



SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED FOR PLAN CHANGE 41

Further submissions due

Name Adamson, Tony

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Full support for plan change as there is a real need in the area for affordable sections.	41/1/1

Name Air New Zealand Limited

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	That the plan change be adopted subject to the following conditions: A) ANZL acknowledges and supports that Plan Change 41 proposes that residential development be prohibited within the new Outer Control Boundary (OCB) as proposed in Plan Change 35. However, in the event that the proposed new OCB be amended (ie expanded) during the Plan Change 35 process (as occurred during the process for Plan Change 19) ANZL seeks to ensure that such amendments will be reflected in the Plan Change 41 process. B) ANZL supports and acknowledges the proposition in Plan Change 41 to impose insulation and acoustic controls on buildings so as to meet an indoor design level of 40 dBA Ldn over the whole of the Plan Change area. However ANZL seeks clarification that compliance with these controls through the installation of acoustic insulation is to be the responsibility of land owners and not of Queenstown Airport Corporation. C) ANZL has reviewed the existing private covenants that exist over some parts of the land subject to Plan Change 41. ANZL supports these covenants as a useful supplement to comprehensive planning controls in protecting the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects arising from residential development near the OCB. However ANZL seeks, as a matter of consistency and good practice, that the covenants be extended to cover the whole of the land subject to Plan Change 41.	41/2/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/2/1.

The Plan provisions in PC41 provide appropriate insulation and acoustic controls. If these provisions are not complied with then the matter becomes an issue of compliance which the QLDC controls.

Covenants between landowners are a private matter and should be dealt with outside the Act

LMP agrees there should be no residential development within the OCB

Queenstown Airport Corporation

Support

41/2/1.

ANZL has made submissions to ensure that any expansion for the PC35 Outer Control Boundary resulting from the PC35 hearing process is reflected in PC41. Through PC35 QAC is seeking to safeguard the ability of Queenstown Airport to grow as projected to 2037. QAC therefore supports the full extent of the PC35 QCB being included in PC41 to ensure the future growth of the Airport is not compromised by issues of reverse sensitivity.

ANZL supports and acknowledges the proposition in PC41 to impose insulation and acoustic controls on buildings in the zone. QAC has made submissions in support of this and to extend the requirement to mechanical ventilation to allow windows and doors to enable windows and doors to remain closed if required by the occupier.

ANZL has sought clarification that compliance with these controls (ie funding) be the responsibility of the land owners and not of QAC. QAC considers that it is reasonable for QAC to be responsible for funding acoustic insulation works to new activities sensitive to aircraft noise that choose to establish on land in the vicinity of the Airport. For this reason QAC supports the ANZL submission.

ANZL identifies that some private covenants in favour of QAC exist over parts of the land subject to PC41. ANZL submits that the covenants should be extended to cover the whole of the land subject to PC41. QAC considers such covenants to be a useful tool in safeguarding current and future operations at the Airport and for highlighting to prospective property purchasers that aircraft noise is a potential issue. For this reason QAC supports the ANZL submission.

Name Aitken, Charlotte

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	100% support, great location, amazing concept. Looking after Queenstown as a tourist destination.	41/3/1

Name Anderson, Janet

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the Shotover Country Plan Change	41/4/1

Name Anderson, Robert

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change.	41/5/1

Name Archer, Nathan

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support all provisions. Flat land will be good for building.	41/6/1

Name Arith Holdings Limited

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------

Oppose	Plan Change 41	Decline the Plan Change or:	41/7/1
--------	----------------	-----------------------------	--------

A) Require the proponents of Plan Change 41 to undertake a comprehensive and proper section 32 analysis in accordance with the principles and practice adopted by the Council on previous plan changes;

B) Amend Plan Change 41 to ensure it meets Part 2 of the Act including, but not limited to, avoiding, mitigating or remedying adverse effects in respect to traffic, landscape, visual, earthworks, flooding, infrastructure and reverse sensitivity effects in relation to the Airport;

C) Amend Plan Change 41 with all consequential relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought above.

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Oppose

41/7/1.

PC 41 appropriately remedies and mitigates any adverse effects on the environment

PC41 provides sufficient recreation opportunities

The Section 32 analysis adequately addresses the effects of PC41

The changes proposed by PC41 is an appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the Act and advancing the provisions of the District Plan

Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Resource Management Act.

NZ Transport Agency

Support

41/7/1.

Support the following parts of this submission:

PC41 fails to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse traffic effects and infrastructural effects;

The Section 32 analysis does not adequately or fully assess or address the effects of PC41;

PC41 is inconsistent with non-statutory, but relevant studies and strategies including Tomorrows Queenstown, the Growth Options Study and the Growth Management Strategy.

Name Bagrie, Joe and Lu

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------

Support	Plan Change 41	Total support for Plan Change 41	41/8/1
---------	----------------	----------------------------------	--------

Name Beal, Ross

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------

Support	Plan Change 41	Supports the applicant with respect to this development.	41/9/1
---------	----------------	--	--------

Name Black, Kelly

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------

Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that the whole plan change be allowed.	41/10/1
---------	----------------	---	---------

Name Boland, Dion and Tasha

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change	41/11/1

Name Bond, Anne

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Seeks that the whole of the Plan Change be allowed	41/12/1

Name Bond, Desiree

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the whole plan change	41/13/1

Name Brennan, Michael

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change as would like to be able to buy an affordable section in Queenstown and as an electrician the increase in building industry may provide job prospects.	41/14/1

Name Britton, Jean and Robert

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Road access via Old School Road	That road access to the subdivision be via Stalker Road only and that Old School Road be permanently closed where it reaches the Stalker Farm property.	41/15/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Support</i>	41/15/1.
	PC 41 is to be served through Stalker Road and Howards Drive		
	LMP agrees PC41 should not be served via Old School Road. Appropriate provisions should be put in place to ensure this.		

Name Browning, Jocelyn

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change	41/16/1

Name Burdon, Kevin J

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change	41/17/1

Name Burdon, Patricia Ann

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change	41/18/1

Name *Burke, Stephen*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change	41/19/1

Name *Chisholm, Beth*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change	41/20/1

Name *Coomer, Rebecca Jane*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Road access via Old School Road	Alternate vehicle access to proposed development. Current access will be unsafe and is not adequate for increased traffic plan.	41/21/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership PC 41 is to be serviced through Stalker Road and Howards Drive	<i>Support</i>	41/21/1.
	LMP agrees PC41 should not be serviced via Old School Road. Appropriate provisions should be put in place to ensure this.		

