

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 13  
– Queenstown  
Mapping Annotations  
and Rezoning  
Requests

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPLY OF ROBERT BRUCE BUXTON  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**GROUP 2 RURAL**

**11 October 2017**

---

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / H L Baillie  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1 |
| 2. GRANT HYLTON HENSMAN, SHARYN HENSMAN & BRUCE HERBERT ROBERTSON, SCOPE RESOURCES LTD, GRANT HYLTON HENSMAN & NOEL THOMAS VAN WICHEN, TROJAN HOLDINGS LTD (361) ..... | 2 |
| 3. GIBBSTON VALLEY STATION LIMITED (827).....  | 3 |
| 4. QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED (806) AND REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED (807).....   | 5 |

## APPENDIX 1: UPDATED LIST OF SUBMISSIONS FOR GROUP 2

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Robert Bruce Buxton. I prepared a statement of evidence in chief, rebuttal evidence, supplementary rebuttal evidence, a summary of evidence, an updated summary of evidence, and reply evidence for the Queenstown Mapping Hearing Stream 13. My qualifications and experience are listed in my evidence in chief dated 24 May 2017.

1.2 The purpose of this supplementary reply evidence is to specifically respond to matters raised by the following submitters during the course of the hearing:

- (a) Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Grant Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd (**Hensman**, 361);
- (b) Gibbston Valley Station Limited (**Gibbston**, 827); and
- (c) Queenstown Park Limited (**QPL**, 806).

1.3 I have also responded to two matters in the Hearing Panel (**Panel**) Minute of 15 September 2017 regarding the activity status of “golf courses” (addressed in section 3 below) and the practicality of standards controlling grazing by cattle (addressed in section 4 below).

1.4 The Panel directed the Council to file its reply evidence in relation to the above three submissions on 11 October 2017.<sup>1</sup> My reply evidence on other submissions in Group 2 – Rural was filed on 6 October 2017.

1.5 I have attached an updated Table of recommendations to Group 2 submissions as **Appendix 1**.<sup>2</sup>

1 Oral directions at hearing. Memorandum of Counsel for Queenstown Lakes District Council seeking an extension of time to file planning reply in relation to Gibbston Valley Station Limited (827) dated 29 September 2017; Panel Minute concerning Council request to extend time to file reply dated 29 September 2017.

2 This supersedes Appendix 1 attached to my reply evidence filed on 6 October 2017.

**2. GRANT HYLTON HENSMAN, SHARYN HENSMAN & BRUCE HERBERT ROBERTSON, SCOPE RESOURCES LTD, GRANT HYLTON HENSMAN & NOEL THOMAS VAN WICHEN, TROJAN HOLDINGS LTD (361)**

**2.1** I participated in expert conferencing with Ms Alyson Hutton, the outcomes of which are recorded in the planning expert conferencing statement dated 15 September 2017.<sup>3</sup> This conferencing statement primarily confirmed agreed refinements to the package of proposed provisions for the new zone sought by Hensman. Although I agreed that those provisions, as refined through the conferencing statement, would be appropriate if the Panel decided to prefer the submitter's position on the areas of disagreement and accept the submission, I remain concerned that Hensman has not provided sufficient information or assessment on the following matters that allows me and therefore also the Panel, to examine the potential effects of the proposed zone including questions as to whether the duties under s32 of the RMA have been fulfilled:

- (a) an up-to date report on the natural hazards both on and above the site has not been provided; and
- (b) the effect of the proposed height control has not been adequately assessed, including a visual impression of the development that could be expected to be achieved under the height control provisions. Dr Read also remains concerned about the visibility of the development. Dr Read's concerns are not with the close views of the site (that is, the 2.5km of SH6 that visibility mapping<sup>4</sup> was undertaken from) but instead with the more distant and oblique views which have not been modelled.

**2.2** The above two matters are recorded as "matters of disagreement" in the conferencing statement.<sup>5</sup>

3 Subsequent to signing the conferencing statement, I note that the reference in (iii) on the front page, should be to s 32AA of the RMA, rather than s 42AA.

4 Memorandum of submitter's counsel to the Panel on 19 June 2017.

5 I have been advised by Mr Mander that the Summary Evidence of Mr Bartlett contains an error in the second sentence of paragraph 9 where Mr Bartlett refers to "The maximum delay for this manoeuvre is 43 seconds which is a level of service E." whereas from the data provided in Appendix C of the Summary Evidence this should have referred to the "The average delay ...". This error does not change the Level of Service, but should be noted.

