

22 October 2015

Queenstown Lakes District Council
Re: Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan
Online Submission

We are the owners of Lot 35 in The Preserve at Jacks Point. We have received DRB approval for our home, and we plan to start construction before year-end. We oppose certain aspects of the proposed changes to the Jacks Point Zone as set forth below.

1. No changes to Open Space and Landscape Protection Areas in the tablelands

We request that the Council make no changes to the current Open Space and Landscape Protection Areas in the tablelands, which were a fundamental component in the creation of the Jacks Point Zone. We strongly object to the proposal to allow for further development of the tablelands as indicated in the Farm Preserve Activity Areas for the following reasons:

(a) Overturns the rigorously considered prior zoning without merit

The proposed development provides for significant additional development on the tablelands. We believe this is dramatically out of keeping with the clear intention of the Jacks Point Zone, which was thoroughly debated over a number of years.

When Variation 16 was originally proposed for the creation of the Jacks Point Zone, there was proposed to be substantially greater development of the tablelands. The Council determined that this was inappropriate and decided to limit development to 36 homesites with highly restrictive building conditions.

Excerpt from the Report for Variation No 16 (10 March 2002):

“The draft guidelines propose a cap of 50 homesites upon the tablelands. However, it is concurred with Council’s Landscape Architect that, regardless of the intent of the aforementioned guidelines, the effect of such a density (with its associated roading, curtilage, etc) on the ONL – WB has the potential to be more than minor:

... the density suggested by the 50 dwelling cap will ultimately result in domestication of the landscape.”

Excerpt from the QLDC Decision (15 August 2003):

“As notified, the Jacks Point Zone allowed for large scale development to occur on the tablelands and Jacks Point as a controlled activity. Submissions to the Variation, along with the relevant Planner’s Report, raised significant concerns in regard to development on the tablelands and Jacks Point, which have been categorised by the Environment Court as forming part of the Outstanding Natural Landscape – Wakatipu Basin (ONL-WB) and Visual Amenity Landscape (VAL). In response to those submissions and the Planner’s Report, Jacks Point Limited presented to the Panel amendments to the Jacks Point Zone

Structure Plan and Zone provisions, showing significantly less development than originally proposed.

With regard to the tablelands and Jacks Point, the Panel was particularly concerned that inappropriate development could potentially compromise:

- the geological, topographical and ecological values of the area;
- the visually coherent form of the tablelands, Peninsula Hill and Jacks Point;
- the landscape and visual amenity values of the landscape surrounding the Zone;
- the integrity of the Proposed District Plan, particularly when considering the District Wide Objectives and Policies; and
- the integrity of the Zone, particularly as it relates to landscape and visual amenity values.”

“Due to their high ecological, landscape and visual amenity values, the tablelands are a sensitive area that will require a suitably subservient response in terms of design and controls if development is to be successfully absorbed. And even then development must be limited and assist in protecting and enhancing those values associated with the tablelands.”

There was also consideration given to a proposal for further development on the tablelands, in addition to the 36 homesites, as a restricted discretionary activity. The Council specifically rejected this proposal.

Excerpt from the QLDC Decision (15 August 2003):

“Proposed Amendment: An additional restricted discretionary activity area for any buildings within a Tableland Residential Activity Area above that maximum number of 18 or outside a specified homesite.

Appropriateness: Such a provision is considered inappropriate, as development in excess of 18 residential units will potentially lead to the degradation of the landscape and amenity values associated with the tablelands. It is the intention of the Panel that, other than 18 residential units, any future development on the tablelands will be avoided.”
(emphasis added)

Note: The text refers to 18 residential units in relation to the Jacks Point portion of the Zone while a further 18 residential units are in the Henley Downs portion of the Zone as it was described at the time of Variation 16.

We believe it was the clear intention from the Council Decision, after extensive consideration of Variation 16 over several years, that there should never be further development within the tablelands. The relevant factors have not changed. What is now proposed is far worse than the originally rejected proposal in terms of the development intensity and reduced controls.

(b) Substantial degradation of Open Space, including Outstanding Natural Landscape. Concerns raised in Plan Change 44 have not been addressed

The proposed development is highly contradictory to the fundamental Jacks Point commitment to Open Space that has been promised to owners in The Preserve and Jacks Point. From its inception to today, Jacks Point continues to be marketed based on this commitment.

From the Jacks Point website:

“We made some ground rules for ourselves very early on; one was to make sure 95% of that area was kept as open space.”

We believe that the proposed development will be highly adverse to the landscape and amenity value of Jacks Point and The Preserve. The proposed Farm Preserve Activity Areas are currently zoned as Open Space and Landscape Protection Area and are part of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, where the currently proposed development would be non-complying. The proposal is to carve out substantial areas from this protected zoning to allow for significant development of lifestyle properties and visitor accommodation.

