

15 May 2025

Sean Widdowson  
Queenstown Lakes District Council

Email: [sean.widdowson@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:sean.widdowson@qldc.govt.nz)

Dear Sean,

**RE: REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION UNDER CLAUSE 23 OF SCHEDULE 1 – THE HILLS RESORT LIMITED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST**

Following the request for further information in your letter dated 11 December 2024, the Requestor has continued with further progressing detailed design of the wider site. As a result of both this and the response to the specific queries in the request for further information, there have been amendments to the Request as originally lodged in November 2024. An overview of these amendments is as follows:

- (a) A reduction in the maximum RL height for buildings in HS11 and revisions to the Indicative LAMA plans affecting HS9, HS10 and HS13;
- (b) A new Homesite location (HS16) including associated controls relating to building height and coverage and LAMA;
- (c) A slight relocation of the indicative cycle trail in the southern portion of the zone as shown on the Structure Plan;
- (d) A slight change in location to the new Sports Courts and Gardens Activity Area as proposed, moving to the west, and a consequential change to the associated LAMA;
- (e) A change in location to the main resort vehicle entrance on McDonnell Road, moving approximately 50m to the south, and consequential relocation of the access road as shown on the Structure Plan; and
- (f) The removal of the service / construction vehicle accessway onto McDonnell Road as previously proposed.

The reasons for these changes are as follows (reflecting the numbering used above):

- (a) To further reduce the potential visual effects of buildings in these Activity Areas;
- (b) To provide for a further potential residential offering in a location that can absorb the development (but without altering the overall proportion of residential activity within the Zone);
- (c) To reflect further detailed investigations in the most (topographically) appropriate location for a future cycle trail;
- (d) To reflect further detailed design work for the resort that has identified the need for a water storage reservoir for golf irrigation purposes to the north of the existing McDonnell Road vehicle

entrance<sup>1</sup>, and the need for the Sports Courts and Gardens Activity Area to shift slightly to accommodate this;

- (e) As for (d) above, the water storage reservoir for irrigation requires realignment of the existing vehicle access and entrance road to accommodate this; and
- (f) To reflect that this matter can be dealt with internally within the site, with service and construction vehicles to utilise the main McDonnell Road entrance as currently the case.

These updates, and any updates arising from the responses to the specific matters raised in your request, have been reflected in an updated documentation package (Plan Change Request, Proposed District Plan Provisions, Assessment of Environmental Effects, Section 32 Evaluation, updated Landscape Assessment and supporting graphic assessment, updated Design Statement) attached to this response. They have also been incorporated into the direct responses (below) to the specific matters raised in your request for further information in your letter dated 11 December 2024, as relevant.

### Site Access

1. *Please provide a statement from a suitably qualified and experienced traffic specialist which: Confirms the suitability of these new accesses from a traffic safety perspective, including sight distances from the access points onto the road, and whether any existing (or proposed) vegetation needs to be modified to achieve adequate access safety.*

The second access (for service and construction purposes) on McDonnell Road is now no longer proposed. An updated version of the Structure Plan, removing this access (among other changes as set out above) is included as **Attachment A**.

An assessment of the effects of the proposed new access location on Hogans Gully Road on the safety of the transportation network has been undertaken by Carriageway Consulting Ltd. The assessment is included as **Attachment B**. In summary, it concludes that the required sight distances for Residential Activity are easily exceeded. While there is a small shortfall of 3m for site distances required by the District Plan for non-residential activities (where the potential use of the proposed Homesites for Residential Visitor Accommodation is non-residential, per the District Plan definitions), the required site distances could be achieved if earthworks within the road reserve are undertaken. The Traffic Assessment further notes that no shoulder widening is required for this access, subject to confirming traffic speeds and achieving the sight distances.

As set out above, it is also proposed to move the existing main entrance on McDonnell Road to 50m south of its current location as part of the Change. The Traffic Assessment has considered this aspect and notes that this would result in the access being located further from the slight curve (located north of the main entrance) on McDonnell Road and that appropriate sight distances are easily achievable.

The existing Chapter 47 provisions relating to vehicle access, as well the district-wide provisions in Chapter 29 (Transport), will continue to apply and will ensure that any effects arising from any of the proposed changes can be managed via the resource consent process as necessary.

### Servicing

2. *Can the Applicant confirm that its expectations have not changed with regard to potential connected reticulation.*

---

<sup>1</sup> This will be subject to a resource consent application and while identified here for explanatory purposes, does not form part of the plan change.

We can confirm on behalf of the Requestor that expectations have not changed with regard to servicing arrangements from the promulgation of the original zone and provisions.