Name *Costello, Paula*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	That Council decline the proposed plan change.	41/22/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership PC 41 reflects sound resource management principles and is appropriate to accommodate for future growth of Queenstown	<i>Oppose</i>	41/22/1.
	PC41 is appropriate in regards to affordability, energy efficiency and the vibrancy and viability of the existing Queenstown/ Frankton centre		
	PC41 does not derogate from the natural landscape to the extent it is not in accordance with sustainable management		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Resource Management Act		

Name *Cousins, Maria*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	That the whole plan change be disallowed.	41/23/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership PC 41 does not alter the landscape in a manner which is inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act	<i>Oppose</i>	41/23/1.
	PC41 does not threaten to damage the reputation of Queenstown or New Zealand		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Resource Management Act.		

Name *Cullimore, Caroline*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support new subdivision of Shotover Country - need for affordable properties.	41/24/1

Name *Cullimore, Samantha*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the new subdivision of Shotover Country to go ahead.	41/25/1

Name Cushen, John

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Supply of rural water	Support plan change in that it will provide an excellent gravity fed water system for properties in the area.	41/26/1

Name David Reid Homes (Southern Lakes) Ltd

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the proposed plan change for a comprehensively master planned new zone to provide for both residential needs and community needs in the Ladies Mile / Lake Hayes Estate area.	41/27/1

Name Davidson, Melissa

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Disallow entire plan change as it is not needed given that the area is already zoned rural residential. Concerned by the loss of visual amenity, which is what attracts visitors to the district. Alternatives like Jacks Point already meet demand for this type of development.	41/28/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership <i>Oppose</i>	41/28/1.
		PC 41 does not result in a loss of visual amenity to an extent that is inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act	
		There are no reasonable alternatives to PC41 within the Queenstown Lakes District	
		Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Resource Management Act	

Name Deasy, Blair and Lisa

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change. It would be a good place to live.	41/29/1

Name Dixon, Emma

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that all of the proposal should be allowed.	41/30/1

Name Duffy, Matt

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the go ahead for the new subdivision at Shotover Country.	41/31/1

Name Dunford, Denise

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support all of Shotover Country residential zone. Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	41/32/1

Name Fiskin, Fabian

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that the whole of the plan change be allowed.	41/33/1

Name Fleck, K

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Full support	41/34/1

Name Fleck, Michael

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that the whole of the plan change be allowed. Great concept, good location.	41/35/1

Name Fleck, Raewyn

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that the whole of the plan change be allowed. Great concept, great location.	41/36/1

Name Fleck, Richard

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	100% support great location and concept.	41/37/1

Name Gain, Mike

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	In favour of the whole plan change being allowed. It's another much needed subdivision development which Queenstown needs.	41/38/1

Name Gallie, Ben

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Full support of plan change	41/39/1

Name Gaston-Scott, Sarah

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support - affordable living in Queenstown, family oriented, great access ways.	41/40/1

Name Genet, Brendon

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41.	41/41/1

Name Genet, Philippa

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41	41/42/1

Name Gerard, Dan

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Roading	Amend roading to a grid pattern.	41/43/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/43/1.
	The roading system that has been designed meets the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act and represents sound planning practice		
	PC41s traffic design will achieve appropriate urban design outcomes		

Name Gillingham, Peta

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the whole of the plan change.	41/44/1

Name Gjaja, Robert

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	That the whole plan change be allowed.	41/45/1

Name Glenda Drive Ltd

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support whole plan change.	41/46/1

Name Glubb, Lisa

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/47/1

Name Goldsmith, Terry

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/48/1

Name Grave, Emma

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/49/1

Name Grave, Yvonne Joyce

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/50/1

Name Guthrie, Max

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety.	41/51/1

Name Guy, Lisa

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Oppose the plan change in its entirety	41/52/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/52/1.
	There is an ample supply of land zoned for rural and lifestyle purposes in the District		
	PC41 is the most efficient use of the relevant land		
	Granting relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and Resource Management Act		

Name Haywood, Sheena

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	That the plan change be disallowed.	41/53/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/53/1.
	PC 41 is not contrary to the objectives and policies of the District Plan		
	PC41 will not have more than minor effect upon the landscape and visual amenity of the Wakatipu Basin		
	PC41 is not contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act		
	PC41 will not significantly reduce amenity values, quality of the environment, or have significant visual impact upon residents		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management practice under the District Plan and Resource Management Act		

Name Henry, Michael Paul & Maureen
Elizabeth

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	The Plan Change in entirety	41/54/1

Name Hensman, Grant

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/55/1

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	<p>The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (the Trust) supports the protection of Hicks Cottage and commends the intention of the proponents of Plan Change 41 for their proactive approach towards protecting an item of significance to the District's Heritage.</p> <p>The Trust supports the creation of Activity Area 4 as a heritage precinct containing Hicks Cottage.</p> <p>The Trust is concerned that the intention stated in the Objectives and Policies is not carried through into the Rules and Assessment Matters that relate to Activity Area 4.</p> <p>Policies 2.8 and 4.1 provide for the creation of a heritage precinct. Activity Area 4 is subsequently incorporated into the Structure Plan for the Zone in accordance with Implementation method (i)(a).</p> <p>Implementation Method (i)(b) under Objective 4 and its associated policies states that the provisions will be implemented through a number of Methods, including Rules and Assessment Matters controlling activities within Activity Area 4.</p> <p>The Trust considers that the Objectives and Policies as drafted provide a good framework for the ongoing protection of Hicks Cottage and the heritage precinct within which it is located. However, the Trust is concerned that this protection is insufficiently carried through into the Rules and Assessment Matters for the Zone.</p> <p>The Trust acknowledges that Hicks Cottage is to be included in the Council's register of Historic Buildings as a Category 3 item. This categorisation will require that any proposals to develop Hicks Cottage will require resource consent pursuant to the Heritage Rules in the Plan. However, there are no Rules or Assessment Matters that indicate how Activity Area 4 as a precinct is intended to be managed. The Trust considers much matters should be included within the plan change to ensure any development of Activity Area 4 is sympathetic to identified heritage values.</p> <p>There are few Rules that establish the nature of appropriate activities in Activity Area 4. Apart from Rules introduced into Part 15 of the Plan regarding lot size and density, and bulk and location controls introduced into Part 12 of the Plan, there is nothing in the Rules that relates to the heritage precinct or identifies any values against which applications can be assessed.</p> <p>The Trust considers that Plan Change 41 should include the following matters in order to establish an appropriate framework for the protections of Hicks Cottage and the Heritage Precinct created by the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A Description of the Values of Activity Area 4 that are to be protected and maintained through the development process. ii) Establishment of Rules that guide appropriate development of Activity Area 4. iii) Inclusion of Assessment Matters that allow for applications within Activity Area 4 to be assessed in relation to the heritage values of the cottage and its setting. <p>The Trust considers that while the intention to protect Hicks Cottage is clear, the intention is not sufficiently carried through into the Rules and Assessment Matters, despite the intention being stated in the text of the plan change. As a result, the nature of activities intended for Activity Area 4 is unclear. The Trust is concerned that in the absence of clear Rules and an appropriate assessment framework the heritage values of the cottage and Activity Area 4 could be adversely affected when applications are made to implement the zone.</p> <p>The Trust would be willing to discuss these matters with the Council prior to any hearing in order to develop appropriate wording to be incorporated into the plan change.</p>	41/56/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/56/1.

