

**APPENDIX 2 : SUMMARY OF DECISIONS  
REQUESTED, INCLUDING FURTHER SUBMISSIONS**

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-01	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Planning Maps	Adopt the rezoning of the North Three Parks area as the Three Parks Special Zone.				
						PC4-F01	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	
						PC4-F02	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	
						PC4-F03	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F04	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-02	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Structure Plan	Adopt the proposed areas for business, low density residential and high density residential sub zones identified on the North Three Parks Structure Plan.				
						PC4-F05	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	
						PC4-F06	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F07	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	<p>The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> <p>Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports Facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.</p>
						PC4-F08	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-03	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Partly Support	Structure Plan and Open Space Plan	Adopt the North Three Parks Structure Plan and the Open Space Plan but amend the neighbourhood reserve (as identified as 11 on the Open Space Plan) to be consistent with the area of neighbourhood park identified on the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan (Appendix 1 pages 21 and 35).				
						PC4-F09	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F10	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	<p>The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> <p>Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.</p>
						PC4-F11	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Partly Support	<p>The roading layout in the Structure Plan provides for access and connectivity for Ballantyne Investments land. Our property is zoned medium density residential with the ability to construct visitor accommodation. Successful visitor accommodation development requires direct and easy access off SH84.</p>
PC4-04	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Objectives	Adopt Objective 2.7 in Section 12.25.				
						PC4-F12	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F13	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F14	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-05	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Rules	Adopt the addition to Rule 12.26.4.3(5)(v).				
						PC4-F15	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	
						PC4-F16	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F17	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-06	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Assessment Matters	Adopt the new assessment matter to provide that the North Three Parks area is developed in accordance with the principles of the North Three Parks Urban Design Framework.				
						PC4-F18	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	
						PC4-F19	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F20	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-07	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Assessment Matters	Adopt the two new assessment criteria for the location and safety of the proposed collector road and Ballantyne Road.				
						PC4-F21	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F22	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	<p>The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> <p>Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.</p>
						PC4-F23	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-08	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Assessment Matters	Adopt the additional diagram to show the relationship between medium density residential and the linear park along the golf course.				
						PC4-F24	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	
						PC4-F25	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F26	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F27	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-09	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Assessment Matters	Adopt the further assessment matter in Rule 12.26.4.5(viii)(c) relating to building and interface design.				
						PC4-F28	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	
						PC4-F29	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F30	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-10	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Assessment Matters	Adopt the additional assessment matter in Rule 12.26.4.7(i)(c).				
						PC4-F31	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	
						PC4-F32	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.
						PC4-F33	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-11	Ballantyne Investments Ltd	Neil Matchett	Support	Definitions	Adopt the definition of North Three Parks.				
						PC4-F34	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	
						PC4-F35	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F36	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	<p>The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road</li> <li>• it provides different a mix of medium and low density residential zoning</li> </ul> <p>Staging for PC4 should be complemented by rules to restrict development in subsequent stages until a proportion of development (say 75%) has occurred in the earlier stage. The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core. No area is identified on the Structure Plan for the Wanaka Sports facilities. PC4 should make provision for the Sports Facilities by zoning land for this activity.</p>
						PC4-F37	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-12		NJ Harris	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Provide a large setback for development from the Golf Course boundary and attach a covenant to restrict residents from complaining about shading and other Club activities. This will ensure that existing activities at the Golf Club will not be compromised.				