## Landscape

### Existing Landscape Context

3. *To assist a clear understanding of the changes to the receiving environment in the vicinity of the site, please provide a scaled context graphic that shows the indicative layout of other development approved by a resource consent or anticipated through changes to zoning in the vicinity of the site, since THRZ Chapter 47 was confirmed by the Environment Court on 7 September 2021. The area covered is expected to include (but not necessarily be limited to) the following properties:*
  - a. *Hogans Gully Resort Zone (PDP Chapter 48)*
  - b. *The outcome of the rezoning appeal on 508A Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road (A Feeley, E Borrie & LP Trustees Limited), specifically the outcome provided for in Environment Court decision [2023] NZEnvC 263.*
  - c. *Approved resource consents along McDonnell Road (both sides of the road other than the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone), including any relevant resource consent at 175 McDonnell Road and/or rezoning as identified in Environment Court decision [2023] NZEnvC 278.*
  - d. *Approved resource consents along Hogans Gully Road in proximity to the Site, including the land legally described as Lot 1 DP 550502 owned by Lakes Hayes Limited, the property at 157 Hogans Gully Road legally described as Lot 2 DP 596041, and Lot 6 DP 392663 owned by Veritas Hill Limited.*
  - e. *Land on the western side of Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road owned by Waterfall Park Development Limited, specifically the outcome of Environment Court Appeal ENV-2019-CHC-90.*

It is not practicable or, with reference cl 23(1) of Schedule 1 to the RMA in our view necessary to better understand the nature of the request and its potential environmental effects, particularly when taking account of the scale and significance of the potential effects, to provide a scaled context graphic showing the indicative layouts of other zoned or consented development in the vicinity of the site. That being so, a map showing the locations of the developments listed above, and a description of the works approved or enabled at each location, is included as **Attachment C**, to address the intention of the information request.

### Description of Proposed Provisions

4. *Please advise the rationale that has informed the proposed Building RL for each AA and HS in terms of the existing ground levels.*

An overview of the proposed building heights across each activity area, and a commentary on any changes to maximum height for existing activity areas or proposed maximum height for new activity areas, has been prepared and is included as **Attachment D**.

5. *Please advise the design rationale for the proposed accessway alignment to the new HSs. The landscape effects of this aspect of the plan change should also be addressed in the landscape effects commentary discussed below.*

The design rationale for the proposed accessway for the new Homesites was to locate it in a manner that reduced landform modification as much as practicable while still being generally compliant with Council standards<sup>2</sup>. The proposed accessway begins by utilising the existing

<sup>2</sup> In this case, a road serving 1-20 dwellings units will have a movement lane of between 5.5m-5.7m, although the exact width will be determined via engineering design.

farm entry, before winding its way up a gully and generally traversing the upper “farm” course land along the existing contour of the land in order to minimise earthworks.

The updated Landscape Assessment included as **Attachment E** addresses the effects of the accessways at Section 3.2.3. In summary, by following the underlying terrain as much as possible, landscape effects are minimised. While some engineering will be required within the gully area to achieve Council standards, the landform in this area will visually absorb these changes. The locating of the accessway following a contour along the upper terrace to the individual Homesites will also minimise the earthworks required, and the LAMA and SPA as required by the provisions will support the visual integration of the accessway.

6. *Please confirm that the current A2/A4 and golf dispersal corridor overlap is acceptable from an operational perspective or amend the Structure Plan accordingly. (NB any amended layout in this regard should be used as the basis for the photomontages and plans requested as part of the Clause 23 request for information.)*

The current A2 and A4 overlap is acceptable from an operational perspective. With regards to A2, dispensation has been made due to the elevation of A2 (being 8-10m above the fairway) meaning the ball flight does not intrude as much into the elevated land. With regards to A4, allowance has been made as it is a teeing area and the intrusion into A4 is behind the tee, in the opposite direction to play.

No changes are proposed to the Structure Plan as a result.

7. *Please provide:*

- a. *A version of the more detailed LAMA, SPA, HS and AA mapping (1:4,000 scale), overlaid on an aerial with existing/proposed contours. Please ensure that the dwelling at 113 Hogans Gully Road (owned by the proponent) is legible on this mapping and that contours numbers are legible.*
- b. *The design rationale for the layout and configuration of the SPA and LAMA planting strategies around HSs 6-15. With reference to the SPA, given the ‘ecological enhancement’ and ‘integration’ intentions of this planting strategy, it would be usual for this to be supported by expert ecological and landscape assessment. The latter would address such matters as the reasoning underpinning the proposed SPA layout in terms of landscape legibility and coherence (put another way, why the SPA planting is laid out in the way that it is, which, for example, sees the SPA applied to some steeper areas and not others etc). The ecological assessment would typically evaluate the existing ecological values of the broader context within which the SPA is located, comment on the ecological enhancement potentials of the area and then evaluate the merits of the proposed SPA strategy.*
- c. *The design rationale for including both the LAMA and SPAs around HSs 6-15, particularly where the two planting strategies overlap.*
- d. *Please advise where in the proposed provisions guidance on the use of tree plantings in gullies around the HSs is addressed.*

In response to (a) above, a map showing the various activity areas (including associated planting areas) overlaid on aerial/topographic information has been included as **Attachment F**.