LMP acknowledges the concerns raised by NZHPT

LMP acknowledges that the plan provisions in PC41 that relate to Hicks Cottage may need amending to address the concerns raised by the submitters submission

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	That the whole of the plan change be allowed. Choice of locations for employees to live. Sections that are reasonably priced.	41/57/1

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	That the whole of the plan change be allowed.	41/58/1

Name Hutton, Toni

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	That the whole of the plan change be allowed.	41/59/1

Name Imajine Property Group Limited

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	That the plan change be rejected in its entirety.	41/60/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/60/1.
	PC 41 avoids cumulative degradation of the landscape, achieves energy efficiency and is a development consistent with maintaining landscape values		
	The Plan Change to establish Urban Growth Boundaries provides a framework for urban boundaries but does not impose urban boundaries		
	The Section 32 analysis is no inadequate		
	PC41 provides for a high level of residential amenity		
	PC41 reflects the purpose and principles of th Act		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Resource Management Act		

Name Inder, Craig

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change for the following reasons: i) The site is appropriate for urbanisation when compared to other rural general areas in te Wakatipu Basin; ii)The proposed zoning provides for community needs in terms of residential demand for affordability, open space, recreational facilities and educational facilities; iii) The proposal provides for landscape and wetland protection,	41/61/1
	Further Submissions - Shotover Park Limited	<i>Partly Support</i>	41/61/1.
	Shotover Park Limited (SPL) does not consider that the site is appropriate for "urbanisation". The term "urbanisation" is broad and could include, for example, industrial and commercial development. SPL opposes those types of activities within the site.		
	SPL supports residential development within the site.		

Name *Jacks Point Limited*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Decline the plan change or; i) Require the proponent to undertake a comprehensive and proper Section 32 analysis; ii) Amend Plan Change 41 to ensure it meets Part II of the Act including avoiding, remedying or mitigating traffic, landscape, visual amenity, earthworks, flooding, infrastructure, and reverse sensitivity effects; iii) Provide sufficient recreational opportunities; iv) Address the issue of consistency with non statutory studies and strategies such as Tomorrow's Queenstown, Growth Options Study and Growth Management Strategy. Amend Plan Change 41 with all consequential relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought above.	41/62/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Oppose

41/62/1.

The objectives and policies proposed by PC41 do not fail to achieve the principles of the Act

PC41 provides sufficient recreational opportunities

PC41 reflects sound resource management practice

The Section 32 analysis adequately and fully addresses the effect of PC41

The objectives and policies, rules and other provisions of PC41 are the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the Act

Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act

NZ Transport Agency

Support

41/62/1.

Support the following parts of this submission:

PC41 fails to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse traffic effects and infrastructural effects;

The Section 32 analysis does not adequately or fully assess or address the effects of PC41;

PC41 is inconsistent with non-statutory, but relevant studies and strategies including Tomorrows Queenstown, the Growth Options Study and the Growth Management Strategy.

Name *Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Decline the plan change.	41/63/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i> 41/63/1.
		The objectives and policies contained in PC41 achieve the purpose of the Act	
		The Section 32 analysis is not inadequate	
		PC41 reflects sustainable management principles	
		Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act	

Name *Jackson, Debbie*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41	41/64/1

Name *Jackson, Kelvin*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Fully support the whole plan change.	41/65/1

Name Johnston, James

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change 100%.	41/66/1

Name Johnston, Kirsty

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change 100%.	41/67/1

Name Jones, Graeme

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the application in full.	41/68/1

Name Jones, Rusell

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change in full.	41/69/1

Name Jones, Ruth

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the application for reasons listed below; i) Great family living conditions ii) Would enhance Lake Hayes Estate.	41/70/1

Name Jones, Simon

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in full.	41/71/1

Name Kidd, Aaron

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change.	41/72/1

Name Kirk, Jamie

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change in full.	41/73/1

Name Knight, Hayden

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	The whole proposal is allowed to go ahead.	41/74/1

Name Lake Hayes Estate Community
Association Inc

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Schooling, Visibility	That the whole of the submission be allowed.	41/75/1

Name Lamont, Carol and Edwin

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change.	41/76/1

Name Lattimore, Fiona

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support this subdivision as it allows fantastic family living with warm sun and school potential is great.	41/77/1

Name Lemaire-Sicre, Keri and Roland

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	That plan change 41 not be granted.	41/78/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/78/1.
	PC41 does not compromise the visual amenity of the area in a manner that is inconsistent with sustainable management		
	PC41 will not result in the overdomestication of the Wakatipu Basin		
	PC41 will not result in adverse reverse sensitivity issues		
	PC41 will not result in safety issues		
	PC41 reflects sound resource management principles and planning		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act		

Name Macdonald, Stephen John

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41.	41/79/1

Name McCashin, Todd

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	I support Shotover County Plan Change.	41/80/1

Name McLellan, Hugh

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change.	41/81/1

Name McLeod, Peter & Jenny

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the proposal in its entirety. That approval be given to Plan Change 41.	41/82/1

Name McMillan, Geraldine

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support whole plan change.	41/83/1

Name Melhop, Bryn

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change in its entirety.	41/84/1

Name Middleton, AA & JG

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Support in its entirety.	41/85/1