						PC4-F38	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	<p>The Urban Design Concept already provides a generous reserve (15m) along the Golf Course boundary and a 10m building setback. 25 m in total so ball strike should not be a issue. McPherson Street Golf Course boundary trees are lower and closer to houses 13mand they seem to have no problems. The Golf Course has neglected to control the height and width of its boundary trees on the side bordering North Three Parks. Most trees are 20m or more and are encroaching on their neighbours properties. A covenant should be placed on residential properties for ball strike if it is a problem. No covenant should be used for shading as trees will grow to massive heights is unattended. My home is shaded now as winter approaches. Shading gets worse ever year as the trees are getting taller.</p>
						PC4-F39	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	<p>The urban design concept for development in the North Three Parks area and the North Three Parks Structure Plan provide for a linear reserve along the golf club boundary. There is also a requirement for buildings to be set back a further 10 metres from the boundary of the linear reserve. This means that development is to be set back 25 metres from the golf club boundary. The purpose of these controls is to ensure that there is adequate separation between the golf club and development to avoid ball strike and to allow access to sunlight for future development. Ballantyne Investments do not agree to a covenant on shading.</p>

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F40	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Disagree to covenant on shading
PC4-13		Loris King	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Housing should be set back sufficiently from the golf course boundary. This will ensure that houses are not shaded by the trees which are an integral part of the golf course				
						PC4-F41	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	The Urban Design Concept already provides a generous reserve (15m) along the Golf Course boundary and a 10m building setback. 25 m in total so ball strike should not be a issue. McPherson Street Golf Course boundary trees are lower and closer to houses 13mand they seem to have no problems. The Golf Course has neglected to control the height and width of its boundary trees on the side bordering North Three Parks. Most trees are 20m or more and are encroaching on their neighbours properties. A covenant should be placed on residential properties for ball strike if it is a problem. No covenant should be used for shading as trees will grow to massive heights is unattended. My home is shaded now as winter approaches. Shading gets worse ever year as the trees are getting taller.
						PC4-F42	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	The urban design concept for development in the North Three Parks area and the North Three Parks Structure Plan provide for a linear reserve along the golf club boundary. There is also a requirement for buildings to be set back a further 10 metres from the boundary of the linear reserve. This means that development is to be set back 25 metres from the golf club boundary. The purpose of these controls is to ensure that there is adequate separation between the golf club and development to avoid ball strike and to allow access to sunlight for future development. Ballantyne Investments do not agree to a covenant on shading.
PC4-14		Loris King	Partly support	Whole Plan Change	Residential zoning needs to be set back from the golf course boundary as stray golf balls and housing do not mix.				
						PC4-F43	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	The Urban Design Concept already provides a generous reserve (15m) along the Golf Course boundary and a 10m building setback. 25 m in total so ball strike should not be a issue. McPherson Street Golf Course boundary trees are lower and closer to houses 13mand they seem to have no problems. The Golf Course has neglected to control the height and width of its boundary trees on the side bordering North Three Parks. Most trees are 20m or more and are encroaching on their neighbours properties. A covenant should be placed on residential properties for ball strike if it is a problem. No covenant should be used for shading as trees will grow to massive heights is unattended. My home is shaded now as winter approaches. Shading gets worse ever year as the trees are getting taller.
						PC4-F44	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	The urban design concept for development in the North Three Parks area and the North Three Parks Structure Plan provide for a linear reserve along the golf club boundary. There is also a requirement for buildings to be set back a further 10 metres from the boundary of the linear reserve. This means that development is to be set back 25 metres from the golf club boundary. The purpose of these controls is to ensure that there is adequate separation between the golf club and development to avoid ball strike and to allow access to sunlight for future development. Ballantyne Investments do not agree to a covenant on shading.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-15		Loris King	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	No business activity should be developed in the business sub zone in North Three Parks until all the available land zoned commercial in the central town area and the logical expansion of the commercial zoning in the Wanaka township is in place, and has been developed.				
						PC4-F45	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	The Plan Change identifies approximately 1.5 hectares of land for business use along Ballantyne Road. This area is intended for light industrial purposes rather than for retail or commercial use as anticipated in the town centre. It is considered that development in this area will provide for business activities that do not require a town centre location and so identification of this area for business will not be to the detriment to the town centre and therefore it is considered that a deferment mechanism is not required.
PC4-16		Ted (CE) Lloyd	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That the development design incorporates wide verges and tree plantings to break up the ridgelines of building roofs etc. so the development at the entrance to Wanaka is a "flag bearer" for the town.				