In relation to (b) above, the original Landscape Assessment lodged with the Request addressed the purpose of the SPAs, however this has been elaborated upon in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**) (see Section 3.2.3, and further addressed below).

With regards to the request for expert ecological input in (b) above, this is not provided as, with reference to Clause 23(1) of Schedule 1 of the Act it is not necessary to better understand the nature of the request appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change.

The Chapter 47 Zone Purpose sets out the existing landscape values of the Zone, including an overview of the vegetation patterns, as follows:

***“Vegetation patterns are characterised by exotic amenity plantings through the golf courses and around buildings, with native plantings adjacent to the pond, stream and wetland features. Isolated pockets of bush and woodlot plantings remain.”***

No changes are proposed to this overview. It is noted that an ecological assessment of the existing ecological values of the affected land was not considered necessary as part of the original promulgation of the zone.

As addressed in both the original and updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**), the purpose of the SPAs is for visual integration, not ecological enhancement. The Request documentation acknowledges, as a matter of common understanding, that use of indigenous vegetation species in these areas (as required by the proposed provisions) will consequentially provide an improved ecological outcome when compared to the use of non-indigenous species in these areas.

In relation to (c) above, the Landscape Assessment lodged with the Request addressed the purpose of the SPAs (as differentiated from the LAMAs), and addressed in the amended provisions, however this has been further elaborated upon in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**). In summary, the purpose of the SPA planting is landscape-related. While LAMAs have been placed in proximity to the Homesites to provide screening for the buildings within them, the surrounding area (currently characterised by the existing 9-hole golf course to be removed) is quite open and to avoid an unnatural appearance of confined LAMA planting areas, the larger SPA will function to tie the individual LAMAs together (but not provide specific screening). While this will reduce the current golf-related openness of the surrounds, it will do so to assist in providing a homogenous appearance around the Homesites.

In response to (d) above, there is no specific “guidance” contained within the amended provisions as to tree planting in gullies, rather the locating of the SPAs in these areas, and the requirement (in Rule 47.5.22 (b)) to utilise the listed species in new Section 47.9 (Hills Resort Zone Plant List) achieves this.

**8. Please advise on the following minor discrepancy identified in the Landscape Report as follows (see yellow highlighted text):**

**“Activity Area A5:**

*Small expansion to the north along the western side of A5, remaining at 40% building coverage leading to 0.14ha increase in built form. **RL remains at 418.5 and 7m rolling height. Max RL changed from 419.5 to 422.0.** Max rolling height remains 8m. Buildings this height would require a restricted discretionary activity consent. Buildings any taller would require a non-complying activity consent.”*

This is not a discrepancy within the Landscape Assessment but rather a reflection of the existing two-tier consenting pathway (Restricted Discretionary versus Non-Complying) that exists for maximum height in Activity Area 5 (as well as Activity Area 4) and which is proposed to be amended as follows (and as set out in the Proposed Amended Provisions included in the Request documentation):

47.5.4	<b>Maximum Height — Activity Areas 4 and 5</b>	RD
	No building shall protrude through the RL listed below and shall be no higher than the height listed below:	Discretion is restricted to:
		a. Visual prominence from public

	<p>a. Activity Area A4 RL417.3 masl — 6m b. Activity Area A5 RL418.5 masl - 7m</p> <p>The notes in 47.5.3 above also apply to this rule.</p>	<p>places outside the Zone; b. External appearance including materials and colours.</p>
47.5.5	<p><b>Maximum Height — Activity Areas 4 and 5</b></p> <p>No building shall protrude through the RL listed below and shall be no higher than the height listed below:</p> <p>a. Activity Area A4 RL419.3 masl — 8m b. Activity Area A5 RL <del>419.5422.0</del> masl — 8m</p> <p>The notes in 47.5.3 above also apply to this rule.</p>	NC

*Modelled Views and Photomontages*

9. *On this basis, please provide Photomontages for the modelled viewpoints showing:*
- a. *Existing view*
  - b. *PDP THRZ simulation view with building envelope and legible new mounding and mitigation planting (assuming 5 years growth).*
  - c. *Proposed PC building envelope for each AA and HS.*
  - d. *Proposed PC building envelope with proposed mounding.*
  - e. *Proposed PC building envelope with proposed mounding and mitigation planting (assuming 5 years growth). Where relevant, please distinguish between SPA and LAMA plantings.*
  - f. *Version of (e) above, draped over (b) above.*

The photomontages requested (as modified by agreement with Council's landscape architect) are included as **Attachment G** as a comprehensive package of visual simulations. The photos for the visual simulations were taken from the following nine viewpoints (**VPs**) (as shown on the viewpoint location plan Figure 1 of that document):

- VP 1: View from Feehley Hill looking South;
- VP 2: View from Fox Terrace Walkway looking Southwest;
- VP 3: View from Cotter Avenue Walkway looking Southwest;
- VP 4: View from Cotter Avenue Walkway outside no.49 looking Southwest;
- VP 5: View from Arrowtown Lake-Hayes near Hogans Gully Road Intersection looking East;
- VP 6: View from outside 36 Hogans Gully Road looking Northeast;
- VP 7: View from outside 58 Hogans Gully Road looking Northeast;
- VP 8: View from outside 108 Hogans Gully Road looking Northwest; and
- VP 9: View from View from Arrowtown Lake-Hayes opposite Ayrburn looking East (as requested in addition (see response to #10 below).