Name Ministry of Education

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Other	Plan Change 41	<p>The Ministry is neutral regarding the proposed plan change.</p> <p>The Ministry is interested in this plan change as it has responsibility for the management of the school portfolio and meeting the demand for schools in the Queenstown Lakes District (QLD).</p> <p>The QLD has experienced significant growth which has lead to growth and development pressures on land, resulting in development opportunities for subdivision as demonstrated in Plan Change 41.</p> <p>The Ministry is actively assessing suitable sites for future schools in the QLD, and within Frankton Flats/Remarkables Park area. However scarcity of land available for purchase in these areas has meant the Ministry has been assessing opportunities in the area affected by the plan change (amongst other areas).</p> <p>If the development promoted by this plan change occurs a number of residential lots are available at competitive process, additional families are likely to move into the area.</p> <p>The proposed development may increase numbers of school aged children in the area, therefore the provision for education facilities with in the proposed subdivision is supported. This would help eliminate the need for families to travel for their children to attend school.</p> <p>The Ministry is supportive of the objective to develop infrastructure in particular a roading network that would service the Education and Community Precinct.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that the above matters are taken into consideration at the hearing. It accepts that there is a balancing required between the needs of future development in the district and other activities and wishes to ensure that the community's future educational requirements are not overlooked.</p>	41/86/1

Name Mitchell, Shane

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41 in its entirety.	41/87/1

Name Moffat, Don

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change in its entirety	41/88/1

Name Mullan, Steve

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety.	41/89/1

Name Murlin, Colleen

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change subject to ensuring that down lighting be considered for houses, accessory buildings and street lighting to mitigate effects of light pollution.	41/90/1

Name Murphy, Bronwyn

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety.	41/91/1

Name Murphy, Gordon

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change in its entirety.	41/92/1

Name Muschamp, Jo

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	The whole of the plan change be disallowed.	41/93/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/93/1.
	PC41 will not significantly damage its surrounding landscape		
	PC41 will not damage the tourist reputation of Queenstown		
	PC41 reflects sustainable management principles		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act		

Name Newman, Richard M

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety.	41/94/1

Name Nickolls, Judy

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	The whole plan change be allowed.	41/95/1

Name Nickolls, Mark

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	The whole plan change be allowed.	41/96/1

Name Norris, Carole

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	The whole plan change be disallowed.	41/97/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/97/1.
	PC 41 will not damage the surrounding landscape in a manner that is inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Act		
	PC41 will not damage the tourist reputation of Queenstown		
	PC41 reflects sustainable management principles		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act		

Name NZ Transport Agency

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Whole plan change	The proposed plan change be rejected in its entirety.	41/98/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/98/1.
	The Section 32 analysis is sufficient and PC41 adequately addresses the issues raised in the submission		
	PC41 provides an integrated approach to land use and transportation		
	PC41 is not inconsistent with the district wide objectives regarding energy and its efficient use		
	PC41 is the most efficient use of the subject land		
	PC41 reflects the principles of the Act		
	The specific objectives, policies and rules included in the NZ Transport Agency's submission do not reflect sustainable management principles		
	In regards to the financial contribution rules that the submission asks for, LMP believes that it would be inappropriate to apply such rules just to PC41. If the submitter wishes to pursue that initiative the submitter should put forward its own Plan Change that includes these rules and that applies to the whole of the District.		

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	<p>Decision Requested;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed link through to the Lake Hayes Estate is altered in order to provide practical access for all modes of transport, including public transport; 2. As part of any residential activity the erection, construction or installation of any solid fuel burning fireplace or appliance in any building and outdoor burning is prohibited; 3. Stormwater management does not adversely affect the regionally significant wetland; 4. Building in the wetland setback is prohibited; 5. Proposed Policy 6.4 is altered to read (additions underlined): To incorporate stormwater and sediment management options that minimise the design or sustainable urban drainage techniques and ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Stormwater management systems are designed to cater for the 1 in 100 year average recurrence interval event and; (ii) The quality of water in any discharge remains equal to or better than that of pre-development. 6. Proposed Assessment Matter 15.2.12.3 is altered to read; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (xv) The extent to which; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Natural flow paths have been used in the design of stormwater management systems; (b) Techniques have been adopted to ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Stormwater management systems are designed to cater for the 1 in 100 year average recurrence interval event; and (ii) The quality of water in any discharge remains equal to or better than that of pre-development 7. Activity Area 1a is deleted from the plan change; 8. That the flood protection provisions (Permitted Activity 12.25.7.1 ii, Zone Standard 12.259.2 ix, Appendix Three, Zone Subdivision Standard 15.2.10.3 and Discretionary Activity 17.2.3.3 iv b) are deleted. 9. Any consequential amendments considered necessary to give effect to this submission. 	41/99/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/99/1.

PC 41 provides adequate analysis of the roadlink through to Howards Drive, Lake Hayes Estate. LMP agrees this roadlink needs to be practical and notes that changes can be made to PC41, where necessary, to achieve that.

Solid fuel burning fireplaces being a prohibited activity is unduly onerous

LMP disagrees that the Confluence Swamp is of regional significance

LMP disagrees that a 1:100 annual recurrence interval for assessing stormwater is consistent with appropriate engineering standards

LMP agrees the adverse effects from stormwater contaminant discharge should be mitigated against

The flood hazard assessment undertaken in PC41 is sufficient

Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act, with the exception of some aspects relating to stormwater

NZ Transport Agency

Support

41/99/1.

NZTA support the following parts of this submission:

The proposed intersection of the link through to Howards Drive, Lake Hayes Estate appears physically impractical, especially regarding public transport.

Wallace, David

Oppose

41/99/1.

Oppose ORC's position that Howards Drive should be the preferred access to Howards Drive.

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
----------	----------------	--------------------	--------

Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety	41/100/1
---------	----------------	---	----------