						PC4-F46	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The scope of this submission is very broad and appears to cover Three Parks and all development along the entrances to Wanaka. The significance of the SH84 entrance into Wanaka is recognised in the design for the plan change area. The Structure Plan and the urban design framework provide for additional open space adjacent to the state highway to protect views and provide sufficient space for planting.
PC4-17	Ministry of Education	Julie McMinn	Partly Support	Policy 4.6	To amend Policy 4.6, to enable the current community demand for education facilities given a new primary school opened in Tenby Street in 2010, as follows: To work with the Ministry of Education to enable <del>a school</del> education facilities to be appropriately located within the zone, should the Ministry deem such a facility to be required.				
						PC4-F47	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Neutral	Possibly outside the scope of the plan change but would have no concerns about the amendment to the wording of the Policy 4.6 as submitted. It is noted that the Three Parks Low Density and Medium Density Residential Zones already provide for education facilities and early childcare centres as restricted discretionary activities.
PC4-18		RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that the main access for their property (124 State highway 84) be shown as being directly off State Highway 84 in the Urban Design Plan for North Three Parks				

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F48	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	Support access off SH84, either as an allowance for the road to be taken (at a suitable date) off the proposed roundabout, or a separate road coming in off SH84 directly into North Three Parks providing good flow to this area. As a 50km speed will probably be enforced, especially if a roundabout does go in, an additional road should be considered.
						PC4-F49	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The design of the roading network shown on the Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide a logical connection into the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. The location of the intersection from the state highway into Three Parks is in such a position as to prevent direct access to the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. So there is no direct roading access into the northern area of the plan change. NZTA's submission prevents these two sites from developing further access points onto SH84. The North Three Parks Structure Plan provides for access to these two sites in the most logical position from the south but the timing of construction of this access depends on the development of this area of Three Parks and of land owned by Ballantyne Investments. Access to this area from the west is very unlikely. The logical location is either directly off SH84 to the north or from Three Parks to the east. From the north this would mean either a single access point to serve these two sites and Three Parks, or more than one access point onto the state highway which would not be supported by NZTA. From the east this would mean an access point onto the Three Parks main street around the area identified as Tourism and Community Facilities Subzone.
						PC4-F50	NZ Transport Agency. Ian McCabe	Oppose	Oppose access to 124 State highway 84 to be directly off State Highway 84. NZTA anticipates development in the Three Parks and North Three Parks area will utilise a common connection to State highway 84. NZTA anticipates that when land adjoining the State highway has reasonable practicable alternative legal access to some other road then the existing additional State highway accesses will be permanently and physically closed. NZTA considers that having additional accesses onto the State highway could adversely affect its safety and functionality.
						PC4-F51	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. The Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Moseby property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 area.
						PC4-F52	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-19		RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that access is provided from Three Parks to their property (124 State Highway 84) through their boundary.				

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F53	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The design of the roading network shown on the Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide a logical connection into the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. The location of the intersection from the state highway into Three Parks is in such a position as to prevent direct access to the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. So there is no direct roading access into the northern area of the plan change. NZTA's submission prevents these two sites from developing further access points onto SH84. The North Three Parks Structure Plan provides for access to these two sites in the most logical position from the south but the timing of construction of this access depends on the development of this area of Three Parks and of land owned by Ballantyne Investments. Access to this area from the west is very unlikely. The logical location is either directly off SH84 to the north or from Three Parks to the east. From the north this would mean either a single access point to serve these two sites and Three Parks, or more than one access point onto the State highway which would not be supported by NZTA. From the east this would mean an access point onto the Three Parks main street around the area identified as Tourism and Community Facilities Subzone.
						PC4-F54	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. The Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Moseby property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 area.
						PC4-F55	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-20		RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that no change in rates due to the zone change occurs until the first stages of development have begun.				
						PC4-F56	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	Provided no rates are increased until services are at our boundaries.
						PC4-F57	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. The Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Moseby property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 area.