2.3 Overall I retain my recommendation that the submission be rejected.

### 3. GIBBSTON VALLEY STATION LIMITED (827)

3.1 I participated in expert conferencing with Mr Brett Giddens<sup>6</sup> on 6 - 9 October 2017 and signed a joint conferencing statement on 9 October 2017. This statement primarily confirms a refined set of provisions for the proposed zone. Although I agreed that those provisions, as refined through the conferencing statement, would be appropriate if the Panel decided to prefer the submitter's position on the areas of disagreement and accept the submission, I remain concerned about the following matters:

- (a) the proposed subzone provides for a density of development that goes beyond being complementary to the character and viability/productivity of the zone and will create development where the rural landscape, including the viticulture, will become significantly less dominant and possibly the lesser element within the subzone; and
- (b) the submitter's amendments that move the emphasis from visitor accommodation (as currently consented) to residential activity within AA3, AA5 and AA6, which introduces activities that do not "provide for viticulture and commercial activities with an affiliation to viticulture" and further erodes the GCZ.

3.2 Dr Read has provided comment on the artist's impression of the possible view of the development, which showed stone walls, hedges and vineyards screening the built development. Dr Read was concerned that the impression only showed the vineyard in leaf, but was also concerned about the loss of wide open views that characterise the Gibbston Valley. While I agree with her concerns, the existing Gibbston Character Zone (**GCZ**) does not control hedges or landscaping, and I consider it would be difficult to control fencing and hedges.

6 This expert conferencing was directed by the Panel Minute dated 29 September 2017. No expert conferencing had occurred prior to 6 October 2017.

- 3.3** Overall I retain my recommendation that the submission be rejected.
- 3.4** The Panel's Minute of 15 September 2017 requested the Council to address whether it is correct that a golf course is a permitted activity in the GCZ as they amount to commercial recreation and involve groups of less than 10 persons. The Minute asked the Council to address what activity status would apply to a golf course in the GCZ, if the assertion that it is permitted is incorrect.
- 3.5** "Commercial recreational activities" are defined as follows:<sup>7</sup>
- Means the commercial guiding, training, instructing, transportation or provision of recreation facilities to clients for recreational purposes including the use of any building or land associated with the activity, excluding ski area activities.*
- 3.6** Under Rule 23.4.15, commercial recreation activities are permitted, provided they meet the standards in Table 3. Relevantly, this includes Standard 23.5.9 "*Commercial recreation activity undertaken outdoors and involving not more than 10 persons in any one group*" (noting that the other standards in Table 3 relate to retail sales of goods produced onsite and home occupation, and are not relevant to the activity status of golf courses). Non-compliance with Standard 23.5.9 results in a discretionary activity status.
- 3.7** I consider that a golf course clearly fits the definition of a commercial recreational activity, being the commercial provision of recreation facilities. However, it is not as clear whether a golf course meets the permitted activity standard of involving no more than ten persons in any one group.
- 3.8** I acknowledge that an interpretation of "in any one group" could refer to each group of golfers teeing off at one time, which is unlikely to involve ten or more people and is more likely to be a foursome or a pair. The alternative interpretation is that the "group" is the total

<sup>7</sup> Chapter 2 (Definitions) attached to Right of Reply of Ms Amanda Leith dated 27 March 2017, Hearing Stream 10.

number of people likely to be on the golf course at any one time, which I consider to be the appropriate interpretation. I consider that it would not be logical to apply the former interpretation to groups within a large recreational facility such as a golf course as this could result in an absurd interpretation. Taken to its extreme, it could be argued that individual riders on a luge are a group less than 10, and therefore a luge facility catering overall for larger numbers (for example, 100 persons) would be a permitted activity within the GVZ (or the Rural zone for that matter). In my view “10 persons in any one group” is a limit that will be exceeded when the commercial recreation facility caters for more than 10 persons at a time.

**3.9** The activity status of a golf course would therefore be discretionary. If the golf course involved new buildings, earthworks, retail, a café or other development then those aspects would need to be considered against the rules of the zone as well.

#### **4. QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED (806) AND REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED (807)**

**4.1** Ms Mellsop has filed reply evidence dated 11 October 2017, in response to the supplementary evidence of Mr Brown and Ms Skidmore and the proposed amendments to reduce the building coverage on the upper and lower terraces of RV3 and to clarify building height within this activity area. Ms Mellsop remains of the view that this landscape is not able to absorb development of the scale and nature enabled by the proposed Queenstown Park Special Zone. I rely on Ms Mellsop’s view and continue to recommend that the rezoning should be rejected.

**4.2** I remain concerned that the Water Conservation Order (**WCO**) for the Kawarau River has been rather glossed over by the submitter. I note that the proposed zone provisions make no mention of the WCO or the values identified in the WCO.<sup>8</sup> There has also been no assessment provided of the rationale for the identified locations of the

<sup>8</sup> I also note there is still very little mention of the ONL, except in Objective 44.2.1B which refers to having “regard for the landscape values of the ONL”.

bridges, jetties, roads and gondola (including possible river crossings of the gondola) in terms of the WCO.