Position	Plan Provision Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	<p data-bbox="252 154 363 203">Whole Plan Change</p> <p data-bbox="456 154 1278 181">QAC seeks the same OCB proposed in Plan Change 35 is applied to Plan Change 41;</p> <p data-bbox="456 208 1315 280">QAC submits that the below Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise definition be included in the Definitions section of the District Plan and applied and applied to the proposed Shotover Country Special Zone:</p> <p data-bbox="456 306 1310 427">Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) means any residential activity, visitor accommodations, community activity and day care facility including all outdoor spaces associated with any education facility but including all outdoor spaces associated with any education facility but excludes police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices.</p> <p data-bbox="456 454 1323 504">QAC seeks the following (or similar) amendments to Rule 12.25.7.6 Prohibited Activities for the Shotover Country Special Zone:</p> <p data-bbox="456 530 1347 651">12.25.7.6 Prohibited Activities: The following shall be Prohibited Activities: iii) Activities within the Outer Control Boundary Queenstown Airport On any site located within the Outer Control Boundary, as indicated on the District Plan Maps, Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise shall be a Prohibited Activity</p> <p data-bbox="456 678 1350 705">QAC seeks that the following amendments (or similar)are made to Zone Standard 12.25.9.2v:</p> <p data-bbox="456 732 1337 871">12.25.9.2 Zone Standards v Airport Noise Queenstown Airport (a) On any site located within the zone, any building or part of a building used for an Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise shall be insulated from aircraft noise so as to meet an indoor design level of 40dBA Ldn except for non-critical listening environments where no special sound insulation is required. This control shall be met in either of the following two ways:</p> <p data-bbox="456 898 1342 1041">EITHER: (i) By providing a certificate from a recognised acoustic engineer stating that the proposed construction will achieve the internal design noise level. OR (ii) The building shall be constructed and finished in accordance with the provisions of Table 4 appended to this rule.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1068 1334 1140">(b) On any site located within the zone, any building or part of a building used for an Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise shall be mechanically ventilated in accordance with the provisions of Table 5 appended to this rule.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1167 1329 1238">QAC Submits that the Table (C.5 Table 5 Mechanical ventilation of buildings containing an Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (except non-critical Listening areas) be appended to Rule 12.25.9.2v, in line with the mechanical ventilation recommended through Plan Change 35.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1265 1334 1364">QAC seeks that 'no complaints covenants' in favour of QAC are required for all ASAN's over the entire plan change area. As well as safeguarding the on-going operation of the Airport, such covenants would ensure that prospective landowners and occupiers are aware that the area is subject to potentially high levels of aircraft noise.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1391 1342 1417">Alternatively if 'no complaints covenants' are not applied, Plan Change 41 should be rejected.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1444 1315 1543">QAC opposes the lack of reference to Queenstown Airport in the proposed Issues (section 12.25.2) and in Policies 2.4 and 7.6 of the Shotover Country Special Zone. Queenstown Airport is a regionally significant asset, therefore it is appropriate that the Airport is safeguarded through provisions in the District Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1570 1350 1668">Within the proposed Shotover Country Zone provisions, a set of Policies relate to each individual Objective. Objectives 2 and 7, which relate to establishing an integrated community and to transportation respectively, are relevant to Queenstown Airport, however, the associated Policies do not refer to Queenstown Airport.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1695 1329 1744">In terms of Objective 7, Queenstown Airport is a fundamental transportation asset within the Otago region, but is not referred to within the Policies under Objective 7.</p> <p data-bbox="456 1771 1350 1843">QAC seeks that the Issues and Policies are updated to be consistent with the proposed Objectives, and to provide an adequate foundation for the Rules which relate to the Airport, as follows (or similar):</p> <p data-bbox="456 1870 1342 2013">Issues ix) Queenstown Airport The Shotover Country Special Zone is located within the vicinity of Queenstown Airport. Part of the Zone is within the Airport's Outer Control Boundary. Development of the Zone shall be undertaken in a manner that does not adversely affect the on-going operation of Queenstown Airport.</p> <p data-bbox="456 2040 1342 2170">Policies 2.4 To recognise the limitations for development of the site (defined by natural topographical boundaries, development form and style, servicing constraints, and Queenstown Airport's Outer Control Boundary), while ensuring that the development yield provided is adequate to establish a sustainable and vibrant community.</p>	41/101/1

Policies

7.6 To ensure development of the zone does not compromise the on-going and future operations of Queenstown Airport.

QAC seeks all necessary and consequential changes to the Objectives, Policies, Rules, and other Methods necessary to give effect to the various relief sought above.

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/101/1.

LMP generally agrees with QAC submission concerning acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation, subject to confirmation that the mechanical ventilation provisions are appropriate

Covenants between landowners are a private matter and should be dealt with outside the Act

Name *Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety subject to provision of appropriate amounts of affordable and community housing.	41/102/1

Name *Queenstown Lakes District Council*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	QLDC support the plan change provided that the following provisions are met: 1. The applicant can demonstrate that the developments meets Part II of the Act, specifically in respect to, but not limited to, the following matters: i) appropriateness of the site for urbanisation, including a comparison with other locations in the Queenstown area; ii) Whether the proposed zoning is an efficient use of this site; iii) Timing of the development ie, whether there is an existing demand for more residential zoning in the district. 2. It results in good resource management outcomes in respect to the following: i) urban design ii) openspace and recreation networks; iii) transportation networks and conectivity; iv) infrastructure provision and stormwater; v) landscape protection. 3. It ensures provision of appropriate amounts of affordable and community housing.	41/103/1

Name *R D Jones Family Trust*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Whole Plan Change	Support all of plan change and seek a 12.6 ha extension to the zone located immediately south and adjoining Lake Hayes Estate (refer to submission for detail). Seek that the area of the zone is extended to provide for this additional area with one residential building platform per allotment, one dwelling and accessory building per platform, minimum allotment area of 1 hectare, setback from the terrace edge of 50m, internal setbacks of 6m, road setbacks of 10m and height restriction of 6m.	41/104/1

Further Submissions - Otago Regional Council

Oppose

41/104/1.

ORC oppose the extension to the zone as shown on the plan attached to this submission for the following reasons:

Beyond the scope of the plan change:

The requested extension to the plan change area is considered by ORC to be beyond the scope of the plan change as notified for the following reasons and as such the inclusion of the area requested by the submitter would be inappropriate and unlawful:

No consultation or public participation

No Section 32 analysis or associated investigations have been undertaken for requested extension to the plan change area, specifically in relation to the natural hazard impacts on the site and consequent suitability for residential activity.

Natural Hazards

From ORC records the requested extension to the plan chagne area as shown on the plan attached to the submission is potentially susceptible to liquefaction and therefore requires site specific natural hazards investigation