						PC4-F58	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-21	Queenstown Lakes District Council	Roger Taylor	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That the Plan Change be approved provided it ensures good resource management outcomes are achieved in particular for: (i) Urban design (ii) Open space and recreation networks (iii) Transportation networks, connectivity and safety (iv) Infrastructure provision including provision of water, collection and disposal of wastewater and stormwater (v) Landscape protection				

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F59	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	Transportation provision has not been made into north North Three Parks area-alignment shown in PC 4 is circuitous and the Council has reneged on its planning. The alignment of the roundabout would be safer if moved 100m north from the proposed site. Now is the time to plan this, not regret this later.
						PC4-F60	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The plan change has been developed from a review of landscape, urban design, open space, transportation and infrastructure constraints in order to ensure that the plan change achieves good resource management and urban design outcomes.
						PC4-F61	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The plan change should be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan as it has been developed through a community process and to ensure harmonious development of the town. PC 4 needs to be consistent with the WSP to be compatible with the Three Parks Special zone in terms of land use, roading and open space. PC4 is inconsistent with the WSP in that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not include the road identified in the WSP on the northern boundary of the PC4 land, connecting Ballantyne Road with State Highway 84 (SH84)</li> <li>• it extend extends the business subzone further along Ballantyne Road than the WSP provides for.</li> </ul> The PC4 Open Space Plan does not show the open space buffer between the Three Parks Commercial Core and the PC4 medium density residential area, as identified in the North Three Parks Urban Design Concept Plan. This area of open space is important in protecting the amenity of the future residents from the effects of activities in the Three Parks commercial core.
						PC4-F62	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Partly Support	Transportation networks and connectivity issues have not satisfactorily been addressed in the Urban design plan for all landowners in North Three Parks.
PC4-22		Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that the property (110 State Highway 84) is provided access from the state highway or access from the neighbouring Three Parks development.				
						PC4-F63	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The design of the roading network shown on the Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide a logical connection into the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. The location of the intersection from the state highway into Three Parks is in such a position as to prevent direct access to the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. So there is no direct roading access into the northern area of the plan change. NZTA's submission prevents these two sites from developing further access points onto SH84. The North Three Parks Structure Plan provides for access to these two sites in the most logical position from the south but the timing of construction of this access depends on the development of this area of Three Parks and of land owned by Ballantyne Investments. Access to this area from the west is very unlikely. The logical location is either directly off SH84 to the north or from Three Parks to the east. From the north this would mean either a single access point to serve these two sites and Three Parks, or more than one access point onto the state highway which would not be supported by NZTA. From the east this would mean an access point onto the Three Parks main street around the area identified as Tourism and Community Facilities Subzone.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F64	NZ Transport Agency. Ian McCabe	Oppose	Opposes the property (110 State highway) having access from the State Highway 84. NZTA anticipates development in the Three Parks and North Three Parks area will utilise a common connection to State highway 84. NZTA anticipates that when land adjoining the State highway has reasonable practicable alternative legal access to some other road then the existing additional State highway accesses will be permanently and physically closed. NZTA considers that having additional accesses onto the State highway could adversely affect its safety and functionality.
						PC4-F65	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. Notwithstanding this, the proposed Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Robertson property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 Zone
						PC4-F66	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	There is no logical access via SH 84 in the urban design Plan to encourage development due to the zone change.
PC4-23		Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that a road is taken off the proposed roundabout for access into this northern part of North Three Parks when development of this area occurs.				
						PC4-F67	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The design of the roading network shown on the Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide a logical connection into the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. The location of the intersection from the state highway into Three Parks is in such a position as to prevent direct access to the submitters' property and the neighbouring site. So there is no direct roading access into the northern area of the plan change. NZTA's submission prevents these two sites from developing further access points onto SH84. The North Three Parks Structure Plan provides for access to these two sites in the most logical position from the south but the timing of construction of this access depends on the development of this area of Three Parks and of land owned by Ballantyne Investments. Access to this area from the west is very unlikely. The logical location is either directly off SH84 to the north or from Three Parks to the east. From the north this would mean either a single access point to serve these two sites and Three Parks, or more than one access point onto the state highway which would not be supported by NZTA. From the east this would mean an access point onto the Three Parks main street around the area identified as Tourism and Community Facilities Subzone.