- 4.3** Although there has been consideration of the extent of the margins of the river (which I understand is addressed in the Council's supplementary reply submissions), and the landscape architects have referred to particular terraces in their joint statement, in my view the overarching consideration is to recognise that the Kowarau River, with its outstanding values, is an integral part of the environment within which the zone will be set. I consider such a view is important to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources (s30(1)(a) and s31(1)(a) of the RMA).
- 4.4** The question of the *vires* of rules proposed by the submitter, and raised in my Supplementary Summary of Evidence dated 4 September 2017, is addressed in the legal reply.
- 4.5** The Panel's Minute of 15 September 2017 requested the Council to comment on the two proposed standards regarding maximum stocking rate and restricting cattle grazing to outside the Significant Natural Areas (**SNA**), being:

|                |  |    |
|----------------|--|----|
| <b>44.5.12</b> | <b>Stocking Rate above 600 masl between SNA F32B and F32A3</b><br>Maximum stocking rate shall be 3 units per hectare | D  |
| <b>44.5.13</b> | <b>Cattle grazing shall be outside the SNA areas</b>   | NC |

- 4.6** The specific matters requested to be addressed (in italics) and my response, are as follows:

- (a) *In what circumstances would these standards be triggered?*  
These standards are not specifically tied to a particular activity, but would be assumed to be standards for the activity of "farming", which is a permitted activity. If the standards are breached, the non-compliance activity status would apply;
- (b) *Would existing use rights (EURs) affect their application?*  
Yes, if the standards apply to farming and that activity is already occurring on the land then existing use rights would

in principle apply, however, only to the extent that existing use rights could be proven (the onus lies with the applicant), and the effects of the use were the same or similar in character, intensity, and scale. Any application for consent for a different activity, is likely to change the character, intensity and scale of the effects of the activity; and

(c) *Does the Council have the capability of monitoring such standards and enforcing them?*

In reality, these standards would be difficult to monitor and enforce. In order for the standards to be met, there would need to be fencing at the 600masl contour and around the SNA areas. Identifying the stocking rate above the 600masl line would be very difficult to determine at any given time. If the SNA areas were fenced, the monitoring of cattle grazing within the SNA would be a little more practical as there would be obvious signs such as cattle droppings, although it would be impractical to monitor the whole of an SNA and it would also be difficult to take enforcement action. It would be easier to make the second standard regarding grazing outside of an SNA, a condition of the first Comprehensive Development Plan consent, and this one would be more practical to monitor.

4.7 At the hearing, QPL produced Exhibit 13.19 showing on-street angle parking on road reserve to the south of Lake Hayes Estate. As noted by Mr Mander in his Summary of Evidence, the Council decides on any parking on road reserve. It is my understanding that if the Council was to consider approval for a gondola station on the site as shown, then access and carparking would be addressed at that time, and this may include consideration of parking on the site rather than the road reserve, as well as providing for public transport and other travel modes.