The detailed approach to the visual simulations is addressed at Section 4.1.3 of the updated Landscape Assessment.

- 10.** *On this basis it is requested that a new photomontage viewpoint is modelled being the outlook from the intersection of Ayrburn Lane and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.*

The photomontage viewpoint is included in the montage package (**Attachment G**) as discussed above.

- 11.** *Please also include a Photomontage Methodology Statement.*

A methodology statement is attached to the graphic attachment (**Attachment G**). It outlines the best-practice process that was followed for the preparation of the visual simulations, in line with NZILA guidance.

#### *Landscape Effects Commentary*

- 12.** *The Landscape Assessment assumes that the earthworks and planting in the vicinity of the new HSs will be carried out comprehensively by the developer. Please confirm how the proposed provisions deliver on this assumption.*

This has been addressed in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**) at Section 3.2.3. In summary, this was an assumption based on the likely development model to be used for the new Homesites, in which the land developer undertakes a subdivision and associated groundworks to create the land parcels and building platforms for future residential units on each Homesite, as well as associated LAMA mounding. The proposed provision amendments, particularly the matters of control (d) and (f) for subdivision under Rule 27.7.22.1, provide the Council the ability to deal with this via consent conditions, if necessary.

- 13.** *To enable a clearer understanding of the cumulative landscape (including visual) effects of the proposed provisions, please provide additional landscape effects commentary for each of the viewpoints. This should include:*
- a. a clear description of what is likely to be visible under the existing provisions;*
  - b. the changes that are proposed in each view;*
  - c. the potential visibility of any proposed changes in the outlook (under the proposed provisions); and*
  - d. the landscape related effects of the proposed changes, clearly explaining any temporal reduction in effects associated with mitigation/integration planting (including assumptions re plant growth rates etc).*

This is responded to in detail in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**) at Section 5.1. In summary, the conclusions on the landscape (including visual) effects remain very low even with this additional assessment.

- 14.** *The landscape effects analysis should also include:*
- a. Commentary on the effects of the proposed provisions in views from Tobins Track and the Zig Zag lookout, which are vantage points that have been identified by the Environment Court as being of importance in the consideration of rezoning appeals in the eastern part of the Whakatipu Basin, since the DPR process.*
  - b. Due to the introduction of the SPG and an additional access point on McDonnell Road, commentary with respect to effects on the outlook from McDonnell Road.*
  - c. Commentary in relation to the proposed accessways to the new HSs (as mentioned above).*

This is responded to in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**) at Section 5.1. In summary, the conclusions on the landscape (including visual) effects remain very low even with this additional assessment.

#### *Landscape Character Unit*

- 15.** *Please confirm if it has been considered necessary to amend the text of the LCU (22) as a result of this Plan Change?*

It is not necessary to amend the text of LCU 22 as a result of the Request.

16. *If yes, please specify what changes would be made to the Landscape Character Unit (22), if not please elaborate on this reasoning.*

It is not necessary to amend the text of LCU 22 as a result of the Request as the Request relates only to The Hills Resort Zone, and the Landscape Character Units are a matter for consideration in relation to applications for land zoned Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. As such, the text of LCU 22 has no relevance to the Request.

Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the text of LCU 22 already refers to golf course development and rural residential activity and the changes sought by the Request do not alter the use of the land for these activities.

#### *Indigenous Biodiversity and Structural Planting Areas (SPA)*

17. *Please advise on the following:*

- a. *Whether the existing LAMA rule framework (Rule 47.4.3) is sufficient in its current form to ensure visual cohesion between the respective homesites (noting that proposed Rule 47.5.22 requires plantings in certain LAMAs to conform to the list in the proposed SPA planting schedule in 47.9).*
- b. *Whether it is appropriate to obtain a botanical survey of the areas intended to be covered by the SPA framework, to ascertain the current composition, extent and values of the indigenous vegetation.*
- c. *That the establishment of indigenous vegetation as proposed on The Hills Structure Plan is viable and successful outcomes are likely (including through Rule 47.4.3A as currently drafted).*
- d. *The appropriateness and relevance of the addition of the SPA concept into Policy 47.2.1.14 (noting that this policy focuses on 'landscape and amenity'), and whether there needs to be greater recognition of enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.*
- e. *Whether the parameters of control in proposed Rule 47.4.3A are appropriate where they refer to visual coherence and amenity, and not indigenous vegetation or indigenous biodiversity values.*
- f. *Whether the matters of discretion in Rule 47.5.22 should refer to matters other than 'landscape character'.*
- g. *Whether the proposed matters of control (g) in Subdivision Chapter Rule 27.7.22 are appropriate.*

In light of the interconnectedness between the above queries, the following response addresses all of points (a) to (g).