						PC4-F68	NZ Transport Agency. Ian McCabe	Oppose	Opposes a road being taken off the proposed roundabout for access into this northern part of North Three parks when development occurs in this area. NZTA anticipates development in the Three Parks and North Three Parks area will utilise a common connection to State highway 84. NZTA anticipates that when land adjoining the State highway has reasonable practicable alternative legal access to some other road then the existing additional State highway accesses will be permanently and physically closed. NZTA considers that having additional accesses onto the State highway could adversely affect its safety and functionality.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F69	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. The Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Robertson property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 area.
						PC4-F70	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	There is no logical access via SH 84 in the urban design Plan to encourage development due to the zone change.
PC4-24		Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Support the Plan Change provided that there is no increase in rates until services are in place to the boundary of the property.				
						PC4-F71	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Oppose	The design of the Three Parks roundabout is not a matter for PC4. The Three Parks roundabout could not accommodate a private access to the Robertson property due to its location. The submitter should engage with the landowners of PC4 to develop a suitable access solution within the PC4 area.
						PC4-F72	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	
PC4-25		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion of incorporation of 27 Ballantyne Road into the development.				
						PC4-F73	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The submitter's site should be included in the plan change so as to enable comprehensive and integrated planning of all the area between Three Parks and the golf course. An isolated Rural General zoning surrounded by Three Parks zone may not result in integrated planning or the best resource management or urban design outcomes. The Plan Change does not require any action from the submitter, the submitter has the ability to retain the site as it is currently or to take advantage of the additional development opportunities presented by the plan change.
PC4-26		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about the stormwater treatment/soakage and attenuation/storage, public open space, neighbourhood/linear park and landscape screening and in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocated to part of our property and not wanted or agreed to</li> <li>• Exact intended utilization</li> <li>• Suitability of this site</li> <li>• Ground composition suitability</li> <li>• Alternative sites</li> </ul>				
						PC4-F74	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The submitter's property includes a closed depression that currently receives stormwater from the upstream catchment (to the west of Ballantyne Road and a small part of the golf course to the north) outside the Plan Change area. The stormwater analysis contained in the Infrastructure Report (Appendix 2 to the Plan Change) identifies the submitter's property as the location for the treatment and disposal of this stormwater, as this is the only location that this can occur without pumping.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-27		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about roading and in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usage of paper road along Golf Course - vehicle traffic, bikes, pedestrians</li> <li>• Driveway entrances/exits</li> <li>• Joining up of planned roads</li> </ul>				
						PC4-F75	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The paper road referred to is a leg-in strip owned by Ballantyne Investments Ltd and managed as part of the submitter's property. This strip has been identified in the Plan Change as a key link in the continuous linear park along the edge of the golf course. There is some concern about the adequacy of sight distances for additional access points on to Ballantyne Road, the proximity of the vehicle and pedestrian access into the golf course and the intersection of Golf Course Road. So no additional access points onto Ballantyne Road into the submitter's site are identified, but that the urban design framework shows two proposed roads entering the site (from the south and the east) and a further road runs along the boundary. Vehicle access to the site need not change until future site development.
						PC4-F76	NJ Harris	Partly Support	I have no knowledge of the paper road existing but it would make some sense for a road to be constructed the full length of the Golf Course boundary. This would be one way to partially alleviate shading of residential dwellings and protect the Golf Club from litigation from property owners who have damage from stray golf balls.
PC4-28		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about trees in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf Course boundary trees</li> <li>• Protection of outlook</li> <li>• Size of boundary trees</li> <li>• Existing trees</li> </ul>				
						PC4-F77	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Support	Support submission on Golf Course boundary trees.
						PC4-F78	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The urban design concept for development in the North Three Parks area and the North Three Parks Structure Plan provide for a linear reserve along the golf club boundary. There is also a requirement for buildings to be set back a further 10 metres from the boundary of the linear reserve. This means that development is to be set back 25 metres from the golf club boundary. The purpose of these controls is to ensure that there is adequate separation between the golf club and development to avoid ball strike and to allow access to sunlight for future development. Ballantyne Investments do not agree to a covenant on shading.
