density zone as a worker accommodation area.	Accept in Part		Zone allows for residential activity
86.6	FS1059.11	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Support worker accommodation on Gorge Rd but not visitor accommodation.	Reject		VA components of this submission are out of scope of Stage 1 of the PDP. The HDRZ provisions do not define the nature of residential activities for which buildings are used. Gorge Road is also located within the Proposed Business Mixed Use.
193.1		Diane Dever	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Requests that all properties serviced by the right of way located off York Street, Queenstown (serving properties 1 to 17) be rezoned to Low Density Residential.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.2		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Amend 9.1 as follows:  <i>"The High Density Residential Zone will provide for more intensive use of land within close proximity to town centres that is easily accessible by public transport, cycle and walk ways. In conjunction with the Medium Density Residential Zone, the zone will play a key planning role in minimising urban sprawl and consolidating growth in existing urban areas. In Queenstown, buildings greater than two storeys up to 7 or 8 metres in height (depending on whether the site is flat or sloping) are anticipated. Buildings that breach these height limits are appropriate only where neighbourhood amenity, access to sunlight and light, and view shafts can be protected and adverse effects on nearby properties can be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and are subject to high design quality and environmental performance... Development controls will provide some degree of appropriate protection for existing amenity values. However given the focus on intensification, over time some private and public views and amenities will be affected to varying degrees as the character of this area changes and evolves into one that is more urban. Small scale commercial activity will be enabled, either to support larger residential and visitor accommodation developments, or to provide low impact local services..."</i>	Reject		
208.2	FS1231.4	Plaza Investments Limited	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
208.2	FS1242.3	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.2	FS1279.8	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
238.57		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports in part. Requests objective review authority such as the Urban Design Panel.	Accept in Part		refer s42A
238.57	FS1107.62	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1226.62	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1234.62	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1239.62	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1241.62	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1242.85	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.1 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 the hearing on mapping	
238.57	FS1248.62	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.1 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		refer s42A
238.57	FS1249.62	Tweed Development Limited	9.1 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		refer s42A
300.8		Rob Jewell	9.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Opposes the provision generally.	Reject		
392.1		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	We support the zone, but would like consideration of changes in the implementation	Accept in Part		
392.1	FS1288.1	Pinewood	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Support submission	Accept in Part		
392.1	FS1059.32	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
392.1	FS1059.33	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
524.27		Ministry of Education	9.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Retain	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.44		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Several key policies of the Operative Plan (such as Part 7, Policy 3.4) recognise the world class landscape that Queenstown sits within. Development should reflect these significant landscape values and this should remain a policy in the Proposed Plan. <b>Amend</b> by adding the following policy: <u>Ensure that external appearance of buildings reflect the significant landscape values and enhance a coherent urban character and form as it relates to the landscape.</u>	Reject		Landscape is addressed within Chapter 6. No areas of ONL or ONF are located in urban areas.
571.16		Totally Tourism Limited	9.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Opposes all the PDP objectives, policies, and other provisions that inform and support Rule 9.4.10, which makes all VA activities (not otherwise specified) a Restricted Discretionary activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
719.67		NZ Transport Agency	9.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	Add a new Objective 9.2.7 as follows: <u>9.2.7 Objective - Manage the development of land within noise affected environments to ensure mitigation of noise and reverse sensitivity effects.</u>	Accept in Part		refer s42A
719.68		NZ Transport Agency	9.2 Objectives and Policies	Not Stated	Add a new Policy 9.2.7.1 as follows: <u>9.2.7.7 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within 80m of the State highway shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2707:2000.</u>	Accept in Part		refer s42A
380.45		Villa dellago	9.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Consider increased height limits for steep sites that back onto large hills	Reject		
380.45	FS1059.22	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Support increased heights when backing onto steep hills. Discretionary.	Reject		
392.2		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.1 Objective 1	Support	supports the objective generally	Accept		
392.2	FS1288.2	Pinewood	9.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Support submission	Accept		
392.2	FS1059.34	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Support	Accept		
208.4		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.1.1	Oppose	<b>Amend</b> as follows: Policies 9.2.1.1 Provide sufficient high density zoned land with the potential to be developed <del>greater than two storeys to 7 or 8 metres</del> in Queenstown (depending on whether a site is flat or sloping) and two storeys in Wanaka to enable diverse housing supply and visitor accommodation close to town centres. <u>A consent process is available to breach these height limits where the merits of an application and effects on nearby properties can be appropriately considered.</u>	Reject		
208.4	FS1231.5	Plaza Investments Limited	9.2.1.1	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept		
208.4	FS1242.5	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.1.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		
208.4	FS1059.66	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.1.1	Support	Support	Reject		
208.4	FS1279.10	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.1.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.3		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Amend as follows: <u>"Objective 9.2.2 – High-density housing development and visitor accommodation will occur in urban areas close to town centres and other appropriately zoned areas, to provide greater housing diversity and respond to strong projected growth in visitor numbers".</u>	Reject		
208.3	FS1242.4	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		
208.3	FS1279.9	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.3	FS1059.65	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support	Reject		
208.45		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	<b>Amend</b> by adding a new policy after 9.2.2.7 as follows: <u>Policy 9.2.2.8 Ensure that development is designed to have regard to and where appropriate reflect, the existing character of neighbouring properties and neighbourhoods, particularly in regards to design, scale and appearance</u>	Reject		
238.58		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.2.2 Objective 2	Other	supports in part. requests inclusion of "high quality urban design" within the objective.	Accept in Part		refer s42A
238.58	FS1107.63	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
238.58	FS1226.63	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
238.58	FS1234.63	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
238.58	FS1239.63	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
238.58	FS1241.63	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
238.58	FS1242.86	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.2 Objective 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.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
238.58	FS1248.63	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
238.58	FS1249.63	Tweed Development Limited	9.2.2 Objective 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.	Reject		
380.46		Villa dellago	9.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Encourage such high density developments to cater for carparking underground to avoid unsightly above ground car parks		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
380.46	FS1059.24	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
392.3		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Supports the objective. Requests that the mass of buildings is dealt with in a more detailed manner. Currently there is no mention of the amalgamation of buildings across multiple sites. I believe there should be landscaped gaps between buildings every so often so we don't end up with the appearance of one mass of building.	Accept in Part		
392.3	FS1288.3	Pinewood	9.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support submission	Accept in Part		
392.3	FS1059.35	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
159.10		Karen Boulay	9.2.2.5	Oppose	There should be more protection of trees; not less.	Accept in Part		This matter was adressed in hearing stream 3 - Protected Trees.