As set out in the original Request documentation (and now further elaborated on in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**)), the purpose of the SPAs is for visual integration of the new Homesites and their associated LAMA when viewed from public places (particularly Hogans Gully Road), and are differentiated from LAMAs which provide a direct screening function for the built form enabled within the associated Activity Area. Therefore the LAMA for each of the new Homesites 6-16 performs a screening function for the future built form (associated with residential activity) in each Homesite, while the SPA ensure a more holistic integration of the LAMA planting into the wider landscape (to avoid the potential for "clusters" of LAMA planting to appear unnatural in the surrounding environment).

To further support the integration function of the SPAs, the planting within LAMAs for the new Homesites 6-16 are restricted to the same planting list as the SPAs, to ensure a cohesive appearance between the two areas. This is in contrast to LAMAs in other parts of The Hills Resort Zone, where plantings are not restricted and are anticipated (although not required) to include exotic amenity plantings consistent with the existing golf resort treatment experienced (and acknowledged in the landscape values set out in the Zone purpose for Chapter 47) on site already.

The provision amendments as drafted appropriately reflect the purpose of the SPAs being for visual integration of the new Homesites and their associated LAMA when viewed from public places, and provide sufficient certainty for Council (through the requirement for resource consent and the subsequent imposition of consent conditions, consistent with the existing approach to LAMAs) that the plantings will be undertaken and then maintained on an ongoing basis.

The Request documentation acknowledges, as a matter of common understanding, that use of indigenous vegetation species in these planting areas (as required by the proposed provisions) would consequentially provide an improved ecological outcome when compared to the use of non-indigenous species in these areas. A botanical survey of any existing indigenous vegetation within the proposed SPAs is not required or necessary to come to this conclusion.

The Request documentation appropriately acknowledges the improved ecological outcomes that will result from the SPAs (briefly in the provisions in the Zone Purpose at 47.1.1, in the Assessment of Environmental Effects, and in the Section 32 evaluation) as a benefit of the proposed change in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 1. We note it is open to the Council to form its own views about whether, when assessing and making a decision on the Request such a benefit can be taken into consideration without the quantification via an expert.

#### *Indicative Trail*

- 18.** *Please identify any adverse effects on the Trail users experience and whether the existing indicative entry point onto McDonnell Road is more appropriate from both a safety perspective and a user experience perspective.*

Notwithstanding that the public notification process required by Schedule 1 will enable potential future trail users to have input into the user experience likely provided by the indicative trail layout as amended, further informal consultation regarding this matter has been undertaken with the Queenstown Trails Trust, whose response is included as **Attachment H**. In summary, the Queenstown Trails Trust does not have a concern with the relocation of the indicative entry point onto McDonnell Road and notes that it is closer to the Centennial Avenue connection onto the Arrow River Trail than the previous location, meaning trail users will have a shorter distance to travel on the roading network, which supports an improved user experience.

In relation to safety, this matter has been considered as part of the Carriageway Consulting Ltd assessment included as **Attachment B**. In summary, it concludes that the proposed amended location of the walkway / cycleway is neutral (when compared with the existing location shown on the Structure Plan) in terms of effects on the transportation network, and that any design-related matters can be dealt with at the time resource consents are sought for the establishment of this trail.

- 19.** *Part of the proposed indicative Trail is located outside the THRZ and Structure Plan Area where it crosses in front of 113 Hogans Gully Road which is zoned Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. Can you identify any impediments to subdivision and development (i.e. in the PDP provisions) of part of the THRZ Structure Plan area applying to a zone other than THRZ?*

No impediments have been identified. The land referenced, while not zoned The Hills Resort Zone, is also owned by the Requestor and therefore it is within the ability (and in the interest) of the Requestor to undertake any required works upon the land that may be indicated on the amended Structure Plan. Further investigations as to the most suitable location (in terms of topography) of the cycle trail have also indicated land immediately to the south of 113 Hogans Gully Road (276 McDonnell Road (Lot 1 DP 506611), not owned by the Requestor) may also be a viable option, subject to a future subdivision boundary adjustment / land swap (work on which is currently underway), and any subsequent easements necessary to ensure public access.