						PC4-F79	NJ Harris	Partly Support	I have no knowledge of the paper road existing but it would make some sense for a road to be constructed the full length of the Golf Course boundary. This would be one way to partially alleviate shading of residential dwellings and protect the Golf Club from litigation from property owners who have damage from stray golf balls.
PC4-29		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about land contours in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural contours to be retained rather than modification</li> </ul>				

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
						PC4-F80	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	Some modification to the land will be needed.
							NJ Harris	Partly Support	I have no knowledge of the paper road existing but it would make some sense for a road to be constructed the full length of the Golf Course boundary. This would be one way to partially alleviate shading of residential dwellings and protect the Golf Club from litigation from property owners who have damage from stray golf balls.
PC4-30		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about septic tank in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewer mains hook up</li> </ul>				
						PC4-F81	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The submitter's site is an enclosed depression without a wastewater connection. It is anticipated that this site (and only a small area of land to the west, outside the site) will be serviced by a wastewater pump station to be constructed at the time of future development. The existing wastewater treatment and disposal system for the house can remain until the pump station associated with future development is required.
						PC4-F82	NJ Harris	Partly Support	I have no knowledge of the paper road existing but it would make some sense for a road to be constructed the full length of the Golf Course boundary. This would be one way to partially alleviate shading of residential dwellings and protect the Golf Club from litigation from property owners who have damage from stray golf balls.
PC4-31		Simon Spencer-Bower	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	Discussion about existing usage in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of existing user rights</li> </ul>				
						PC4-F83	NJ Harris	Partly Support	I have no knowledge of the paper road existing but it would make some sense for a road to be constructed the full length of the Golf Course boundary. This would be one way to partially alleviate shading of residential dwellings and protect the Golf Club from litigation from property owners who have damage from stray golf balls.
PC4-32	NZ Transport Agency	Ian McCabe	Support	Whole Plan Change	The Plan Change be adopted as it is an integrated land use and transport solution to the on-going growth of Wanaka as it coordinates the development of the North Three Parks site with that of adjacent Three Parks Zone.				
						PC4-F84	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	Support submitter's comments on plan change as offering an integrated transport and land use solution that will integrate with Three Parks and that the plan change provides for a logical direction for Wanaka's future growth.
						PC4-F85	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Supports the use of a common single state highway access for Three Parks and North Three Parks provided the internal road network is appropriate and ensures the most efficient traffic flow through the site and onto the State Highway.
						PC4-F86	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Support	

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-33	NZ Transport Agency	Ian McCabe	Support	Whole Plan Change	The Plan Change be adopted as it utilizes the Three Parks main road and its intersection with the State highway thereby eliminating the need to create any additional intersections onto State Highway 84.				
						PC4-F87	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	Transit also need to consider access into north North Three Parks from SH84 as this area is disadvantaged and not being considered by Three Parks. Access is totally reliant on Ballantyne Investments or any other developer for access. A slip road off any roundabout or alignment, or another separate road is needed to feed this area. North North Three Parks is isolated without and it is dangerous if any emergency should arise.
						PC4-F88	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	Support submitter's comment but note concerns about providing logical access to two properties in plan change area adjacent to state highway, and access that is not dependant on the development of land owned by Ballantyne Investments or Willowridge.
						PC4-F89	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Supports the use of a common single state highway access for Three Parks and North Three Parks provided the internal road network is appropriate and ensures the most efficient traffic flow through the site and onto the State Highway.
						PC4-F90	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	SH 84 access to North Three Parks via Three Parks does not provide a logical roading connection for landowners that front onto SH84. This raises the issue of additional access points off SH84.
PC4-34	NZ Transport Agency	Ian McCabe	Support	Structure Plan	That the Plan Change be adopted as the structure plan establishes appropriate connectivity and promotes better efficiency of the network.				