**Robert Buxton**  
**11 October 2017**

**APPENDIX 1: UPDATED LIST OF SUBMISSIONS FOR GROUP 2**

| Original Point No | Further Submission No | Submitter  | Lowest Clause   | Submitter Position | Submission Summary  | Planner Recommendation | Transferred   | Issue Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 168.1             |                       | Garry Strange  |   | Oppose             | That the areas shown as Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle and Rural General on Map 38 at Wilsons Bay be zoned one consistent zoning being Rural Residential.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 168.2             |                       | Garry Strange  | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Other              | The council address the different zonings of Wilson bay and remove from outstanding natural landscape.  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 243.29            |                       | Christine Byrch  | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | Remove the Visitor Accommodation sub-zone from the proposed plan.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 243.29            | FS1224.29             | Matakauri Lodge Limited  | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 243.33            |                       | Christine Byrch  | 22.5.13   | Oppose             | Delete this sub-zone, but if it is retained, maximum building coverage should be 2000m <sup>2</sup> , and any more than this should be prohibited. add another point for discretion: Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.  | Reject                 | Removal of Visitor Accommodation Subzone for Speargrass Flat deferred to Wakatipu Basin Mapping Hearing | Group 2 Report  |
| 298.2             |                       | Nick Clark   | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | Change from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. The land at Closeburn is useless for anything but building on. Remove the building restriction area.  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 328.2             |                       | Noel Gutzewitz   | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Rezone part of the land located between Boyd Road and the Kawarau River as described in section 1 (Secs 42 and 43, Blk XII Closeburn SD and Lots 4 and 5 DP 24790) and Attachment B from rural to rural lifestyle. Copied from submission point 328.1   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 328.2             | FS1340.75             | Queenstown Airport Corporation   | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | QAC is concerned rezoning requests that will result in the intensification of ASAN establishing within close proximity to Queenstown Airport. The proposed rezoning is a significant departure from the nature, scale and intensity of ASAN development currently anticipated at this site and may potentially result in adverse effects on QAC over the longer term. The proposed rezoning request should not be accepted. | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 331.5             |                       | The Station at Waitiri   | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Oppose the rural general/ Gibbston valley character (GVCZ) zoning of Lots 51, 52, 53, 54 & 55 DP 390679 and Section 12 SO 342162 (the location of the submitter's property is highlighted on Attachment [A] of the original submission) and request it be rezoned from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle. (Copied from submission point 331.3)   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.1             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd |   | Oppose             | Amend planning map 13 to rezone land identified in a map attached to the submission and which is located generally on the eastern side of State Highway 6, opposite Jacks Point. from 'Rural' to 'Industrial B - Coneburn'.   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.1             | FS1229.1              | NZSki Limited  |   | Support            | NZSki Limited supports submission 361 in its entirety and agrees with the conclusions in the submitters Section 32 Report that the issues identified and options taken forward are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. NZSki Limited seeks that this submission be accepted by QLDC.  | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.3             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Amend planning map 13 to rezone land identified in a map attached to the submission and which is located generally on the eastern side of State Highway 6, opposite Jacks Point. from 'Rural' to 'Industrial B - Coneburn'. Copied from submission point 361.1 on the Rural Zone.   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.3             | FS1229.3              | NZSki Limited  | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | NZSki Limited supports submission 361 in its entirety and agrees with the conclusions in the submitters Section 32 Report that the issues identified and options taken forward are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. NZSki Limited seeks that this submission be accepted by QLDC.  | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.3             | FS1277.3              | Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association   | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Opposes. Believes that the rezoning will have cumulative adverse effects on landscape and visual values, including light spill, and the character of the area. Seeks that the submission be disallowed.   | Accept                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.3             | FS1275.90             | "Jacks Point"  | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Opposes in part. Believes that the rezoning of Rural General to Industrial as requested is opposed on the basis that it will have cumulative adverse effects on landscape and visual values, and the character of the area. Seeks that the submission be disallowed.  | Accept                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.6             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd |   | Oppose             | Oppose the subdivision chapter and request that it be amended to include the Industrial B - Coneburn Zone by adding new objectives, policies, and performance standards in order to give effect to the proposed Industrial B - Coneburn structure plan.   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.7             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd | 27.4.1 Discretionary activities                             | Oppose             | Opposes the discretionary activity status and requests controlled activity status for subdivision in the Industrial B - Coneburn Zone; through amending the rule as follows: <b>"27.4.1.1 Subdivision in the Industrial B: Coneburn is a Controlled Activity"</b> .   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.8             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd | 27.7 Location-specific objectives, policies and provisions  | Other              | Requests additional objectives and policies be added as detailed in Appendix D to the submission.   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 361.9             |                       | Grant Hylton Hensman, Sharyn Hensman & Bruce Herbert Robertson, Scope Resources Ltd, Granty Hylton Hensman & Noel Thomas van Wichen, Trojan Holdings Ltd | 27.8 Rules - Location Specific Standards                    | Other              | Requests additional rules be added specific to the industrial B - Coneburn Zone, as detailed in Appendix D to the submission.   | Reject                 | Industrial B zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2   | Group 2 Report  |
| 393.1             |                       | Middleton Family Trust   | Map 31 - Lower Shotover                                     | Oppose             | Oppose the rural zoning AND request that 114 hectares of Lot 2 DP 351844 (located at the top of Queenstown Hill and as identified in Attachment A of the submission) be rezoned to Airport Mixed Use zone. Copied from Submission point 393.3 to the rural zone.  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 393.1             | FS1077.14             | Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)  | Map 31 - Lower Shotover                                     | Oppose             | To the extent that any of this land falls within the Queenstown Airport ANB or OCB BARNZ opposes the change and asks that the land be retained in its proposed zone.  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 393.1             | FS1340.93             | Queenstown Airport Corporation   | Map 31 - Lower Shotover                                     | Oppose             | QAC opposes the proposed rezoning until such a time that an aeronautical study has been completed for the site that confirms the site is suitable for aviation activities. Rezoning the land may also potentially result in significant adverse effects on QAC that have not been appropriately assessed in terms of section 32 of the Act.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 393.1             | FS1097.260            | Queenstown Park Limited  | Map 31 - Lower Shotover                                     | Support            | Support proposed rezoning of Queenstown Hill to Airport Mixed Use Zone  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 393.1             | FS1270.104            | Hansen Family Partnership  | Map 31 - Lower Shotover                                     | Oppose             | Opposes. Assures that an airport in the location proposed will have adverse effects on the Hansen Family Partnership land. Seeks this submission be disallowed.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 409.2             |                       | Neil McDonald  | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Amend the Proposed District Plan Landscape Category Boundary to reflect the most recent Court Decision (i.e. C203/2004). NB - the submitter owns Lot 1 DP 443946, as shown on the map attached to the decision. Copied from submission point 409.3.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 431.2             |                       | Barbara Kipke  | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Other              | Opposes the Rural zoning of the land at Lot 1 DP 474749, at Wye Creek, shown on Proposed District Plan Map 13a. Seeks that the Rural Zoning is deleted and replaced with Rural Lifestyle Zoning.  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |

| Original Point No | Further Submission No | Submitter  | Lowest Clause   | Submitter Position | Submission Summary  | Planner Recommendation   | Transferred | Issue Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|--|-------------|-----------------|
| 431.3             |                       | Barbara Kipke  | 27.5.1  | Other              | Seeks that the average allotment size of the Rural Lifestyle Zone is reduced from 2 hectares to 1.5 hectares for the submitters property at Lot 1 DP 474749, Wye Creek, shown on Proposed District Plan Map 13a.<br>Amend Rule 27.5.1 by adding a new row under the heading Rural Lifestyle:<br><u>Rural lifestyle – Wye Creek One hectare, provide the average lot size is not less than 1.5 hectares.</u>   | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 447.2             |                       | Karen & Murray Scott, Loch Linnhe Station                | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Other              | The submitters property at Loch Linnhe Station located south of Wye Creek and Drift Bay, and east of Lake Wakatipu with access off Kingston Road. This land is shown on Proposed Planning Map 13.<br>Requests that the PDP should provide for areas within large farm (say over 1000 hectares in area) where the erection of homesteads, staff accommodation and farm buildings are a permitted or controlled activity. States that the PDP is disenabling of this, as residential activity on a large rural property is treated exactly the same as a residential activity on a small landholding in the Wakatipu Basin.<br>Requests the following:<br>(i) The concept of a Farm Base Area (FBA's be included in the Queenstown-Lakes PDP;<br>(ii) That FBA's be identified on large rural property in excess of 1000 hectares in area;<br>(iii) That within FBA's, homesteads, staff accommodation and farm buildings be a permitted or controlled activity;<br>(iv) That two FBA's be identified on our property as shown on the plans attached to this submission;<br>(v) If (i) to (iv) above is not accepted, then we seek Rural Visitor zoning over the two areas we identify as being suitable FBA's consistent with other stations in the district.<br>(vi) Any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this submission. | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 478.2             |                       | Lake Wakatipu Station Limited & Review Seventeen Limited | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Other              | Opposes the proposed Rural Zoning of land located at Halfway Bay on the western shoreline of the southern arm Lake Wakatipu, shown on Proposed Planning Map 13 and 15. States that this land should be zoned to enable diversification (including tourism) of the station, similar to what the Council has enabled with the Rural Visitor Zones located at Cecil Peak and Walter Peak Stations.<br><br>Requests a Rural Visitor Zone be adopted over the area of flat land at Halfway Bay (shown on the plan attached to the submission).<br><br>Retain the balance of the Station as Rural zoning within the QLDC boundaries.  | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 481.1             |                       | Cabo Limited   | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Other              | Supports the proposed provisions to the Wyuna Rural Lifestyle Zone (inclusive of the building restricted area) as proposed in Planning Map 25. Adopt Planning Map 25 as it relates to the Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.<br>Supports the visitor accommodation subzone located on the corner of southern corner of Shiel and Oban Streets provided there is flexibility for use of this land for retail and commercial purposes also as provided for through the underlying Township zoning.<br>Opposes the blanket zoning of Designation 428 on Planning Map 25 and formally requests that the Designation 428 (Glenorchy Closed Landfill) be further refined in location. Remove the large shaded area which identifies Designation 428 (Glenorchy Closed Landfill)  | Accept the support for the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Visitor Accommodation subzone not "on" Stage 1. Designation addressed in Hearing 07 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 481.3             |                       | Cabo Limited   | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Other              | Support the proposed provisions to the Wyuna Rural Lifestyle Zone (inclusive of the building restricted area) as proposed in Planning Map 25. Adopt the Rural Lifestyle provisions within proposed Chapter 22 and Planning Map 25 as it relates to the Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.  | Accept the support for the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Visitor Accommodation subzone not "on" Stage 1. Designation addressed in Hearing 07 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 486.1             |                       | Temple Peak Ltd  | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Support            | Supports the Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone as it relates to Temple Peak Station shown on Proposed District Plan Map 9 (legally described as Sec 1-9 SO460577 Sec 32-34 38A 39 Blk 1 Glenorchy SD). Adopt the Rural Lifestyle provisions for the area identified.  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 486.2             |                       | Temple Peak Ltd  | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Support            | Supports the Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone as it relates to Temple Peak Station shown on Proposed District Plan Map 9 (legally described as Sec 1-9 SO460577 Sec 32-34 38A 39 Blk 1 Glenorchy SD).  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 519.64            |                       | New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited                      | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Amend Map 9 as shown in the map attached to this submission.  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 519.64            | FS1356.64             | Cabo Limited   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | All the relief sought be declined   | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 519.64            | FS1015.100            | Straterra  | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Support            | I support this submission in its entirety as providing appropriately for minerals and mining activities in the District, in a way that is consistent with the letter and intent of the RMA.   | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 595.1             |                       | Matakauri Lodge Limited                                  |   | Other              | Support in part. The Visitor Accommodation sub-zoning for the MLL site is confirmed.  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 607.22            |                       | Te Anau Developments Limited                             | Part Seven - Maps   | Not Stated         | Rezone the "Rural General" zoned land (including land described as Pt. Sect 19 BLK III MID WAKATIPU SD, recreation reserve, Section 1 SO 10828, and marginal strip adjoining this land and adjoining the land owned by Te Anau Developments Ltd) to "Rural Visitor Walter Peak".  | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 624.4             |                       | D & M Columb   | Part Seven - Maps   | Not Stated         | Shift southern reach of the ONL overlay affecting Gorge Road back to its previous location.   | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             |                       | Amrta Land Ltd   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Other              | Amend Planning Maps 9 and 25 C to include the land described as Woodbine Station with the Rural Visitor Zone. Alternatively, a zoning that would suitably provide for tourism development, such as the Rural Lifestyle Zone with a Visitor Accommodation Overlay, or some other specific tourism related zoning.  | Reject   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1035.8              | Mark Crook   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Preserve the natural landscape by refusing the application.   | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1074.8              | Alistair Angus   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | That the whole submission be disallowed. The applicant/Ref 677 has already shown scant regard for land and neighbours to grant this submission would be a total and irreversible disaster.  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1290.2              | Robert Andrew Singleton                                  | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Object to these proposed changes  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1312.8              | AG Angus   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Oppose on every level in its present form   | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1319.1              | John glover  | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Notwithstanding the fact that some carefully planned development near the bush edge at the valley floor may be able to be accommodated, the lack of detail and a simple request to wholly reclassify the station land means that I am in opposition to the proposal.  | Accept   |             | Group 2 Report  |