208.5		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.2.7	Oppose	<b>Amend</b> as follows: <u>9.2.2.7 Incentivise greater building height where development is designed to achieve a high environmental performance and only where effects on nearby properties can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Accept in Part		
208.5	FS1231.6	Plaza Investments Limited	9.2.2.7	Support	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Reject		
208.5	FS1242.6	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.2.7	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Polices and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		
208.5	FS1059.67	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.2.7	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
208.5	FS1279.11	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.2.7	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.7		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	<b>Amend</b> as follows: <u>9.2.3 Objective – A reasonable degree of p- Protection of amenity values is an important consideration will be provided, particularly in areas which are becoming within the context of an increasingly intensified and urban zone where character is changing.</u>	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.7	FS1242.8	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.7	FS1279.13	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.10		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Amend by adding the following policy: <i>Ensure a balance between building activity and open space on sites to provide for on and off-site amenity, outdoor living and planting.</i>	Reject		
208.10	FS1242.11	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.10	FS1279.16	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
380.47		Villa dellLago	9.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Supports the objective	Accept		
383.51		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Amend to add new policy to address privacy/overlooking effects.	Accept		
383.51	FS1148.9	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission.	Accept in Part		
383.51	FS1059.29	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.3 Objective 3	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
208.8		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.3.1	Oppose	Amend as follows: Policy 9.2.3.1 Developments controls such as Apply recession planes, building height, floor area ratio, yard setback and site coverage controls are as the primary means of limiting overly intensive development and ensuring reasonable protection of neighbours' outlook, sunshine and light access, and privacy of nearby properties is appropriately protected.	Reject		
208.8	FS1231.8	Plaza Investments Limited	9.2.3.1	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
208.8	FS1242.9	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.3.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.8	FS1279.14	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.3.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits at the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.9		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.2.3.2	Oppose	Amend as follows: Policy 9.2.3.2 Ensure that where development standards are breached, impacts on the amenity values of <del>neighbouring</del> <i>nearby</i> properties, <i>including on their outlook, sunlight and light access and privacy</i> , and on public views (especially towards lakes and mountains), are no more than minor relative to a complying development scenario.	Reject		
208.9	FS1242.10	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.2.3.2	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.9	FS1279.15	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.2.3.2	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits at the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
520.1		Fred van Brandenburg	9.2.3.2	Other	Amend policy 9.2.3.2 as follows: <del>Ensure that</del> Where development standards are breached, impacts on the amenity values of neighbouring properties, and on public views (especially towards lakes and mountains), <del>are adequately mitigated no more than minor relative to a complying development scenario.</del>	Accept		
380.48		Villa dellLago	9.2.4 Objective 4	Support	supports the objective	Accept in Part		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
438.17		New Zealand Fire Service	9.2.4 Objective 4	Other	Objective 9.2.4 - The NZFS wish to include the term "emergency service facilities" to this Objective. Amend to read: "Provide for community activities and facilities, <u>and emergency service facilities</u> , that are generally best located in a residential environment close to residents". Policy 9.2.4.1 - 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 <u>and emergency service facilities</u> , where adverse effects on residential amenity values such as noise, traffic, lighting, glare and visual impact can be avoided or mitigated."	Reject		
524.28		Ministry of Education	9.2.4 Objective 4	Support	retain	Accept in Part		Clarification amendment made to remove the word "facilities"
524.29		Ministry of Education	9.2.4.1	Support	Retain	Accept in Part		Clarification amendment made to remove the word "facilities"
159.22		Karen Boulay	9.2.5 Objective 5	Oppose	Commercial uses in residential areas, wherever they are, should be avoided unless it is a dairy or something useful for the residents.	Reject		
380.49		Villa dellLago	9.2.5 Objective 5	Support	supports the objective	Accept in Part		
380.50		Villa dellLago	9.2.5 Objective 5	Support	supports the objective	Accept in Part		
380.51		Villa dellLago	9.2.6 Objective 6	Other	Reduction in parking, but where parking is provided, keep it within the building, underground and away from sight	Reject		
380.51	FS1059.25	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.6 Objective 6	Support	Support	Reject		
392.4		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.6 Objective 6	Support	supports the objective generally	Accept in Part		
392.4	FS1288.4	Pinewood	9.2.6 Objective 6	Support	Support submission	Accept in Part		
392.4	FS1059.36	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.2.6 Objective 6	Support	Support	Accept in Part		
719.64		NZ Transport Agency	9.2.6 Objective 6	Support	Retain	Accept in Part		Amended by #798
805.51		Transpower New Zealand Limited	9.2.6 Objective 6	Oppose	Amend to: <u>Ensure High-density residential development will efficiently utilise existing infrastructure and does not adversely affect the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of infrastructure, including the National Grid and roading networks.</u>	Reject		
798.32		Otago Regional Council	9.2.6.1	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		
719.65		NZ Transport Agency	9.2.6.2	Support	Retain	Accept in Part		Amended by #798
719.66		NZ Transport Agency	9.2.6.4	Other	Amend Policy 9.2.6.4 as follows: Ensure access and parking is located and designed to optimise <u>the connectivity, efficiency and safety of the transport network.</u>	Accept		
805.52		Transpower New Zealand Limited	9.3.1 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		
275.5		Robertson Family Trust	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Supports this objective and policy. Requests that a further policy be added which enables lesser access widths in this zone than would otherwise be required under the operative provisions in the Transport section of the plan (which is not under review), <u>provided that proposed access way designs are practical and safe.</u>		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
275.6		Robertson Family Trust	9.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	The Trust opposes Rule 9.4.3, which permits only 3 dwellings, units and/or flats per site. Requests that the provisions enable each dwelling to also have a residential flat as a permitted activity, and so that the number of permitted dwellings per site is greater in this zone than in the Medium Density Zone.	Reject		A Residential Flat is encompassed within the definition of a Residential Unit. Therefore, the rules allow for residential flats. Furthermore, there are no density controls for the zone.
383.52		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Consider amendment to include the potential for a design review process to confirm permitted status and review the design and yield of buildings progressing without resource consent.	Accept in Part		refer s42A
383.52	FS1148.10	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission.	Accept in Part		refer s42A
383.52	FS1274.38	John Thompson and MacFarlane Investments Limited	9.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Opposes in part. Believes that permitted status should be apparent by applying the facts to the District Plan provisions. Determination of status should not be dependent upon a discretionary design review process. Seeks that the submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		refer s42A
383.53		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to delete "residential flat"	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
383.54		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to delete "residential flat"	Accept		
383.55		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Amend to add privacy, screening and overlooking impacts as a matter of discretion.	Accept		
383.55	FS1059.30	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support	Accept		
383.55	FS1148.11	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission.	Accept in Part		
575.2		Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Oppose in part.  The Proposed District Plan is modified so that Rule 9.4.8 and 9.4.9 is increased to two (2) residential units or flats.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.11		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.1	Support	Retain Rule 9.4.1	Accept		
208.11	FS1242.12	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.4.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		
208.11	FS1279.17	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.4.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
166.14		Aurum Survey Consultants	9.4.3	Oppose	Delete Rules 9.4.3 and 9.4.4 and consider controlled activity for more than one unit on all sites where the site density requirements are met.	Reject		
681.2		Gerard Auckram	9.4.3	Other	Confirm the following (permitted status): Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat comprising three (3) or less per site	Accept in Part		Minor wording amendments made to this rule.