						PC4-F91	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Support	The Structure Plan provides for appropriate connectivity and promoting efficiency of transport network between land owned by Ballantyne Investments and Willowridge Developments and Ballantyne Investments and the two land owners to the north.
						PC4-F92	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Supports the use of a common single state highway access for Three Parks and North Three Parks provided the internal road network is appropriate and ensures the most efficient traffic flow through the site and onto the State Highway.
						PC4-F93	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Structure Plan provides good and appropriate connectivity for the bulk of PC4 but the Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide an efficient roading pattern for, or connectivity with the northern area of PC4.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-35	NZ Transport Agency	Ian McCabe	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	<p>The Plan Change is amended to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on North Three Parks land by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increasing the width of the open space land adjacent to the SH 84 road reserve: or</li> <li>• requiring all residential dwellings, visitor accommodation and retirement villages within 80 metres of the seal edge of SH84 to meet the following requirement:</li> </ul> <p>(i) New residential buildings, visitor accommodation and retirement villages located within 80 m of the seal edge of the State highway shall be designed and constructed to meet noise performance standards for noise from traffic on State highway 84 that will not exceed 35dBA Leq(24hr) in bedrooms and 40dBA Leq(24hr) for other habitable rooms in accordance with the satisfactory sound levels recommended by Australian and New Zealand Standards AS/NZ2107:2000 Acoustics-recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors.</p> <p>This shall take account of any increases in noise from projected traffic growth during a period of not less than 10 years from the commencement of construction of the</p>				
						PC4-F94	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose/Support	If the roundabout goes in and the speed lowered to 50km for safety reasons an 80m reserve would not be needed. It would be a waste of land which could be put to better use. Some extra building requirements should be met if a problem exists.
						PC4-F95	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	Reverse sensitivity from traffic noise on the SH is acknowledged. The open space area adjacent to the SH partially mitigates this effect. Increasing the width of this open space area is opposed. Noise mitigation of all residential buildings and visitor accommodation within 80 of the highway is also opposed. It is likely that as a result of the construction of the future SH intersection that the speed limit will be reduced to or below 70km/h. As a result the area NZTA will seek to cover with the noise performance standard may drop from 80m to 40m.
						PC4-F96	Willowridge Developments Ltd. Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Supports the use of a common single state highway access for Three Parks and North Three Parks provided the internal road network is appropriate and ensures the most efficient traffic flow through the site and onto the State highway.
						PC4-F97	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Imposing an 80 metre setback at this stage is inappropriate. Consideration should be given to setbacks when SH84 access points have been finalised as there could possibly be a reduction to the 80Km/hr speed environment that may result in a lesser area required to mitigate against traffic noise.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-36	Wanaka Golf Club		Neither Support nor Oppose	Whole Plan Change	The Golf Club does not wish to ever remove the trees from the boundary with the North Three Parks as they are needed for safety from flying golf balls especially if development goes ahead.				
						PC4-F98	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	In 2009 I wrote to and met with the Golf Course about the problems the trees were causing. As neighbours the height, massive branches low over our drive, pine cones everywhere and seedling pines constantly causing problems in my front paddock along the fence line and around my implement shed. The Golf Club agreed to top the trees by 2/3rds and trim some branches in the next years budget. After a year I contacted them again but got nowhere. I am still waiting with the problem getting worse and losing more sunlight. A 25 m buffer is proposed and covenants can be put in place on new neighbours properties for ball strike.
						PC4-F99	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Neutral	The urban design concept for development in the North Three Parks area and the North Three Parks Structure Plan provide for a linear reserve along the golf club boundary. There is also a requirement for buildings to be set back a further 10 metres from the boundary of the linear reserve. This means that development is to be set back 25 metres from the golf club boundary. The purpose of these controls is to ensure that there is adequate separation between the golf club and development to avoid ball strike and to allow access to sunlight for future development. Ballantyne Investments do not agree to a covenant on shading.
						PC4-F100	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	There needs to be a maximum tree height established to mitigate shading effects to be consistent with the Wanaka Golf Club trees that run parallel with McPherson Street.