| Original Point No | Further Submission No | Submitter                       | Lowest Clause   | Submitter Position | Submission Summary  | Planner Recommendation | Transferred   | Issue Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 677.8             | FS1323.1              | Kinloch Residents Association   | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | Opposes. States that there is a large area of land zoned rural visitor at Arcadia which remains undeveloped. Unlike the Woodbine proposal, at least the Arcadia land has an agreed structure plan in place. Requests that the proposal is declined.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1364.8              | John and Kay Richards           | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Oppose             | believe the submission to be vague with little in the way of defining details and with no prior consultation consider it to be flawed in many ways  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.8             | FS1117.271            | Remarkables Park Limited        | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Support            | For the reasons outlined in RPL's primary submission.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             |                       | Amrta Land Ltd                  | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Other              | Amend Planning Maps 9 and 25 C to include the land described as Woodbine Station with the Rural Visitor Zone Alternatively, a zoning that would suitably provide for tourism development, such as the Rural Lifestyle Zone with a Visitor Accommodation Overlay, or some other specific tourism related zoning.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1035.9              | Mark Crook                      | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | Preserve the natural landscape by refusing the application.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1074.9              | Alistair Angus                  | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | That the whole submission be disallowed. The applicant/Ref 677 has already shown scant regard for land and neighbours to grant this submission would be a total and irreversible disaster.  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1290.1              | Robert Andrew Singleton         | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | Object to these proposed changes  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1312.9              | AG Angus                        | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | Oppose on every level in its present form   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1319.2              | John glover                     | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | Notwithstanding the fact that some carefully planned development near the bush edge at the valley floor may be able to be accommodated, the lack of detail and a simple request to wholly reclassify the station land means that I am in opposition to the proposal.  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1364.9              | John and Kay Richards           | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | believe the submission to be vague with little in the way of defining details and with no prior consultation consider it to be flawed in many ways  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 677.9             | FS1323.2              | Kinloch Residents Association   | Map 25 - Glenorchy, Kinloch and South of Blanket Bay        | Oppose             | Opposes. States that there is a large area of land zoned rural visitor at Arcadia which remains undeveloped. Unlike the Woodbine proposal, at least the Arcadia land has an agreed structure plan in place. Requests that the proposal is declined.   | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 689.1             |                       | Kingston Lifestyle Family Trust |   | Oppose             | The site (located on Kingston-Garston Highway (State Highway 6) legally described as Lot 3 DP 12725) be rezoned from Rural General to either Kingston Township, Low Density Residential or Kingston Village Zone  | Reject                 | Township Zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2 of the review | Group 2 Report  |
| 689.1             | FS1344.5              | Tim Tayler                      |   | Support            | Allow relief sought - The submitter requests it land to be rezoned from rural general to an alternative zone that provides for residential development. The further submitter considers that residential development in this location is appropriate and that the rural general zone inappropriate.   | Reject                 | Township Zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2 of the review | Group 2 Report  |
| 689.1             | FS1348.4              | M & C Wilson                    |   | Support            | Allow relief sought - The submitter requests it land to be rezoned from rural general to an alternative zone that provides for residential development. The further submitter considers that residential development in this location is appropriate and that the rural general zone inappropriate.   | Reject                 | Township Zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2 of the review | Group 2 Report  |
| 689.2             |                       | Kingston Lifestyle Family Trust | Map 39 - Arthurs Point, Kingston                            | Oppose             | Planning Map 39A is updated to reflect the change in zone (The site (located on Kingston-Garston Highway (State Highway 6) legally described as Lot 3 DP 12725) be rezoned from Rural General to either Kingston Township, Low Density Residential or Kingston Village Zone).   | Reject                 | Township Zone provisions to be addressed in Stage 2 of the review | Group 2 Report  |