The Coneburn Area Resource Study, in assessing potential to absorb change, identifies the majority of the areas proposed to be Farm Preserve Activity Areas as less able to absorb change than the area of The Preserve. In consideration of the possible impact of development on the tablelands, building in The Preserve has been subject to highly restrictive conditions designed to minimize impact and create development that is highly subservient to the landscape. The proposed Farm Preserve Activity Areas have dramatically less controls on development.

The consultation documents refer to updates to the Coneburn Area Resource Study, a report by Boffa Miskell and a report by Vivian + Espie. Although not clear from the consultation documents, these reports were prepared by or for the developer. Given the landscape sensitivity of the proposed development, the public should have the benefit of more independent and diverse professional views on the impact of the proposed development.

In connection with Plan Change 44, which has formed the basis of the proposed changes to Jacks Point, there were substantial concerns raised by the QLDC’s consultant planner, landscape architect and staff regarding the scale of development and insufficient controls that would lead to significant adverse effects on the amenity of Jacks Point residents and on the extremely important priority of protecting the character and integrity of the ONL. It is unclear how those concerns have been addressed.

It is also unclear whether the proposed changes have been assessed against the Stakeholders Deed entered into by the QLDC in connection with the original development of Jacks Point.

(c) Farm Preserve Activity Areas (which are intended for lifestyle properties and visitor accommodation) are irrelevant to the principle rationale for rezoning Jacks Point and have no compelling merits in comparison to the current Open Space

The overriding rationale for the proposed changes in Jacks Point is the creation of more affordable housing. The proposed development of the tablelands and Peninsula Hill through the Farm Preserve Activity Areas is irrelevant to those considerations and should be considered on its own merit. The creation of additional lifestyle lots should not be considered a high priority, especially given the significant detrimental affects of further development.

The Section 32 report provides scant rationale for the benefits of converting important Open Space / Landscape Protection Area / ONL to developed Farm Preserve Activity Areas. The Section 32 report has not adequately addressed the costs and benefits of the Farm Preserve Activity Areas independently from the other unrelated changes to Jacks Point. The limited “benefits” appear exceptionally weak in comparison to the current zoning and in contrast to the substantial impact on the landscape and visual amenity.

There is no evidence to suggest that the land is unable to be appropriately maintained under the current zoning. If maintenance of the land is a concern, other alternatives should be fully explored, including maintenance by the Jacks Point Residents & Owners Association.

“Farm Preserve” appears to be a misleading characterization of the intended development, which provides for lifestyle properties and visitor accommodation. There appear to be, in fact, no requirements that the land be maintained as a farm.

The proposed visitor accommodation is also completely inconsistent with one of the founding principles of Jacks Point that has emphasized the location of visitor accommodation in the Lodge and the Village, not in the residential areas (and certainly not in Open Space).

2. Maintain the originally designated trail for public access route

We request that the Council not proceed with the proposed public access route that has been indicated immediately along the northern border of our property. One of the original Jacks Point trails, Stragglers Loop (see attached), should be utilized for this purpose. Development of The Preserve was completed a number of years ago and there was never any indication of additional trails being created. No reasons have been provided as to why the original Stragglers Loop trail should not be used. The proposed location of the trail, especially in light of the expected future population of Jacks Point, would be substantially adverse to the amenity value of our property, which was purchased with the specific objective of being in a remote location. Any public access route through The Preserve should be located at a substantial distance from the homesites as originally designed.

Sincerely,

Alexander Schrantz and Jayne Schrantz



LAKE WAKATIPU

TO KELVIN HEIGHTS/QUEENSTOWN

Jack's Point Loop
 WALKING TIME | 1.5 - 2 Hours
 GRADE | Medium to Hard

Beware - Steep Cliff

BEACH ACCESS

Lakeside Trail
 WALKING TIME | 1.5 - 2 Hours to Kelvin Heights
 GRADE | Easy

Preserve Loop
 WALKING TIME | 1.5 - 2 Hours
 GRADE | Medium

EASIEST WAY TO CLUBHOUSE BY BIKE

Stragglers Loop
 WALKING TIME | 3 - 4 Hours
 GRADE | Medium

Opening late Summer 10

Lake Tewa Loop
 WALKING TIME | 25 Minutes
 GRADE | Easy

Remarkables Loop
 WALKING TIME | 1.5 - 2 Hours
 GRADE | Easy

TRAIL BOLLARDS



MAP KEY

- MOUNTAIN BIKING
- WALKING
- DOGS ON LEASH
- WATCH FOR GOLFERS
- TRAIL BOLLARDS
- LOOKOUT
- PICNIC AREA
- POINT OF INTEREST
- PARKING
- FENCE LINE



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

**In support of, or in opposition to, submissions on the Proposed District Plan
Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 – as amended 30 August 2010**

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Submitter Details: Alexander Schrantz and Jayne Schrantz

Address for Service: House A1, 6 Mount Davis Road, Pokfulam, HONG KONG
alex_schrantz@hotmail.com

1. This is a further submission in support of and in opposition to submissions on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan.