159.12		Karen Boulay	9.4.4	Oppose	There should be more protection of trees; not less.	Accept in Part		Addressed in hearing stream 3 - protected trees
208.12		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.4	Oppose	Amend as follows: "Dwelling, Residential Unit, Residential Flat comprising four (4) or more per site Discretion is restricted to all the following: • The location, <u>scale</u> , external appearance and design of buildings <u>and impacts on nearby properties particularly on sunshine and light access, outlook and privacy</u> • The extent to which the development positively addresses the street <u>and has had regard to the character of the surrounding area</u> • The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on <u>neighbouring nearby properties and the public realm</u> • Parking and access arrangements: <u>safety and efficiency</u> • The extent to which landscaped areas are well integrated into the design of the development and contribute meaningfully to the amenity of the development and <u>nearby properties</u> • 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 mitigated1. • <u>The extent to which the building is consistent with the Urban Design Assessment Criteria listed in [xx].</u>  And reinsert the Operative Plan Assessment Matters relating to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol contained at 7.7.2xiii of the Operative Plan	Accept in Part		
208.12	FS1242.13	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.4.4	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.12	FS1279.18	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.4.4	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
392.8		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4.4	Oppose	Notes that the development of 4 or more dwellings or visitor accommodation on a site has the potential to impact negatively on the residential amenity and there needs to be consultation with neighbours in these situations.	Reject		redrafted Rule 9.6.3 requires notification to affected persons for RD building height.
392.8	FS1288.6	Pinewood	9.4.4	Support	Support submission	Reject		redrafted Rule 9.6.3 requires notification to affected persons for RD building height.
392.8	FS1059.40	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4.4	Support	Support	Reject		redrafted Rule 9.6.3 requires notification to affected persons for RD building height.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
719.69		NZ Transport Agency	9.4.4	Not Stated	Amend Rule 9.4.4 as follows: . Parking and access arrangements <u>and the safety and efficiency of the roading network.</u>	Reject		
159.20		Karen Boulay	9.4.6	Oppose	Commercial uses in residential areas, wherever they are should be avoided unless it is a dairy or something useful for the residents.	Reject		
612.3		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.4.6	Support	Confirm this provision.	Accept in Part		
719.70		NZ Transport Agency	9.4.6	Oppose	Change the activity status of Rule 9.4.6 to Restricted Discretionary or full Discretionary.	Reject		
159.21		Karen Boulay	9.4.7	Oppose	Commercial uses in residential areas should be avoided unless it is something useful for the residents.	Accept in Part		
392.5		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4.8	Oppose	9.4.8, 9.4.9, 9.4.10 - All visitor accommodation should be dealt with as a commercial activity, therefore subject to commercial rates.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
392.5	FS1288.5	Pinewood	9.4.8	Support	Support submission		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
392.5	FS1059.37	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4.8	Support	Support		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.13		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.9	Oppose	Amend as follows: <i>Visitor Accommodation involving the commercial letting of one (1) residential unit or dwelling per site for more than 90 nights in any calendar year.</i> <i>Control is reserved to all of the following:</i> • <i>The location, nature and scale of activities on site</i> <i>- Impacts on nearby properties</i> • <i>Parking and access: safety, efficiency and impacts on on-street parking and neighbours</i> • <i>Noise and methods of mitigation (through design and management controls)</i> • <i>Hours of operation</i> • <i>Accommodation format and numbers of guests</i> • <i>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.</i> • <i>The extent to which the building is consistent with the Urban Design Assessment Criteria listed in [xx].</i> And reinsert the Operative Plan Assessment Matters relating to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol contained at 7.7.2xiii of the Operative Plan		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.13	FS1242.14	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.4.9	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.13	FS1279.19	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.4.9	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
719.71		NZ Transport Agency	9.4.9	Not Stated	Amend Rule 9.4.9 as follows: . Parking and access: safety, <u>and efficiency of the roading network,</u> and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
798.33		Otago Regional Council	9.4.9	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.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.14		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.10	Oppose	Amend as follows: <i>Visitor accommodation (not otherwise identified)</i> <i>Discretion is restricted to all the following:</i> • <i>The location, <u>scale</u>, external appearance and design of buildings <u>and impacts on nearby properties particularly on sunshine and light access, outlook and privacy</u></i> • <i>The extent to which the development positively addresses the street <u>and has had regard to the character of the surrounding area</u></i> • <i>The extent to which landscaped areas <u>are well integrated into the design of the development and contribute meaningfully to the amenity of the development and nearby properties</u></i> • <i>The extent to which building mass is broken down and articulated in order to reduce impacts on <u>neighbouring nearby</u> properties and the public realm.</i> • <i>Parking and access arrangements: safety and efficiency, and potential impacts on <u>neighbours</u>- amenity <u>of nearby properties</u> and on-street parking.</i> • <i>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 <u>and the extent to which such risk can be avoided or sufficiently mitigated</u></i>		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.14	FS1242.15	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.4.10	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.14	FS1279.20	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.4.10	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
551.2		Plaza Investments Limited	9.4.10	Oppose	Requests that visitor accommodation remains a controlled activity in the High Density Residential Zone.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.2	FS1260.5	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.4.10	Support	Grant the relief set out in the submission. The HDR objectives, policies and rules provide an appropriate development framework. The objectives, policies and rules for visitor accommodation as RDIS are overly restrictive and there has been no justification provided for the change from controlled to discretionary status.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.2	FS1148.15	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.10	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted in part to the extent it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission and provided the Body Corporate's original submission is accepted. More particularly, the submission is supported provided that the Body Corporate's original submission seeking appropriate development controls in the High Density Residential Zone is accepted, and/or its submissions that the vacant site adjacent to the Pounamu Apartments (Lot 5) is subject to development controls that require any development on that site to be cognisant of and integrated with the Pounamu Apartments, is accepted.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.2	FS1271.22	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	9.4.10	Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to grant the relief set out of the submission.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.2	FS1331.27	Mount Crystal Limited	9.4.10	Support	Grant relief set out in clause 5.2 or original submitters submission		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
561.2		Three Beaches Limited	9.4.10	Oppose	Oppose objectives, policies and rules informing and supporting 9.4.10 - making all visitor accommodation a Restricted Discretionary activity. Rationale being S32 provides no evidence that monitoring has been inefficient or ineffective. Uncertainty will be created for development without any clear benefits. The existing controlled activity status provides good development outcomes and this status should be maintained		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
571.17		Totally Tourism Limited	9.4.10	Other	Oppose all Visitor Accommodation in the High Density Residential Zone being a Restricted Discretionary Activity pursuant to Rule 9.4.10 and submit that the it should remain a Controlled Activity as per the operative district plan		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
571.17	FS1059.94	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.4.10	Support	Support		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
579.2		Gem Lake Limited	9.4.10	Other	Opposes in part. The Proposed District Plan is modified so that Rule 9.4.10 relating to visitor accommodation activities within the High Density Residential Zone are a controlled activity.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