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Plan Change 41	<p>The submitter does not oppose development or the plan change per se, but does not consider that PC41 is sustainable or well designed, and therefore considers that PC41 fails to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). Its reasons and proposed relief is set out below.</p> <p>The objectives and policies and other changes proposed by PC 41 fail to achieve the purpose of principles of the Act in that:</p> <p>5.1.1 They do not represent sustainable management; that is, the managements, use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety;</p> <p>5.1.2 They do not avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the environment, including but not limited to:</p> <p>(a) adverse traffic effects, including in respect of access to and from major roads and other arterial routes;</p> <p>(b) the adverse landscape, visual and amenity effects. In particular, PC41 fails to provide an appropriate balance between development and open space. The open space proposed is too limited and will adversely affect the amenity within the plan change area, as well as views and amenity from outside PC41 (including from elevated nearby areas);</p> <p>(c) the adverse effects from earthworks;</p> <p>(d) the actual and potential effects of flooding, given the area is prone to such flooding;</p> <p>(e) the adverse infrastructural effects; and</p> <p>(f) the adverse reverse sensitivity effects in relation to the Airport. Such effects will constrain future growth and development of the Airport. Such effects will constrain future growth and development of the Airport, which is one of the District's most important assets.</p> <p>5.2 PC41 does not provide sufficient recreational opportunities;</p> <p>5.3 PC41 does not represent sound recourse management practice;</p> <p>5.4 The section 32 analysis does not adequately or fully assess or address the effects of PC41. Further, there is no need for the plan change;</p> <p>5.5 The changes proposed to the District Plan by way of the objectives, policies, rules and other provisions in PC41 are not the most appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the Act or achieving/advancing the provisions of the District Plan. Nor are they the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions in respect of efficiency and effectiveness relative to other means.</p> <p>5.6 PC41 is contrary to or otherwise inconsistent with non-statutory, but nonetheless relevant and important studies and strategies undertaken in the District, including Tomorrow's Queenstown (2002), Growth Options Study (2004) and Growth Management Strategy (2007).</p> <p>6. The Submitters seek the following decisions from the Local Authority:</p> <p>6.1 Decline the Plan Change; or in the alternative without derogating from the relief above</p> <p>6.2 Require the proponent of PC41 to undertake a comprehensive and proper section 32 analysis in accordance with the principles and practice adopted by the Council on previous plan changes;</p> <p>6.3 Amend PC41 in accordance with the submissions above; and</p> <p>6.4 Amend PC41 with all consequential relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought.</p>	41/105/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Oppose

41/105/1.

PC 41 represents sustainable management

PC41 remedies and mitigates any effects on the environment

PC41 provides sufficient recreation opportunities

PC41 represents sound resource management practice

The Section 32 analysis adequately addresses the effect of PC41

The objectives and policies and rules proposed by PC41 are the most appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the Act and advancing the provisions of the District Plan.

Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act

NZ Transport Agency

Support

41/105/1.

Support the following parts of this submission:

PC41 fails to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse traffic effects and infrastructural effects;

The Section 32 analysis does not adequately or fully assess or address the effects of PC41;

PC41 is inconsistent with non-statutory, but relevant studies and strategies including Tomorrow's Queenstown, the Growth Options Study and the Growth Management Strategy.

Name *Read, Suzie*

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	Plan change should be allowed.	41/106/1

Name *Robins, Ken*

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	The plan change should be allowed.	41/107/1

Name *Scott, Aaron*

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Plan Change 41	The plan change should be allowed.	41/108/1

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Whole Plan Change	<p>SPL seeks the following recommendation;</p> <p>i) The "commercial precinct" and visitor accommodation activities be excluded from the plan change;</p> <p>ii) The definition of "convenience retail" be deleted or amended as sought in this submission;</p> <p>iii) That the plan change be amended to address the matters raised in this submission, inparticular the lack of certainty of outcomes. It is difficult to discern the precise intent of the Plan Change or the likely development outcome(s). The following matters are noted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no Activity Table and as such it seems too broad and that a range of activities could occur as a result; - There is a dearth of Objectives or Policies for the various Activity Areas and therefore little guidance as to the intended outcomes. There are no specific objectives for any of the Activities Areas. - The Objectives, Policies and Rules are inconsistent; - Activity Areas 1 and 1a are referred to in Policy 2.5 as a "low density living environment". It is not clear if a "low density living environment" is intended to be a residential development or something else. Furthermore, Activity Areas 1 and 1a are not referred to by Rule 12.25.7; - Activity Area 1 and 1a are shown on the Structure Plan but are not defined or referred to in the legend; - The phrase "commercial precinct" is not defined. Further, commercial uses or a "commercial precinct" conflicts with Policy 2.6, which states that Activity Area 3 is intended to create a precinct providing for "education and community activities". <p>Proposed Commercial Precinct Given above, the proposed commercial precinct is not supported or envisaged by the objectives and policies of the plan change. Further, it is not consistent with the operative and unchallenged definitions in the District Plan. If the commercial precinct is intended to serve a "convenience retail" function then that is acceptable and fits within the plan change framework. However, if that is the intention, the phrase "commercial precinct" is confusing and should be deleted.</p> <p>Visitor Accommodation The type, extent and location of visitor accommodation should be carefully assessed if the plan change is to enable such activities.</p> <p>Urban Design. The plan change refers to such matters as "integration of activities" "urban form" and "integrated community". There is no urban design analysis or report submitted with the plan change. The Structure Plan is very general and Objective 2 is to be implemented by its inclusion, however it appears as though a range of activities could occur as a result. As such there is very little urban design guidance in the plan change. The intended urban design outcomes are unknown.</p> <p>District Plan The Plan Change does not follow the format of the District Plan or the existing Special Zones within Chapter 12.</p> <p>Non-notification The non-notification rule (12.25.8) refers to Section 93 of the Act. Section 93 of the Act has been repealed.</p> <p>Any further and consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>	41/109/1

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/109/1.

PC41 does accord with the purpose of the Act

PC41 is not uncertain. A structure plan is provided and further detail would be resolved through the outline development plan process

LMP broadly agrees to the changes requested by the submitter to limit convenience retail outlets to 200m GFA

LMP notes SLP has raised some issues of merit that may necessitate appropriate amendments to PC41s provisions

NZ Transport Agency

Support

41/109/1.

NZTA supports the following parts of this submission:

It does not meet Section 32 of the Act;

There is no urban design analysis;

The intended urban design outcomes are in effect unknown.

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change.	41/110/1

Name *Smith, Donna*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change.	41/111/1

Name *Smith, Simon*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Disallow entire plan change.	41/112/1
	Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>	41/112/1.
	PC41 will not adversely effect the visual amenity of residents and visitors		
	PC41 contains sufficient traffic analysis		
	PC41 reflects sustainable management principles		
	Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act		

Name *Stalker, Grant and Sharyn*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	The plan change be granted as notified. That consideration be given to providing for greater density of development within the narrow strip of Area 1 located east of Stalker Road between Area 5e and the internal road just north of Area 5e.	41/113/1

Name *Stalker, Kristan*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Full support of plan change.	41/114/1

Name *Stalker, Layton*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Shotover Country Plan Change.	41/115/1

Name *Stephenson, Fiona*

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support Plan Change 41.	41/116/1

Name Stevens, Helen & Preston

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan change 41	Oppose Plan Change 41 in its entirety. Should the Queenstown Lakes District Council make a decision to proceed with Plan Change 41 then we propose that the plan change and resulting Special Zone include provisions to ensure that at no time and/or in accordance with any variation or extension of the Zone by any subsequent plan change or resource consent, that Spence and Old School Roads would not provide for any form of: i) access to the Special Zone ii) infrastructure or services as required by the Special Zone. iii) facilitation of any construction works as required in executing the Special Zone or any development within the Special Zone. Further that in the creation of the Special Zone that the section of Old School Road that is not formed as a road be closed as a legal road and that the land be given over as some form of public amenity being no longer a legal unformed road.	41/117/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership The current District Plan does not make adequate provisions to meet medium and low density residential demand of the District PC41 does not reflect urban sprawl LMP believes who initiated the Plan Change is irrelevant PC41 meets the purpose and principles of the Act Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act	<i>Oppose</i> 41/117/1.