2. We are submitters who have an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has because:

we are the owners of Lot 35 in The Preserve at Jacks Point and we made an original submission regarding land which is specifically addressed by other submissions which we wish to support or oppose as detailed below.

we use the trails and open space networks and pay for upkeep of these via our levies to the Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association, and these areas are directly affected by other submissions which we wish to support or oppose as detailed below.

3. We **support** the submission of:

3.1 Submitter 131: Joanna and Simon Taverner

3.2 We **oppose** the submission of:

3.3 Submitter 632: RCL Limited

3.4 Submitter 715: Jardine Family Trust and Remarkables Station

4. The particular parts of the submissions we **support** are:

4.1 Submitter 131: All points. In addition, to the extent these points are accepted, the entirety of The Preserve (all of Lots 1-36 as currently zoned) should be maintained cohesively with the Jacks Point portion of the Jacks Point Zone.

4.2 The particular parts of the submissions we **oppose** are:

4.3 Submitter 632: Points 18, 21, 31 and 34. In summary the submission seeks a change in land-use within the Jacks Point Structure Plan to allow an area called "Open Space and Community Recreation". This area enables large scale commercial recreation buildings on this land.

4.4 Submitter 715: All points, specifically the extension of the Jacks Point Zone, the Jacks Point Structure Plan and the Urban Growth Boundary and extension of the Homestead Bay Structure Plan to include increased development such as residential and an Education Innovation Campus at Homestead Bay.

5. The reasons for our **support** are:

5.1 Submission 131 seeks to preserve the integrity of the original Jacks Point Vision, and recognise the many varied, special and important values of the Jacks Point part of the zone. In particular they:

- 5.1.1 seek to protect the landscape and visual amenity, and local character values of the zone,
- 5.1.2 oppose the increase in allowable densities,
- 5.1.3 separate the planning controls conceived for Hanley Downs from Jacks Point because Hanley Downs will be developed in a far different way to Jacks Point.
- 5.1.4 oppose Hanley Downs construction traffic using Maori Jack road, the upkeep of which is paid for by Jacks Point residents.

5.2 Specifically Submitter 131 in paragraph 4.9 states:

- *All the areas within Jacks Point zoned as G and G/F on Figure 1, including the areas owned by the Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association and Lot 12 DP 364700 should remain as per the existing structure plan together with existing objectives, policies and rules for these areas, specifically:*
- *Zone F: Recreation Activities - the use of the area is restricted to recreation activities,*
- *Zone G: Golf Course and Open Space - the use of the area is restricted to outdoor recreation activities and open space*
- *maximum height of buildings of 4m.*
- *No residential and / or commercial subdivision and development in these areas.*

5.3 The reasons for our **opposition** are:

5.4 Submitter 632: This submission proposes changing the rules within the proposed district plan to enable development of commercial recreation buildings of a height, mass and footprint of completely inappropriate scale and site coverage within an area of existing designated open space. This is contrary to any masterplan ever conceived for the area, to the findings and recommendations of the Coneburn Resource Study, and the existing and proposed provisions of the QLDC district plan. It is also contrary to the original Jacks Point vision. The negative impact of this proposal would be significant on the immediate neighbours, the Jacks Point residents, the general public who use the tracks and QLDC reserves adjacent to the proposal and users of State Highway 6, and would have a negative impact on the visual and landscape amenity of the adjacent environment.

5.5 Commercial recreation facilities also include noisy activities such as go-karting. Again this is inappropriate and inconsistent with the Jacks Point zone.

5.6 Both the current and proposed structure plan allows for appropriate community facilities in this area, without the addition of commercial recreation as proposed by RCL.

5.7 Submitter 715: This submission proposes allowing additional development in a rural zone which is inappropriate and which would have a negative impact of 'more than minor' on the immediate neighbours, the Jacks Point residents, the general public who use the tracks and QLDC reserves adjacent to the proposal and users of State Highway 6, and the visual and landscape amenity of the adjacent environment. It would also set a precedent for infill development, create over-domestication of the landscape and result in urban sprawl. It is contrary to the Coneburn Resource Study and the existing and proposed provisions of the QLDC District Plan.

6. We seek that the whole or part of the following submissions be allowed

6.1 Whole of submission 131. In addition, to the extent these points are accepted, the entirety of The Preserve (all of Lots 1-36 as currently zoned) should be maintained cohesively with the Jacks Point portion of the Jacks Point Zone.

We seek that the whole or part of the following submissions be disallowed

6.2 Parts 18, 21, 31 and 34 of submission 632

6.3 Whole of submission 715

7. The submitter wishes to be heard in support of their submission.

Sincerely,

Alexander Schrantz and Jayne Schrantz