612.10		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.4.10	Oppose	Reject this provision.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
612.10	FS1148.18	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.10	Support	That this submission point be accepted in part to the extent it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission and provided the Body Corporate's original submission is accepted. More particularly, the submission is supported provided that the Body Corporate's original submission seeking appropriate development controls in the High Density Residential Zones is accepted, and/or its submission that the vacant site adjacent to the Pounamu Apartments (Lot 5) is subject to development controls that require any development on that site to be cognisant of and integrated with the Pounamu Apartments, is accepted.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
719.72		NZ Transport Agency	9.4.10	Not Stated	Amend Rule 9.4.10 as follows: . Parking and access arrangements: safety, and efficiency of the <u>roadning network</u> , and potential impacts on- neighbours' amenity and on-street parking.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
1366.18		Moraine Creek Limited	9.4.10	Oppose	Oppose all objectives, policies and other provisions that inform and support Rule 9.4.10. Rationale being that S32 shows no evidence that monitoring has been inefficient or ineffective.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
612.4		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.4.11	Support	Confirm this provision.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.3		Plaza Investments Limited	9.4.12	Oppose	Licensed premises operating between the hours of 10pm and 8am should be a controlled activity, subject to compliance with applicable noise standards.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.3	FS1271.23	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	9.4.12	Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to grant the relief set out of the submission.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
551.3	FS1331.28	Mount Crystal Limited	9.4.12	Support	Grant relief set out in clause 5.2 or original submitters submission		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
561.3		Three Beaches Limited	9.4.12	Oppose	Change to a controlled activity, subject to compliance with applicable noise standards		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
612.11		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.4.12	Oppose	Reject this provision.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
438.18		New Zealand Fire Service	9.4.15	Support	Retain as notified. The NZFS supports this Rule as Fire Stations need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times.	Accept		
524.30		Ministry of Education	9.4.15	Oppose	Relief sought: <b>Change the activity status of community activities and facilities to Permitted.</b>	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
524.30	FS1125.4	New Zealand Fire Service	9.4.15	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		
628.3		reception@jea.co.nz	9.4.16	Not Stated	Amend rule to clarify that the use of a retirement village is a permitted activity and the construction of buildings for the purpose of a retirement village is restricted discretionary. Buildings for the purpose of a retirement village shall be a restricted discretionary. Councils discretionary shall be restricted to: (i) Site layout, building location and design; (ii) Landscape treatment; (iii) Traffic and parking effects; and (iv) Construction effects.	Reject		
628.3	FS1265.9	DJ and EJ Cassells, the Bulling Family, the Bennett Family, M Lynch	9.4.16	Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.	Accept		
628.3	FS1268.9	Friends of the Wakatipu Gardens and Reserves Inc	9.4.16	Oppose	That the submission be refused in its entirety.	Accept		
628.3	FS1148.19	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.4.16	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission as retirement villages are not consistent with the activities provided for and established in the High Density Residential Zone. A retirement village on the vacant site adjacent to the Pounamu Apartments (Lot 5) would not be an appropriate means of recognising and providing for the relationship between the Pounamu Apartments and Lot 5, as described in the Body Corporate's original submission, nor would it result in integrated development between the two sites.	Accept		
68.4		Nigel Sadlier	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Opposes proposed Rule – Standard 9.5.2 and associated notes as a building height of 10 metres on sloping sites is excessive. Requests Rule – Standard 9.5.2 and the associated note should be deleted. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment set out above.	Reject		
68.4	FS1231.2	Plaza Investments Limited	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
68.4	FS1279.3	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		
68.4	FS1331.8	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		
68.4	FS1260.14	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcome which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR zone and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		
208.15		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Delete rules 9.5.1, 9.5.2 and 9.5.3 and reinsert the Operative Plan height rules for High Density Zones which require non-complying resource consent to exceed a flat site height limit of 8 metres and sloping site height limit of 7 metres.	Reject		
208.15	FS1231.9	Plaza Investments Limited	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
208.15	FS1242.16	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.15	FS1279.21	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
383.56		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Amend to ensure recession planes apply adjoining the Business Mixed Use Zone, by stating: "Recession planes do not apply to site boundaries adjoining a Town Centre, or fronting the road, or adjoining a park or reserve".	Accept		
383.56	FS1059.31	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Support	Accept		
383.57		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Amend to add privacy, screening and overlooking impacts as a matter of discretion.	Accept		
383.57	FS1148.12	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the Body Corporate's original submission.	Accept in Part		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
383.58		Queenstown Lakes District Council	9.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Amend to ensure that voids are not used as a means to increase building floor area coverage under a FAR control	Reject		
383.58	FS1148.13	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be rejected and the Body Corporate's primary relief as stated in its original submission, that Rule 9.5.5 be deleted in its entirety, be accepted. If the Body Corporate's primary relief is not accepted, then the relief sought in this submission should be accepted.	Reject		
392.6		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Don't require minimum space, rather require adequate provision for waste storage and collection. Notes minimum space may not be practical for larger developments of 4 or more units.	Accept		Rule has been amended to clarify this rule only applies to Permitted developments of 3 residential units or less.
392.6	FS1059.38	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Support	Accept		
719.74		NZ Transport Agency	9.5 Rules - Standards	Not Stated	Add an additional Rule 9.5.9.3 as follows: <u>9.5.9.3 Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within 80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(7 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2 707:2000.</u>	Accept in Part		
68.2		Nigel Sadlier	9.5.1	Oppose	Rule – Standard 9.5.1.1 and the associated note should be amended so that the definition of a "Flat Site" applies to land in its original state, meaning land that has not been subject to any prior earthworks and/or development. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment set out above.	Accept in Part		"Ground Level" and "Height" are defined by the PDP and relate to original ground level, prior to earthworks. Therefore the submitters position is accepted although no change is deemed necessary.
68.2	FS1279.1	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		
159.5		Karen Boulay	9.5.1	Oppose	Oppose greater height in the HDR Zone.	Reject		
159.5	FS1059.95	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.1	Oppose	Allow for greater height in flat sites.	Accept in Part		
238.59		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.5.1	Other	supports in part. Requests involvement of an objective review authority such as the Urban Design Panel. Requests deleting reference to Green Star- we do not think this is workable or appropriate.	Accept in Part		
238.59	FS1107.64	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1226.64	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1234.64	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1239.64	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1241.64	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1242.87	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.1	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 the hearing on mapping	
238.59	FS1248.64	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
238.59	FS1249.64	Tweed Development Limited	9.5.1	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.	Reject		
410.2		Alps Investment Limited	9.5.1	Support	Supports the increased height limit of 12m	Accept in Part		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
410.2	FS1059.74	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.1	Support	Support by immediate neighbours must approve.	Accept in Part		Redrafted 9.6.3.1 for RD height provides for limited notification to those persons considered to be adversely affected.