| 694.20            |                       | Glentui Heights Ltd             | 22.5.32   | Oppose             | Delete Table 5  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 694.2             |                       | Glentui Heights Ltd             |   | Oppose             | Delete the Bobs Cove Sub Zone as shown on the Planning Maps and show as Rural Residential Zone with no subzone.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 694.30            |                       | Glentui Heights Ltd             | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | Delete the Bobs Cove Sub Zone as shown on the Planning Maps and show as Rural Residential Zone with no subzone.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 694.4             |                       | Glentui Heights Ltd             | 22.2.6.1  | Oppose             | Delete the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential subzone - To create comprehensively-planned residential development with ample open space and a predominance of indigenous vegetation throughout the zone. Policies: Ensure at least 75% of the zone is retained as undomesticated area and at least 50% of this area is established and maintained in indigenous species such that total indigenous vegetation cover is maintained over that area. Ensure there is open space in front of buildings that remains generally free of vegetation to avoid disrupting the open pastoral character of the area and the lake and mountain views.  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 694.6             |                       | Glentui Heights Ltd             | 22.2.7 Objective 7  | Support            | Confirm the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob's Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob's Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: • appropriate landscaping using native plants; • restricting the use of exotic plants; • removing wilding species; • providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; • maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown                | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 702.19            |                       | Lake Wakatipu Stations Limited  | Part Seven - Maps   | Not Stated         | Amend the planning maps 13a to show the extent of Significant Natural Area C24A to be in accordance with the black dotted line in the attached image. - Image in the original submission  | Accept                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 710.2             |                       | Reavers NZ Limited              | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Other              | Submitter requests that that ONL boundary as shown on Planning Map 13 is amended to align with the plans marked Annexure A and attached to the submission which relates to the submitter's property on the Kingston-Garston Highway (Lot 2 DP 300643) and locality. AND any other additional or consequential relief that will fully give effect to this submission.  | Accept in part         |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.10            |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | 22.5 Rules - Standards                                      | Oppose             | Rules 22.5.21 to 22.5.32 - delete Table 5   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.3             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | Rezoned the "Rural General" zoned land identified in the attached Drawing by Paterson Pitts (refer to submission) as Proposed Section 1 to "Rural Residential".   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.5             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | Map 38 - Wilson Bay and Bobs Cove                           | Oppose             | Delete the Bobs Cove Sub Zone as shown on the Planning Maps and show as Rural Residential Zone with no subzone.   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.6             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | 22.2.6 Objective 6  | Oppose             | Delete this objective   | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.7             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | 22.2.6.1  | Oppose             | Delete this policy  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.8             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | 22.2.6.2  | Not Stated         | Delete this policy  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 712.9             |                       | Bobs Cove Developments Limited  | 22.2.7 Objective 7  | Support            | Confirm the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob's Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob's Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: • appropriate landscaping using native plants; • restricting the use of exotic plants; • removing wilding species; • providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; • maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown-Glenorchy Road | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 764.18            |                       | Mount Christina Limited         | Map 9 - Glenorchy Rural, Lake Wakatipu                      | Other              | Support in part<br>Amend Planning Map 9 (Glenorchy, Lake Wakatipu), to adjust the boundaries of the rural residential zone on the MCL land, in accordance with the revised zoning plan contained within Appendix 1 to this submission (764).  | Accept in part         |   | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.1             |                       | Queenstown Park Limited         | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Queenstown Park and the access corridors from Remarkables Park to the Remarkables ski field are rezoned as Queenstown Park Special Zone in accordance with the provisions and structure plan attached at Appendix A (see submission)  | Reject                 |   | Group 2 Report  |