Name Stoff, Toby Peter

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support all of the plan change.	41/118/1

Name Stringer, Richard

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Fully support the development.	41/119/1

Name Todd, Alexander

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support all provisions of the proposed plan change.	41/120/1

Oppose	Plan Change 41	Relief Sought:	41/12/1
--------	----------------	----------------	---------

That the Queenstown Lakes District Council refrains from approving the plan change unless its provisions are amended to ensure:

- i) the NPSET is given effect to;
- ii) the sustainable management of the National Grid as a physical resource;
- iii) the protection of the existing network, and its ongoing operation, maintenance, upgrading and development, from issues of reverse sensitivity and the effects of others activities.

One way of achieving this would be to adopt the relief sought throughout the balance of this submission.

Insert the following Policy under Objective 1 - Landscape and Urban Form:

The reverse sensitivity effects generated by land development within electricity transmission corridors shall be managed in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on both the safe, secure and efficient use and development of the transmission network and the safety and amenity values of the community

Make the following changes to Policy 2.4 under Objective 2 - Heritage Community

To recognise the limitations for development on the site (defined by a high voltage transmission line, natural topographical boundaries, development form and style, and servicing constraints), while ensuring that the development yield provided is adequate to establish a sustainable and vibrant community.

Add the following Restricted Discretionary Activities in Rule 12.25.7.3 Restricted Discretionary Activity

(x) Setbacks from electricity transmission lines

Buildings and structures within 25-32m of the centreline of a high voltage transmission line shall be a Restricted Discretionary Activity in respect of assessment matters 12.25.10(x)

(x) Earthwork Setbacks from electricity transmission lines

(i) Any earthworks carried out within 12 metres of the closest visible edge of the foundation of the Frankton - Cromwell A 110kV high voltage transmission line support structure shall be a Restricted Discretionary Activity in Respect of assessment matters 12.25.10(X).

(ii) Any earthworks carried out within 12 metres of the centreline of an electricity transmission line shown on the Shotover Country Special Zone Structure Plan, that results in an increase in ground level (i.e reduces clearance distance from conductor to ground) shall be a Restricted Discretionary Activity in respect of Assessment Matters 12.25.10(x).

Add the following Advise Note to Rule 12.25.7.1 Permitted Activities

The planting of vegetation that will reach over 2 metres in height at full maturity should not be undertaken within 12 metres of the centreline of an electricity transmission line, in accordance with the Tree Regulations.

Make the following changes to Rule 12.25.7.5 Non-Complying Activities:

The following shall be Non-Complying Activities, provided that they are not listed as a Prohibited Activity:

(vi) Buildings in Activity Areas 5a

(a) A park and ride facility, including any necessary parking areas, shelter and ticketing structures.

(b) Buildings related to recreation activities no greater than 200m² in area.

(vii) Buildings and Structures within Activity area 5e

Make the following changes to Section 12.25.8 Non-notification of applications:

Any application for a resource consent for the following matters may be considered without the need to obtain a written approval of affected persons (except where the written approval of Transpower New Zealand Limited is required) and need not be notified in accordance with Section 93 of the Act unless the Council considers special circumstances exist in relation to any such circumstance.

(iii) The written approval of Transpower New Zealand Limited is required an activity is Restricted Discretionary because it is within the Electricity Transmission Line Corridor. Such applications need not be publically notified and need not be served on any affected party other than Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Add the following Assessment Matters into Section 12.25.10 - Resource Consents Assessment Matters

(x) Restricted Discretionary Activity - Setbacks from Electricity Transmission Lines

For resource consent to buildings and structures discretion is restricted to the following matters:

- The risk to the structural integrity of the transmission line;
- the effects on the ability of the transmission line to operate, maintain and upgrade the high-voltage transmission network;
- the proximity of buildings and structures to electrical hazards;
- the risk of electrical hazards affecting public safety, and risk of property damage;
- The risk of electrical faults causing disruption to electricity supply
- The extent of earthworks required, and use of mobile machinery near transmission line

- which may put line at risk;
- The risk of electrical hazards due to mature height of any associated vegetation including within landscaped areas
- The siting of buildings in relations to transmission lines to minimise visual effects from transmission line;
- The risk of generating radio interference or earth potential rise;
- Any other matters set out in plans for buildings; and
- Extent of compliance with NZECP34:200

(x) Restricted Discretionary Activity - Earthworks setbacks from Electricity Transmission Lines
For resource consent to earthworks discretion is restricted to the following matters.

- Any effects on the integrity of the transmission line;
- Volume area and location of the works, including temporary activities such as stockpiles;
- Time of the works
- Site remediation;
- The use of mobile machinery near transmission line which may put the line at risk;
- Compliance with the NZECP 34:2001
- Outcomes of any consultation with Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Add the following Objective and supporting Policy in section 15.1 Issues, Objectives and Policies

Objective 11

Shotover Country Special Zone -To recognise the importance of the National Grid to the districts, regions and nations social and economic well being and take into account the benefits derived for that infrastructure at a local, regional and national level when determining the overall level of adverse effects of subdivision and development.

Policy

11.1 Shotover Country Special Zone - The reverse sensitivity effects generated by subdivision and land development within electricity transmission managed in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on both the safe, secure and efficient use and development of the transmission network and the safety and amenity values of the community.

Add the following paragraph to Rule 15.2.6 - Notification of Applications:

This rule does not apply to subdivision 0-32m of a high voltage transmission line traversing the Shotover Country Special Zone where the written approval as an affected party is required from Transpower New Zealand Limited for subdivision within 0-32m of a high voltage transmission line.

Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity in to Rule 15.2.3 -Subdivision Activities as follows:

Within the Shotover Country Special Zone, any subdivision within 32m either side of the Cromwell-Frankton A 110kV transmission line in respect of assessment matters 5.2(x)

Council's discretion is restricted to subdivision design and measures to address actual and potential effects relating to the presence of transmission line.