438.19		New Zealand Fire Service	9.5.1	Other	The NZFS wishes to exempt drying towers from rules 9.5.1.2 and 9.5.1.2. Amend to state: <u>Exemption: Fire station towers are exempt from this rule</u>	Reject		
722.2		Firestone Investments Limited	9.5.1	Support	Support the Restricted Discretionary activity status placed upon the building heights above 7m and below 10m.	Accept		
722.2	FS1148.20	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.1	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission as it considers that the Operative Plan height provisions are appropriate and should be included in the Proposed Plan. Taller buildings have the potential to be overbearing and dominant, and to give rise to adverse privacy, amenity and shading effects, particularly given the siting of the Pounamu Apartments to the rear of their site, and noting the intention at the time the Apartments were built was that they would be integrated with the Hilton Hotel development, then intended for the adjacent lot (Lot 5).	Reject		
68.3		Nigel Sadlier	9.5.1.1	Oppose	Rule – Standard 9.5.1.1 and the associated note should be amended so that any proposal to construct buildings to a maximum height of 12 metres (3 storeys) or 15 metres (4 storeys) in Queenstown is a Discretionary Activity and subject to full notification processes. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment set out above.	Reject		
68.3	FS1231.1	Plaza Investments Limited	9.5.1.1	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
68.3	FS1279.2	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.1.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		
366.1		Robins Road Limited	9.5.1.1	Oppose	Submit the maximum building height in HDR be 8m - discretionary activity resource consent for buildings above this height	Reject		
366.1	FS1288.11	Pinewood	9.5.1.1	Support	Support in part. Support submission with the exception that if the proposal to rezone does not go through buildings immediately against the hill be shown special consideration to allow for 30 storeys.	Reject	Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	This submission relates to the area of HDRZ at Gorge Road, excluded from Stage 1 of the review.
529.1		Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.1.1	Other	Add the following to Rule 9.5.1.1: <u>The maximum height for buildings in the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge shall be 10 metres and in addition no building shall protrude through a horizontal line drawn due north commencing at 7 metres above any given point along the required boundary setbacks at the southern zone boundary.</u>	Accept		
529.1	FS1352.1	Kawarau Village Holdings Limited	9.5.1.1	Oppose	Disallow relief sought by submitter	Reject		
665.1		Danmont Investments Queenstown Limited	9.5.1.1	Support	Supports the provision and requests it be confirmed.	Accept in Part		
64.1		Trustees - Panorama Trust	9.5.2	Oppose	Does not support the Restricted Discretionary height limit for sloping sites without public notification. Submitters main interest relates to the Pounamu Hotel site at 94-130 Frankton Road and the outcomes of a previous case in the environment court (ENV-2007-CHC-191). Requests the 7m height limit be enforced for the Pounamu Hotel site at 94-130 Frankton Road. Requests that full notification is required if the 7m height is exceeded. Requests that the council acknowledge that the submitter is an affected party and have the right to object to any plans submitted to council on this site that exceeds 7m in height.	Accept in Part		
64.1	FS1148.1	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.2	Support	That this submission be accepted. The Body Corporate supports this submission for the reasons stated in the submission and in its original submission and for the further reasons that increased height limits in this location have the potential to significantly affect the amenity, outlook and access to sunlight and of neighbouring and nearby sites; to give rise to adverse privacy and shading effects; and to result in buildings that are overbearing, dominant and inconsistent with the form and scale of existing development in the area.	Accept in Part		
150.4		Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.2	Support	Amend Rule 9.5.2 by deleting '10 metres' and inserting '12 metres'		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
150.4	FS1148.3	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.2	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission. The effect of the amendment sought by the submitter is to allow buildings between 7 metres and 12 metres as a restricted discretionary activity, which is inappropriate as it would further enable development while failing to ensure amenity, privacy, views and outlook of nearby and neighbouring sites are maintained. Buildings of this height also have the potential to be overbearing, dominant, restrict access to sunlight and cause shading problems for nearby and neighbouring sites, especially in winter, and would be out of character with the existing surrounding environment. As stated in its original submission, the Body Corporate considers that the height restrictions in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan, which require non-complying resource consent to be obtained for buildings exceeding a height of 7 metres (sloping sites) and 8 metres (flat sites), are appropriate.	Accept		
159.6		Karen Boulay	9.5.2	Oppose	Oppose greater height in the HDR Zone.	Accept in Part		
184.2		Bevan & Aderianne Campbell	9.5.2	Oppose	Opposes the restricted discretionary status for buildings on sloping sites exceeding 7m (under rule 9.5.2). Requests Council enforce the 7m height restriction on the 'Pounamu Hotel Site' 94-130 Frankton Road.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
184.2	FS1148.4	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.2	Support	That this submission be accepted. As stated in its original submission, the Body Corporate considers that the height restrictions in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan, which require non-complying resource consent to be obtained for buildings exceeding a height of 7 metres (sloping sites) and 8 metres (flat sites), are appropriate.	Reject		
184.2	FS1331.5	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.2	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		
184.2	FS1260.19	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.2	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR Zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes which respond to the site and its context, and -which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR Zone and allow for most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		
187.7		Nicholas Kiddle	9.5.2	Other	Raise High Density Residential Zone height standards on sloping sites to 14 metres	Reject		
187.7	FS1148.6	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.2	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. As stated in its original submission, the Body Corporate considers that the height restrictions in the Operative Plan are appropriate.	Accept		
187.7	FS1260.8	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.2	Support	Amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m. Increased height limits on sloping sites (14m and 20m as permitted and RDIS respectively) will provide for innovative and flexible design outcomes and promote the objectives and policies of the HDR Zone, and allow for the most efficient and effective use of the resource.	Reject		
187.7	FS1059.19	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.2	Oppose	This should be on case by case basis, and only where impact is less than minor. Neighbours must sign off.	Accept		
187.7	FS1271.14	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	9.5.2	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m.	Reject		
187.7	FS1331.23	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.2	Support	Amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m.	Reject		
238.62		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.5.2	Other	Supports in part. Requests removing differences in building height for flat and sloping sites - with height limits of 10 to 15 m in Queenstown, and 8 to 12 m in Wanaka, with discretionary status over 10m height with approval by Urban Design Panel.	Accept in Part		RD height limit recommended to be increased in Queenstown to 15m. No changes recommended to height limits in Wanaka.