To ensure that this connection is achieved wherever final investigations determine it is most appropriately located, it is proposed to further amend Rule 47.4.1 (Controlled Activity rule for construction of access and walkway/cycleways indicatively shown on the Structure Plan) as follows (red underline and ~~strikethrough~~ indicates amendments as lodged, green underline indicates further amendments proposed in response to this request for further information):

	Activities —The Hills Resort Zone	Activity Status
	<b>Structure Plan</b>	
47.4.1	<p>Access, and the walkway/cycleway <u>connecting Hogans Gully Road and McDonnell Road</u>, as <u>indicatively</u> shown on the Structure Plan in Section 47.7 <del>(+/- 30m)</del>.</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrance design (including lighting);</li> <li>Materials and colour;</li> <li>Edge and berm treatment (including footpaths (if required) and any lighting);</li> <li>Stormwater management</li> <li><u>For the walkway/cycleway, any legal mechanisms necessary to ensure continuous access is provided across, and formation of the trail occurs within Lot 2 DP 392663, Lot 4 DP 25341 and Lot 1 DP 506611 (or any title derived therefrom).</u></li> </ol>	C

A copy of updated Proposed District Plan Provisions (including this change and other amendments as a consequence of the changes discussed at the beginning of this letter) is included as **Attachment I**.

#### Structure Plan

20. On the basis of the above:
- Is that part of Lot 2 Deposited Plan 392663 currently zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct proposed to be rezoned and included in THRZ?
  - If the answer to the above is no, can you identify any impediments to subdivision and development (i.e. in the PDP provisions) of a part of the THRZ Structure Plan area applying to a zone other than THRZ?
  - Please clarify what is meant by the identification of Lot 2 Deposited Plan 392663 as the 'McDonnell Subdivision'. Is this relevant in any way to THRZ and should this title be included on the THRZ Structure Plan?

In relation to (a) above, it is not proposed to rezone Lot 2 DP 392663 to The Hills Resort Zone. It will remain zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.

In relation to (b) above, no impediments have been identified. The land referenced, while not zoned The Hills Resort Zone, is also owned by the Requestor and therefore it is within the ability (and interests) of the Requestor to undertake any required works upon the land that may be indicated by the amended Structure Plan. The interrelationship between this land parcel (Lot 2 DP 392663) and The Hills Resort Zone regarding vehicle access is already anticipated by and provided for by existing Proposed District Plan provisions in both Chapter 24 (Wakatipu Basin) and Chapter 27 (Subdivision and Development):

**Policy 24.2.5.8** *For development within Lot 2 DP 392663, Part Lot 7 DP 392663, and Part Lot 2 DP 501981 (or subsequent title/s), avoid additional vehicle crossings onto McDonnell Road by utilising existing vehicle access through The Hills Resort Zone.*

	<b>Zone and Location Specific Rules</b>	<b>Activity Status</b>
<b>27.7.18B</b>	<p><b>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone – Lifestyle Precinct</b></p> <p><b>Access</b></p> <p>Access to lots created within Lot 2 DP 392663, Part Lot 7 DP 392663, and Part Lot 2 DP 501981 (or subsequent title/s) shall be from the western boundary of the Lifestyle Precinct and shall connect to McDonnell Road via existing roading within The Hills Resort Zone. There shall be no direct access from the Lifestyle Precinct to McDonnell Road.</p>	<b>NC</b>

In relation to (c) above, this label was for informational purposes only, however, to avoid confusion it has been removed and the Structure Plan updated (**Attachment A**) to make it clear that this land does not form part of The Hills Resort Zone.

*Proposed PDP Provisions*

- 21. Clarify what is the consequence of removing the following rules? Is there another rule proposed and what is the activity status?**
- Rule 47.4.5 if buildings are proposed prior to the relevant LAMA or SPA being completed;
  - Rule 47.4.7;
  - Rule 47.4.22;
  - Rule 47.4.27;
  - Rule 47.4.32.

As addressed on Page 30 of the Section 32 evaluation, the purpose of the deletion of these listed Non-Complying activity rules is to improve efficiency in light of the already existing default Non-Complying rule (Rule 47.3.36) for activities not listed. Rule 47.3.36 ensures that the activities covered by the listed rules are captured, and the deletion of these rules therefore removes duplication of rules to improve plan clarity and usability.

- 22. What are the implications of removing the qualification as to ownership for Rule 47.4.10?**

There are no implications to this change beyond removing potential impediments (primarily financial) to developing Activity Areas S1 and S2 as intended by Chapter 47. The requirement to hold Activity Areas S1 and S2 in the same ownership (and same title) as Activity Areas C and G is not necessary to ensure that these Activity Areas are utilised for their intended purpose (staff accommodation and facilities) as both the amended Rule 47.4.10 and the retention of Rule 47.4.16<sup>3</sup> (“Residential Activity in Activity Areas S1 and S2 (excluding staff accommodation)...” is a Non-Complying Activity) will ensure that this remains the outcome.

As part of the overall objective to deliver a world class golfing experience and golf resort with resort accommodation and facilities centred around a redesigned championship golf course of international ranking and world renown, the Hills Family have entered into partnership to further develop and enhance The Hills. This includes a new equity ownership model, taking effect from April 2025, where existing members have been offered the opportunity to share in ownership of the new club and course.