Add the following Assessment Matters into Section 15.2 (x) Subdivision within a Transmission Corridor -Assessment Matters for Resource Consents:

Subdivision within 0-32m of a high voltage transmission line in the Shotover Country Special Zone:

- (i) The extent to which the subdivision design mitigates the effects on the lines for example through the location of roads and reserves under the line or lot layout;
- (ii) The ability for maintenance and inspection of the transmission line, including ensuring access for the same;
- (iii) The extent to which the design and development will minimise risk or injury and/or property damage from such lines.
- (iv) The extent to which potential and adverse effects including visual impact are mitigated, for example through the location of building platforms, landscape design;
- (v) The location of any building platforms
- (vi) Compliance with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001); and
- (vii) The outcomes of any consultation with the affected utility operator.

Such other relief to those parts of the proposed plan change to which sections 75(1)(a) and (b) and 75(2) of the RMA are applicable and that are consequential to the changes referred to above, and/or are necessary to give effect to the NPSET.

Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership

Partly Support

41/121/1

While LMP generally agrees with the substance of the submission LMP disagrees with the wording contained in the submission

LMP agrees appropriate wording needs to be included in PC41 to protect the transmission lines

Name Turnball, Mary

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support plan change.	41/122/1

Name Turnbull, Blair

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that access be restricted to Howards Drive or as a minimum Stalker Road be diverted. The new road would then be aligned with the opposite Shotover Road. Howards Drive would be primary access point and/or the above proposed change to Stalker Road is implemented as a condition of the proposed plan change and development.	41/123/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership LMP believes that access to PC41 should not be restricted to Howards Drive	Partly Support 41/123/1.
		LMP agrees the realignment of Stalker Road opposite Lower Shotover Road is desirable at an appropriate stage of the development, subject to consultation and agreement with NZTA	
		Wallace, David	Oppose 41/123/1.
		Oppose the submitters preference for access to the plan change site via Howards Drive	

Name Wadworth & Watts, Ann & Dave

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Seek that the whole of the plan change be allowed.	41/124/1

Name Wales, Robert and Marie

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support new subdivision.	41/125/1

Name Wallace, David

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Plan Change 41	Oppose the location of the park and ride facility on Howards Drive, proposed access and urban densities.	41/126/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership PC41 reflects sound resource management principles	Oppose 41/126/1.
		The location of the Park and Ride reflects an appropriate planning approach	
		Water supply to Lake Hayes Estate will not be adversely affected	
		Granting the relief requested by the submitter would not constitute sound resource management under the District Plan and the Act	

Name Wilkins, Blair

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Fully support the plan change.	41/127/1

Name Wilson, George

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Plan Change 41	Retain the status quo or alternatively ensure the most appropriate landuse possibly including heavy industrial ie:gravel processing, rock and recycled concrete crushing and/or contractors, truck and machinery yards or campground facilities. Furthermore, close Old School Road and provide for a new 20m paper road along the line of the pylons to extend the trail proposed by the Applicant.	41/128/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Oppose</i>
		There are other plan changes currently being progressed that provide for the Districts industrial needs	41/128/1.
		Camping ground activities are not an appropriate or efficient use of PC41s land	
		LMP agrees PC41 should not be serviced via Old School Road and that appropriate provisions should be put in place to ensure this	
		Otago Regional Council	<i>Oppose</i>
		The requested alterations to the plan change area and proposed activities are considered by ORC to be beyond the scope of the plan change as notified for the following reasons and, as such, the requested amendments would be inappropriate and unlawful:	41/128/1.
		No consultation or public participation	
		No Section 32 analysis or assoicated investigations have been undertaken by the requested alterations to the plan change area and proposed activities specifically in relation to the natural hazard impacts on the site and consequent suitability for the proposed uses, the potential for the transport and storage of hazardous substances and the discharge of contaminants to land and water from the proposed activities.	
		Natural hazards:	
		The submitter proposed an extension to the area subject to the plan change and alteration to the proposed activities. This proposed extension area has been identified to be susceptible to flood and erosion hazard from the adjacent Shotover River and is potentially susceptible to liquefaction. As such, any proposal requires site specific natural hazards investigation.	
		Potential adverse effects of proposed activities:	
		The submitter requests that terraces T5 and T6 be utilised for activities such as heavy industrial, transport hub and campground facilities. These proposed activities could result in adverse effects, including but not limited to traffic, storage of hazardous substances and the discharge of contaminants, greater than that of the proposed plan change.	

Name Wilson, Narelle

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Access and Egress Plan Change 41	Closure of Old School Road to non vehicular traffic beyond the currently formed section. Safety reasons, vehicles driving too fast in residential area on a dusty road.	41/129/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership	<i>Support</i>
		PC41 is to be serviced through Stalker Road and Howards Drive	41/129/1.
		LMP agrees PC41 should not be serviced via Old School Road. Appropriate provisions should be put in place to ensure this	

Name Wilson, Simon

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support all of Plan Change 41.	41/130/1

Name Wood, K H

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change in its entirety including the addition of Area A as shown on attached plan (refer to submission) to provide for an additional dwelling within the plan change area (proposed area located south of Activity Area 1a). The area is physically similar to the adjoining land and will be able to absorb an additional house. Visitor accommodation is a logical provision that should be made in a residential area.	41/131/1
		Further Submissions - Otago Regional Council ORC opposes the following specific parts of this submission: 41/131/1 That the area marked "A" on the plan attached to the submission be included as part of the Plan Change for a single dwelling house and / or visitor accommodation. The requested area is considered to be beyond the scope of the plan change as notified for the following reason and , as such, the inclusion of area "A" would be inappropriate and unlawful: No consultation or public participation; No Section 32 analysis or associated investigations have been undertaken for area "A" specifically in relation to the natural hazard impacts on the site and consequent suitability for residential activity; Area "A" is a terrace feature of the adjacent Shotover River. As such it is potentially subject to flooding, erosion and liquefaction and therefore requires site specific natural hazard investigation.	41/131/L
		Shotover Park Limited Shotover Park Limited does not agree that the provision of visitor accommodation is logical within the proposed residential area (for the reasons set out in its submission).	41/131/L

Name Wrigley, Bill

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Plan Change 41	Support the plan change as long as Old School Road is closed.	41/132/1

Name Yochay, Avi & Wendy

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Access and Egress Plan Chage 41	Submit that Old School Road be closed off to incoming traffic not residents of the road.	41/133/1
		Further Submissions - Ladies Mile Partnership PC41 is to be serviced through Stalker Road and Howards Drive LMP agrees PC41 should not be serviced via Old School Road. Appropriate provisions should be put in place to ensure this.	41/133/L