238.62	FS1107.67	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1226.67	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1231.10	Plaza Investments Limited	9.5.2	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
238.62	FS1234.67	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1239.67	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1241.67	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1242.90	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.2	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.		Transferred to the hearing on mapping	
238.62	FS1248.67	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.5.2	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.	Reject		
238.62	FS1249.67	Tweed Development Limited	9.5.2	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.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
238.62	FS1260.11	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.2	Support	Building height for flat and sloping sites in the HDR Zone should be up to 10m as a permitted activity, and between 10m and 15m as RDIS. Topography in the HDR Zone (i.e. flat or sloping site) should not necessarily influence the potential height of built outcomes. To have an option of different building heights within the HDR Zone will provide for innovative and flexible design and promote the objectives and policies of the HDR Zone and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Reject		
238.62	FS1331.24	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.2	Support	Building height for flat and sloping sites in the HDR Zone should be up to 10m as a permitted activity, and between 10m and 15m as RDIS.	Reject		
392.7		Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.2	Other	Support, but would like to see stepped heights for sloping sites. Suggest the buildings at the lower part of the slope are limited to 7m, whereas the at the top they could be 10m.	Reject		
392.7	FS1059.39	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.2	Support	Support	Reject		
392.7	FS1288.10	Pinewood	9.5.2	Not Stated	SUPPORT that buildings at the lower part of the slope are limited to 7m h OPPOSE submission around the 10m height cap for buildings against the hill. Would recommend that they increase that to 75m. Agree with their stepped commentary around buildings in front not being able to build views out. The buildings must not detract from the natural beauty.	Accept in Part		
529.2		Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.2	Other	Add the following to Rule 9.5.2  <u>The maximum height for buildings in the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge shall be 10 metres and in addition no building shall protrude through a horizontal line drawn due north commencing at 7 metres above any given point along the required boundary setbacks at the southern zone boundary.</u>	Accept		
529.2	FS1352.2	Kawarau Village Holdings Limited	9.5.2	Oppose	Disallow relief sought by submitter	Reject		
612.5		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.5.2	Support	Confirm this provision.	Accept in Part		
627.4		HW Holdings Ltd	9.5.2	Not Stated	Amend as follows: Building Height – Sloping sites Except in the Lynch Block, The permitted height shall be 7 metres.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
846.1		Philippe & Jean Berton & Foster	9.5.2	Oppose	The 7 metre height restricted be enforced. Full notification is made if the Council is considering using its proposed discretion to exceed 7 metres in height. The Council acknowledges that the submitters are an affected party and that they would be notified and have the right to object to any plans submitted to the Council that exceeds the 7 metres height line.	Accept in Part		Redrafted 9.6.3.1 for RD height provides for limited notification to those persons considered to be adversely affected.
846.1	FS1331.6	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.2	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		
846.1	FS1260.12	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.2	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcome which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR zone and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		
68.5		Nigel Sadlier	9.5.3	Oppose	Rule – Standard 9.5.3 should be amended so that the maximum building height is retained at 7 metres. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment set out above.	Reject		
68.5	FS1231.3	Plaza Investments Limited	9.5.3	Oppose	Disallow the submission in relation to any reduction in building height when compared to the promoted building height for sloping sites in the High Density Residential Zone under the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part		
68.5	FS1279.4	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.3	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		
68.5	FS1331.9	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.3	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		
68.5	FS1260.15	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.3	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcome which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR zone and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		
187.15		Nicholas Kiddle	9.5.3	Other	Raise High Density Residential Zone height standards on sloping sites to 20 metres.	Reject		
187.15	FS1148.7	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.3	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. As stated in its original submission, the Body Corporate considers that the height restrictions in the Operative Plan are appropriate.	Reject		
187.15	FS1059.58	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.5.3	Oppose	Oppose having blanket height limits, as each site is different and needs to be assessed individually. 20m is too high or 99% of sites.	Reject		
187.15	FS1260.10	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.5.3	Support	Amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m. Increased height limits on sloping sites (14m and 20m as permitted and RDIS respectively) will provide for innovative and flexible design outcomes and promote the objectives and policies of the HDR Zone, and allow for the most efficient and effective use of the resource.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
187.15	FS1271.15	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	9.5.3	Oppose	Opposes. Seeks that the local authority to amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m.	Reject		
187.15	FS1331.22	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.3	Support	Amend the height rules in the HDR Zone to provide for a permitted height of 14m, and RDIS up to 20m.	Reject		
529.3		Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.3	Other	Add the following to Rule 9.5.3  <u>The maximum height for buildings in the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge shall be 10 metres and in addition no building shall protrude through a horizontal line drawn due north commencing at 7 metres above any given point along the required boundary setbacks at the southern zone boundary.</u>	Accept		
529.3	FS1352.3	Kawarau Village Holdings Limited	9.5.3	Oppose	Disallow relief sought by submitter	Reject		
627.5		HW Holdings Ltd	9.5.3	Not Stated	Amend as follows: Maximum Building Height – Sloping Sites The maximum building height shall be 10 metres, except in the Lynch Block subzone where it shall be 15m.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
681.3		Gerard Auckram	9.5.3	Support	Confirm the following rule (non complying to breach): Maximum Building Height – Sloping Sites The maximum building height shall be 10 metres.	Accept in Part		rule is retained but combined with redrafted 9.5.3
166.15		Aurum Survey Consultants	9.5.4	Other	Remove ground slope definition from coverage rule	Accept		
238.60		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.5.4	Other	supports in part. Requests inclusion of provisions for minimum outdoor living space.	Reject		
238.60	FS1107.65	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1226.65	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1234.65	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1239.65	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1241.65	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1242.88	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.4	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	
238.60	FS1248.65	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.5.4	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		
238.60	FS1249.65	Tweed Development Limited	9.5.4	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		
438.20		New Zealand Fire Service	9.5.4	Not Stated	NZFS require the ability to have a gross floor area area which can provide for the essential activities carried out at a fire station. Requests addition of: <u>Exemption: Fire stations are exempt from this rule.</u>	Reject		
551.4		Plaza Investments Limited	9.5.4	Oppose	The maximum building coverage should be 70% for sloping sites.	Accept		
551.4	FS1148.14	Pouanamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.4	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission as it seeks to increase site coverage from 65% to 70% for sloping sites. The Body Corporate considers that this amendment is inappropriate as it would enable intensive development while failing to maintain amenity, views and outlook.	Reject		
551.4	FS1271.24	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	9.5.4	Support	Supports. Seeks that the local authority to grant the relief set out of the submission.	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
551.4	FS1331.29	Mount Crystal Limited	9.5.4	Support	Grant relief set out in clause 5.2 or original submitters submission	Accept		
612.12		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.5.4	Oppose	Reject this provision.	Accept		
612.12	FS1148.17	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.4	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission as the amendment would enable intensive development while failing to maintain amenity, views and outlook.	Reject		
627.6		HW Holdings Ltd	9.5.4	Not Stated	Amend as follows: Building Coverage <b>Flat Sites</b> a maximum of 70% site coverage <b>Sloping Sites</b> a maximum of 65% site coverage <b>Lynch Block Subzone (all sites):</b> a maximum of 80% site coverage	Reject	Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	This submission relates to replicating rules of PC50 as they apply to the "Lynch Block" and is therefore out of scope.