This change to a new member ownership model means that achieving the existing proviso in Rule 47.4.10 (“provided it is maintained in the same ownership as Activity Areas C and G and is not subdivided, unit titled or otherwise separated (including by lease) from the S1 and S2 ownership”) is more likely to be not feasible or practicable from a funding perspective.

- 23. Has consideration been given to the use of applying design guidelines to the new homesites HS6-HS15? This may assist with a consistent approach to development and an integrated outcome to achieve Objective 47.2.1.**

<sup>3</sup> An omission in the amended drafting of Rule 47.4.16 (the retention, instead of deletion, to reference to Activity Area DR) has been corrected in the Updated Proposed District Plan Provisions included as **Attachment I**.

It is anticipated that, similar to many developments within the Queenstown Lakes District, there will be design guidance in the form of private covenants for any development within the resort that is not undertaken by the developer (such as the Homesites).

- 24. If the answer to the above is yes, what form would any plan provisions take? If the answer is no, how is Objective 47.2.1 proposed to be achieved?**

No design guidance is proposed to form part of the plan provisions as part of the plan change request, consistent with the current approach to the zone as a whole. Objective 47.2.1 will continue to be achieved in the same manner it currently is, through the application of the existing rules (for example, the requirement for Controlled Activity resource consent for new buildings). The proposal does not alter this.

*Section 32 Evaluation – Function of the amended THRZ as a resort zone*

- 25. Please provide consideration of whether the proposal would result in THRZ moving away from the concept of a resort zone (including within the meaning at 47.1 of THRZ), and whether the proposed new Homesites and dispersal of residential activity could mean that the proposed residential and visitor accommodation parts of the development could weaken the overall focus on onsite visitor activities under the PDP definition of ‘resort’?**

The PDP definition of “Resort” is:

***“Means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing temporary visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focused on onsite visitor activities.”***

Chapter 47.1 Zone Purpose states:

***“The purpose of the Zone is to enable high quality on-site visitor activities and resort facilities, within a golf course setting and with a predominance of open space. The Zone provides for golf courses (including an 18-hole championship course), a sculpture park, walkway and cycleway, visitor industry activities, residential activities (including staff accommodation), and a small scale commercial area. A range of forms of visitor accommodation are anticipated in the Zone, including boutique hotels / lodges with associated visitor amenities (including cafés and restaurants and facilities for health and wellness), and units that are primarily available for short-term visitor stays.”***

The change sought by the Request does not move away from or weaken either the concept of this particular resort zone (as set out in Chapter 47.1) or the focus on onsite visitor activities as required by the PDP definition.

The zone remains primarily for high quality on-site visitor activities (being a world-class golf course) and the change reinforces this by addressing the outcomes of the redesign necessary to achieve a championship golf course of international ranking and world renown. While the existing nine-hole “farm” golf course in the southern part of the zone will be disestablished, other parts of the zone will have an improved or increased resort offering (such as the new Golf Training Facility Activity Area and Sports Courts and Gardens Activity Area) and the wider zone will therefore continue to achieve the definition of being an overall development focused on onsite visitor activities.

To reiterate the Assessment of Environmental Effects in relation to this issue, while, as a result of the Change, the dispersal of residential units throughout the THRZ may be slightly different compared to the operative THRZ, the Change will continue to ensure that the THRZ meets the PDP definition of “Resort” by retaining the existing cap on overall (both visitor accommodation and residential) unit numbers (set at 150 by Rule 47.5.15) and the existing cap on the number of residential units (set at 66 by Rule 47.5.16), (noting also that unlimited Residential Visitor Accommodation is provided for in all residential units). The zone will remain as “principally providing temporary visitor accommodation” as required by the definition of “Resort” and will continue to remain a comprehensively designed, planned and integrated development.

26. Please provide comment or further evaluation of the removal of the golf course and dispersed homesites in relation to SP 3.3.1 and Objective 47.2.1. In particular, whether the proposed outcomes would still maintain and enhance visitor attractions, facilities and services as promoted by Strategic Policy 3.3.1, and the extent the following elements of the proposal achieve Objective 47.2.1:
- That the new residential activity elements (i.e. Homesites 6-15) are integrated with the golf resort;
  - That buildings and vehicle access to Homesites 6-15 would maintain landscape character and visual amenity values of the Zone and surrounding environment.