PC4-37	Willowridge Developments Ltd	Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That the Plan Change is amended to be consistent with the Wanaka Structure Plan in its entirety.				
						PC4-F101	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Partly Support	PC4 takes into account the changes that have occurred since the Wanaka Structure Plan was developed in 2007 including the Three Parks Plan Change and the Wanaka Sports facilities. The extent of medium and low density residential better supports these activities in this area.
						PC4-F102	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	The uses are in accordance with the Wanaka Structure Plan and the Plan Change provides logical and appropriate locations for the boundary between medium and low density residential and business. The Wanaka Structure Plan identifies an area of business in the Plan change area. The business zoning in the plan change provides a logical extent for business uses given existing activities including the electrical substation and business on the opposite side of Ballantyne Road and proposed residential uses to the east and south. The plan change takes into account the development pattern on adjacent land and the proposed Wanaka sports facilities that were not contemplated when the structure plan was completed in 2007. The areas of medium and low density residential have been designed to provide for the best possible resource management and urban design outcomes and provide densities to support the adjacent commercial core, sports facilities and the transport network.
						PC4-F103	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Wanaka Structure Plan is now 5 years old. Things have changed in this area including Three Parks Plan Change and the Wanaka Sports Facility. The North Three Parks Structure Plan takes these changes into account.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-38	Willowridge Developments Ltd	Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That the Plan Change is amended to ensure that there be clear evidence of sufficient demand for the development of PC4 before development land is released. A suitable deferment method built into the objectives, policies and rules requiring the progressive development of the land once demand has been proven is appropriate.				
						PC4-F104	Susan Robertson for Robertson Family Trust	Oppose	It looks like Willowridge is seeking to enable all of their land to be developed before all other developments, which would be an unfair advantage over other landowners in the North Three Parks Area.
						PC4-F105	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	This submission is an attempt by a trade competitor to gain a commercial advantage. There is a clear benefit in avoiding a monopoly provider of residential or business sections in a market.
						PC4-F106	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Willowridge opposes PC4 as a trade competitor solely to gain commercial advantage.
PC4-39	Willowridge Developments Ltd	Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That the PC4 Structure Plan, staging (i.e. servicing) roading design and open space overlay are amended to ensure compatibly with the adjacent Three Parks Special Zone.				
						PC4-F107	Ballantyne Investments Ltd. Neil Matchett	Oppose	An agreement exists between Ballantyne Investments and Willowridge Developments regarding infrastructure. The roading pattern is consistent with that shown on the Three Parks Structure Plan. The road linkage sought is provided for by the central collector road shown on the North Three Parks Structure Plan. This is the optimal location for this connection to Ballantyne Road due to sight distance limitations, intersection and potential pedestrian conflict and timing of development. The location proposed by the submitter would not be feasible. An additional access to the SH would alleviate concerns raised by submitters but appears not to be supported by NZTA. The open space area adjacent to the Three Parks Commercial core is for stormwater treatment and disposal. The location of this area is subject to detailed design and final location. The commercial core should be designed to provide an active and attractive interface with adjacent residential land and any buffering should be within the commercial core area.
						PC4-F108	RS Moseby and MF Gordon	Oppose	Single access off SH84 does not provide a satisfactory outcome for all landowners in North Three Parks. Additional access off SH84 would resolve capacity issues and provide for good connectivity for landowners fronting SH84. The buffer zone between the commercial core in Three Parks and medium density residential area in North Three Parks may not be required, given co-operation and continuity of development in this area. The Three Parks Structure Plan does not provide roading access and infrastructure connection to service the northern area of this plan change. Willowridge submits staging and servicing requirements need to be worked through and agreed to with adjacent developer. There is more than one developer affected by PC4.

Submission number	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Position	Plan Provision	Original Decision Requested	Further Submission ID	Further Submitter	Position	Reason
PC4-40	Willowridge Developments Ltd	Claire Hunter	Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	That all other necessary consequential changes are made to the objectives, policies, rules and other methods necessary to give effect to the relief sought above.				