665.2		Danmont Investments Queenstown Limited	9.5.4	Support	Supports the provision and requests it be confirmed.	Accept in Part		Amended by #551, #612
208.16		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.4.1	Oppose	Amend as follows: <i>9.5.4.1 Flat Sites a maximum of 65% <del>70%</del> site coverage</i>	Reject		
208.16	FS1242.17	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.4.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.16	FS1279.22	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.4.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
575.3		Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.4.2	Other	Oppose in part.  The Proposed District Plan is modified so that the building coverage specified under Rule 9.5.4.2 is increased to 75% building coverage.	Accept in Part		
575.3	FS1148.16	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.4.2	Oppose	That this submission point be rejected. The Body Corporate opposes this submission as the amendment sought would enable intensive development while failing to maintain amenity, views and outlook.	Reject		
166.27		Aurum Survey Consultants	9.5.5	Other	Clarify meaning of rule 9.5.5	Accept in Part		
208.17		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.5	Oppose	Delete Rule 9.5.5	Accept		
208.17	FS1242.18	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.5	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Reject		VA components of this submission are out of scope of Stage 1 of the PDP.
208.17	FS1279.23	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.5	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
208.18		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.6	Oppose	Delete Rules 9.5.6.1, 9.5.6.2 and 9.5.6.3 and Reinstat the Operative Plan provisions for recession planes for High Density Zones which require recession lines inclined towards the site at an angle of 25 degrees and commencing at 2.5m above ground level for flat sites and which apply to all buildings. With respect to sloping sites, ensure that the same recession line applies to sloping sites as it does to flat sites (therefore, apply the recession lines to all buildings on sloping sites, not just accessory buildings).	Reject		
208.18	FS1242.19	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.6	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.18	FS1279.24	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.6	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
238.63		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.5.6	Other	Supports in part. Requests consideration to applying a more detailed compass similar as say used for Christchurch City Council Living H Zone (example diagram attached). But calculated for the specific topography and sun angles of Queenstown and Wanaka.	Reject		I consider that the recession plane diagram included within the definition of "recession plane" is adequate.
238.63	FS1148.8	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.6	Support	Support in part. That this submission point be accepted provided it results in recession plane requirements that are no less restrictive than those contained in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan.	Reject		
238.63	FS1107.68	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1226.68	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1234.68	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1239.68	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1241.68	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1242.91	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.6	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	
238.63	FS1248.68	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.5.6	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		
238.63	FS1249.68	Tweed Development Limited	9.5.6	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		
665.3		Danmont Investments Queenstown Limited	9.5.6	Support	Supports the provision and requests it be confirmed.	Accept in Part		Amended by #383
159.11		Karen Boulay	9.5.7	Not Stated	There should be more protection of trees; not less.	Accept in Part		Addressed in hearing stream #3 - Protected Trees
208.19		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.7	Support	Retain Rule 9.5.7	Accept		
208.19	FS1242.20	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.7	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Polices and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.19	FS1279.25	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.7	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
561.4		Three Beaches Limited	9.5.7	Oppose	Should be decreased to 15%	Reject		
208.20		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.8	Oppose	Amend as follows: <i>Continuous Building Length</i> <u>No unbroken building length shall exceed 16m. Breaks in building length shall be a minimum of 2m in depth and 4m in width for the full height of the wall and shall include a discontinuous eave line and roofline at the break. The aggregate continuous length of any building facade above one storey, including breaks, shall not exceed 30m.</u> Where a proposal exceeds this length, a Restricted Discretionary activity consent shall be required with discretion restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The extent to which topography or landscaping mitigates any dominance impacts</li> <li>• The extent to which the height of the building influences the dominance of the building in association with the continuous building length.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.20	FS1242.21	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.8	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.20	FS1279.26	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.8	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
238.61		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	9.5.8	Other	Supports in part. Requests inclusion of diagram to clarify how rule applies to a double level building.	Accept in Part		For clarity the wording of the rule has been amended to refer to above 'ground level', rather than 'storey'.
238.61	FS1107.66	Man Street Properties Ltd	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1226.66	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1234.66	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1239.66	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1241.66	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1242.89	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.8	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	
238.61	FS1248.66	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	9.5.8	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		
238.61	FS1249.66	Tweed Development Limited	9.5.8	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		
612.6		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.5.8	Support	Confirm this provision.	Accept in Part		Amended by #238
166.28		Aurum Survey Consultants	9.5.9	Support	add an eave exception to rule 9.5.9	Accept in Part		eave exception provided for in Rule 9.6.3.2
208.21		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.5.9	Oppose	Delete rules 9.5.9.1 and 9.5.9.2 and Reinsert the Operative Plan road and internal boundary setback rules, including those aspects of the Operative setback rules which require setbacks between buildings on the same site (ie the mutual setback requirements).	Reject		
208.21	FS1242.22	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.5.9	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
208.21	FS1279.27	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.5.9	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
612.7		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.5.9	Support	Confirm this provision.	Accept in Part		Amended by #719
665.4		Danmont Investments Queenstown Limited	9.5.9	Support	Supports the provision and requests it be confirmed.	Accept in Part		Amended by #719
719.73		NZ Transport Agency	9.5.9.1	Not Stated	Amend Rule 9.5.9.1 as follows: 9.5.9.7 Road boundary setback: 2m, <u>except for state highway boundaries which shall be 4.5m.</u>	Accept		
719.73	FS1270.71	Hansen Family Partnership	9.5.9.1	Oppose	Opposes in part. Believes that the proposed amendment is inappropriate and unnecessary. If buildings have to be designed to meet required internal acoustic noise standards, as proposed elsewhere in this submission (which is not opposed) then there is no need to increase the setback requirement from the State Highway boundary. Seeks the submission be disallowed to the extent detailed in this Further Submission.	Reject		
7.3		Sue Knowles	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	That Clause 9.6.3. and 9.6.3.1 are deleted and replaced with provisions to require that all building heights on sloping land above 7 metres are publically notified.	Accept in Part		Notified (and redrafted) Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
7.3	FS1059.1	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Support non-notification for building heights over 7m, however affected parties should sign off.	Accept in Part		Notified (and redrafted) Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
7.3	FS1279.7	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The submission of S Knowles (#7) has been deferred to the hearing on mapping. The submitters concerns around heights are limited to the HDR at York Street, and unrelated to land west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.