Strategic Policy 3.3.1 states:

***“Make provision for the visitor industry to maintain and enhance attractions, facilities and services within the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres and elsewhere within the District’s urban areas and settlements at locations where this is consistent with objectives and policies for the relevant zone.”***

This SP was not identified as relevant to the proposal and therefore not assessed by the Requestor in the Section 32 evaluation as it is limited to “within the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres and elsewhere within the District’s urban areas and settlements” (emphasis added). The Hills Resort Zone is not within a town centre, urban area or settlement<sup>4</sup>, therefore this SP would appear not to apply. Notwithstanding this, the objective of the plan change (being to deliver a world class golfing experience and golf resort with resort accommodation and facilities centred around a redesigned championship golf course of international ranking and world renown) would clearly achieve the policy intent of maintaining and enhancing visitor industry attractions, facilities and services. As previously addressed in the response to (25) above, the disestablishment of the existing nine-hole “farm” golf course in the southern part of the zone does not affect the overall purpose of the zone being focused on onsite visitor activities, as this is being done in conjunction with an increased or improved resort offering in other parts of the zone.

In response to (a) above, the location of the proposed new Homesites may appear, when viewed on an aerial image or on the Structure Plan, to be distant and disconnected from the location of the golf course, but in practice it is an easy walk (or golf cart ride) from the Clubhouse and golf course to the new Homesite locations.

In response to (b) above, this matter has been addressed in response to (5) above already and in the updated Landscape Assessment (**Attachment E**), but in summary, by following the underlying terrain as much as possible, landscape effects are minimised. While some engineering will be required within the gully area to achieve Council standards, the landform in this area will visually absorb these changes. The locating of the accessway following a contour along the upper terrace to the individual Homesites will also minimise the earthworks required, and the LAMA and SPA as required by the provisions will support the visual integration of the accessway.

27. With the proposal resulting in a greater dispersal of development through the Zone (as acknowledged on page 25 of the section 32 report), has consideration been given to staging residential activity development with visitor accommodation and/or visitor industry development of the Zone, or any other methods, as a means to ensure that implementing the THRZ framework still principally provides a resort offering rather than the potential for parts of the plan change to result in rural residential development tacked onto a golf course?

<sup>4</sup> “Settlement” is not a defined term in the PDP however upon review of its use within the various parts of the PDP, it appears generally to reference to either those areas zoned Settlement Zone (which includes areas such as Glenorchy, Kingston and Cardrona) and which is located within Part Three “Urban Environment” of the PDP, or in reference to areas that are zoned another Part Three “Urban Environment” zone (such as Hawea, which is zoned primarily Low Density Suburban Residential). In light of this focus on “urban” where the term settlement is used, it would not be appropriate to consider a resort zoning to fall under this term for the purpose of SP 3.3.1, especially when the definition of “Urban Development” makes it very clear that a resort development in an otherwise rural area does not constitute urban development.

This is not a matter relevant to the change sought by the Request. The dispersal referred to in the Section 32 evaluation was reference to the change in location of a very small amount of residential development (11 units, or approximately 17% of the total residential unit capacity enabled in the zone) resulting from the proposed new Homesite locations (and that would otherwise be enabled elsewhere in the zone under the current provisions).

There is no existing requirement for a set level of visitor accommodation to be established prior to residential units being constructed, or vice versa, and the Change does not propose to alter the proportion of visitor accommodation and residential activity from what is provided for by the operative zone. The Hills Resort Zone was found to meet the definition of "Resort" as part of its original promulgation, and redistribution of possible locations for the residential component of the resort development does not alter this assessment.

**28. If the answer to the above is yes, what form would any plan provisions take?**

As no further controls are necessary for the reasons set out in response to (27) above, no additional plan provisions are required or proposed.

We trust this response resolves your queries, however, please feel free to get in touch if you have any questions on the above matters.

Yours sincerely,



Christine Edgley / Jeff Brown  
**Brown & Company Planning Group**

**ATTACHMENTS**

- A.** The Hills Resort Zone Structure Plan (Updated) prepared by RBT Design Group dated 30 April 2025
- B.** Traffic Assessment prepared by Carriageway Consulting Ltd dated 7 May 2025
- C.** Overview of surrounding development context prepared by Brown & Company Planning Group dated 15 April 2025
- D.** Overview of building heights and rationale prepared by RBT Design Group dated 1 May 2025
- E.** Landscape Assessment (Updated) prepared by Boffa Miskell dated 9 May 2025
- F.** Updated mapping of activity areas with aerials prepared by RBT Design Group dated 30 April 2025
- G.** Photomontages and Photomontage Methodology Statement prepared by Boffa Miskell dated 7 May 2025
- H.** Email correspondence with Queenstown Trails Trust representative Mark Williams dated 13 January 2025 – 7 February 2025

- I.** Proposed District Plan Provisions (Updated) prepared by Brown & Company Planning Group dated 15 May 2025
- J.** Request for Plan Change (Updated) prepared by Brown & Company Planning Group dated 15 May 2025
- K.** Assessment of Environmental Effects (Updated) prepared by Brown & Company Planning Group dated 15 May 2025
- L.** Section 32 Evaluation (Updated) prepared by Brown & Company Planning Group dated 15 May 2025
- M.** Design Statement (Updated) prepared by RBT Design Group dated 7 May 2025