77.1		Angela Waghorn	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Clause 9.6.2 and 9.6.2.1 be amended to read notification be required. Clause 9.6.3 and 9.6.3.1 be amended to read notification be required.	Reject		
159.14		Karen Boulay	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Submitter believes they should be notified of any building which wants to go higher or any commercial activity outside the established zones.	Reject		
159.14	FS1059.96	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Only those affected should be notified.	Accept in Part		
363.2		Body Corp 27490	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	opposes the provision generally.	Reject		
1366.19		Moraine Creek Limited	9.6 Rules - Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Non-Notification of Applications - Restricted Discretionary Activity consents for Visitor Accommodation. If the intention is not to require notification in any circumstances, then Controlled Activity Status should be maintained		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	
208.25		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.6.1	Oppose	Delete 9.6.2.1	Reject		
208.25	FS1242.26	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.6.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		Amended by #719
208.25	FS1279.31	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.6.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
612.8		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.6.2	Not Stated	Confirm this provision.	Reject		Amended by #719

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
719.75		NZ Transport Agency	9.6.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 9.6.2 to read as follows: 9.6.2. 7 Residential development involving the development of 4 or more dwellingsthat do not require direct access to a State highway. 9.6.2.2 Visitor accommodation that does not require direct access to a State highway.	Accept in Part		
166.16		Aurum Survey Consultants	9.6.2.1	Oppose	Review rule 9.6.2.1. Questions application if a large multi dwelling development is not notified, but if you only do a couple of dwellings then it can be notified.	Reject		Notified rule 9.2.6.1 relates only to activities that are RD. There is no need to state non-notification provisions for permitted activities.
166.16	FS1059.18	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6.2.1	Support	Support	Reject		Notified rule 9.2.6.1 relates only to activities that are RD. There is no need to state non-notification provisions for permitted activities.
64.2		Trustees - Panorama Trust	9.6.3	Oppose	Does not support the Restricted Discretionary height limit for sloping sites without public notification. Submitters main interest relates to the Pounamu Hotel site at 94-130 Frankton Road and the outcomes of a previous case in the environment court (ENV-2007-CHC-191). Requests that full notification is required if the 7m height is exceeded. Requests that the council acknowledge that the submitter is an affected party and have the right to object to any plans submitted to council on this site that exceeds 7m in height.	Accept in Part		Notified (and redrafted) Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
64.2	FS1148.2	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.6.3	Support	That this submission be accepted. The Body Corporate supports this submission for the reasons stated in the submission and in its original submission and for the further reasons that increased height limits in this location have the potential to significantly affect the amenity, outlook and access to sunlight and of neighbouring and nearby sites; to give rise to adverse privacy and shading effects; and to result in buildings that are overbearing, dominant and inconsistent with the form and scale of existing development in the area.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
64.2	FS1059.10	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6.3	Support	Affected parties must be notified.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
193.2		Diane Dever	9.6.3	Oppose	Clause 9.6.3 and 9.6.3.1 be deleted and replaced with all height increases above 7 metres for sloping sections must be notified.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
193.2	FS1059.20	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6.3	Support	Support in part. Only affected neighbors (including across road) should be notified.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
364.1		Body Corp 27490 9A,B,C and D York Street	9.6.3	Oppose	Clause 9.6.3 and 9.6.3.1 be deleted and replaced with all height increases above 7 metres for sloping sections must be notified.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
364.1	FS1059.23	Erna Spijkerbosch	9.6.3	Support	Support in part. Affected parties must be notified.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
612.9		Skyline Enterprises Limited	9.6.3	Not Stated	Confirm this provision.	Accept in Part		
846.2		Philippe & Jean Berton & Foster	9.6.3	Oppose	The 7 metre height restricted be enforced.  Full notification is made is the Council is considering using its proposed discretion to exceed 7 metres in height.  The Council acknowledges that we are an affected party and that we would be notified and have the right to object to any plans submitted to the Council that exceeds the 7 metres height line.	Reject		
846.2	FS1331.7	Mount Crystal Limited	9.6.3	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		Amendments made to the RD status for building height (flat sites)

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 9 – High Density Residential

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
846.2	FS1260.13	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.6.3	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcome which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR zone and allow for the most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		Amendments made to the RD status for building height (flat sites)
184.1		Bevan & Aderianne Campbell	9.6.3.1	Oppose	Opposes the restricted discretionary status for buildings on sloping sites exceeding 7m (under rule 9.5.2). Requests council acknowledge that the submitter is an affected party and be notified of any proposal on the 'Pounamu Hotel Site' 94-130 Frankton Road that exceeds 7 metres. Requests ability for full public notification to be made for resource consent applications that exceed 7 metres.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
184.1	FS1148.5	Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.6.3.1	Support	That this submission be accepted. As stated in its original submission, the Body Corporate considers that the height restrictions in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan, which require non-complying resource consent to be obtained for buildings exceeding a height of 7 metres (sloping sites) and 8 metres (flat sites), are appropriate.	Accept in Part		Notified Rule 9.6.3.1 states that RD activities for RD building height for sloping sites (10m) will require serving of notice on those persons considered to be adversely affected, if those persons have not given their written approval.
184.1	FS1331.4	Mount Crystal Limited	9.6.3.1	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone remain unchanged	Accept in Part		Amendments made to the RD status for building height (flat sites)
184.1	FS1260.18	Dato Tan Chin Nam	9.6.3.1	Oppose	The height limits in the notified plan for the HDR Zone should remain unchanged. Restricting height limits to 7m on sloping sites in the HDR Zone will not allow for innovative and flexible design outcomes which respond to the site and its context, and -which will ultimately promote the objectives and policies of the HDR Zone and allow for most efficient and effective use of resources.	Accept in Part		Amendments made to the RD status for building height (flat sites)
208.26		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	9.6.3.1	Oppose	Delete 9.6.3.1	Reject		
208.26	FS1242.27	Antony & Ruth Stokes	9.6.3.1	Oppose	Believes that the proposed High Density Residential Objectives, Policies and Rules will provide a development framework that supports appropriate residential and visitor accommodation activities in the zone. The submitter seeks submission be disallowed.	Accept in Part		
208.26	FS1279.32	Lakes Edge Development Limited	9.6.3.1	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks amendments to Chapter 9 insofar as they relate to the High Density Residential Zone located immediately west of the Kawarau Falls Bridge.	Accept in Part		The relief sought by submitter 208 (PBCC) to reinstate the height limits of the ODP is not accepted. However, minor amendments have been recommended to grant the relief sought by this submitter for height limits atg the Kawarau Falls Bridge HDRZ
166.10		Aurum Survey Consultants	27.5.1	Oppose	Amend the minimum lot sizes: High Density - no minimum Low Density Residential - 300m <sup>2</sup> Large Lot Residential - 2000m <sup>2</sup> across the zone Rural Lifestyle - reject capping average calculations at 4 hectares.	Reject		
208.43		Pounamu Body Corporate Committee	Floor Area Ratio	Oppose	Opposes the definition of Floor Area Ratio. Delete the definition.	Accept		
68.1		Nigel Sadlier	2.2 Definitions - Ground level	Support	Retain the Definition of 'Ground Level' as proposed.	Accept		