| Original Point No | Further Submission No | Submitter                                    | Lowest Clause   | Submitter Position | Submission Summary  | Planner Recommendation | Transferred | Issue Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 806.1             | FS1229.29             | NZSki Limited                                | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | NZSki Limited support gondola access the Remarkables Ski Area and consider that such access will be complimentary to recreational use of the Ski Area Sub-Zone on a year round basis. NZSki Limited do however consider it necessary that a plan of the proposed gondola corridor is provided by the submitter to ensure that any future gondola is complimentary to NZSki Limited's existing and future proposed buildings, infrastructure and recreational activities. Overall, NZSki Limited requests that the submission points be allowed.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.1             | FS1313.57             | Darby Planning LP                            | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Support/Oppose Seek that the whole of the submissions seeking rezoning of land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zone be disallowed. DPL supports rezoning where that is based on a thorough assessment of infrastructure, protection of open space, provision of public benefits and landscape and visual amenity is protected, but opposes submissions to the PDP seeking to rezone land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zones where infrastructure and visual amenity matters have not been fully investigated or provided for or real risk of adverse effects arises, particularly landscape or cumulative effects. The reasons for this further submission relates to the potential for submissions to result in disparate development across the District, adverse effects on landscape and amenity values and also the inefficient use of natural and physical resources and infrastructure. DPL believes that decisions relating to rezoning requests should be informed by thorough analysis of the natural and physical resources of an area, an appropriate design response and a section 32 evaluation to support a robust framework for making decisions on the sustainable management of those resources. | Accept                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.1             | FS1340.145            | Queenstown Airport Corporation               | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | QAC opposes the proposed rezoning of this land and associated policy suite. Rezoning the land would have significant adverse effects on QAC that have not been appropriately assessed in terms of section 32 of the Act.  | Accept                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.1             | FS1371                | Queenstown Park Ltd and Remarkables Park Ltd | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | The gondola access corridor will provide an efficient and effective method to provide for a gondola. Consideration should be provided to the particular mechanism utilised to implement the access corridor whether it be rezoning the land or other methods such as an overlay.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.1             | FS1371                | Queenstown Park Ltd and Remarkables Park Ltd | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | The alignment of the gondola access corridor to be adjusted so that it does not extend across Lot 4 DP 447906 (Bridesdale Farm Developments Ltd) and therefore is adjusted as illustrated on the plan attached (Figure 1).  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.147           |                       | Queenstown Park Limited                      | 21.4 Rules - Activities                                     | Not Stated         | New rules consequential to the proposed change to objectives and policies that recognise the importance of the Remarkables ski field as a destination in both summer and winter. Rule 21.4.XX Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area Permitted Recreation, public access. Controlled activities: Commercial activities Commercial recreation activities Visitor accommodation Buildings and structures for the purposes of gondola access, and ski area activities Control reserved over; • Servicing • Landscaping and ecological impact • Nature and scale Rule 21.4.XX Access to the Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area Controlled activity: The construction and operation of a gondola that provides access from the Remarkables Park Zone to the Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area on the route shown on District planning Map 13.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.147           | FS1229.32             | NXski Limited                                | 21.4 Rules - Activities                                     | Support            | NZSki Limited support gondola access the Remarkables Ski Area and consider that such access will be complimentary to recreational use of the Ski Area Sub-Zone on a year round basis. NZSki Limited do however consider it necessary that a plan of the proposed gondola corridor is provided by the submitter to ensure that any future gondola is complimentary to NZSki Limited's existing and future proposed buildings, infrastructure and recreational activities. Overall, NZSki Limited requests that the submission points be allowed.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.2             |                       | Queenstown Park Limited                      | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | The ONL classification does not apply to the river terraces located within the Queenstown Park Special Zone and is instead moved back to the foot of the northern slopes of the Remarkables.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.2             | FS1313.58             | Darby Planning LP                            | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Support/Oppose Seek that the whole of the submissions seeking rezoning of land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zone be disallowed. DPL supports rezoning where that is based on a thorough assessment of infrastructure, protection of open space, provision of public benefits and landscape and visual amenity is protected, but opposes submissions to the PDP seeking to rezone land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zones where infrastructure and visual amenity matters have not been fully investigated or provided for or real risk of adverse effects arises, particularly landscape or cumulative effects. The reasons for this further submission relates to the potential for submissions to result in disparate development across the District, adverse effects on landscape and amenity values and also the inefficient use of natural and physical resources and infrastructure. DPL believes that decisions relating to rezoning requests should be informed by thorough analysis of the natural and physical resources of an area, an appropriate design response and a section 32 evaluation to support a robust framework for making decisions on the sustainable management of those resources. | Accept                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.206           |                       | Queenstown Park Limited                      |   | Not Stated         | QPL does not support the location or the extent of the four SNAs identified on its land. QPL considers that the proposed Queenstown Park Special Zone would ensure development that supports retention and enhancement of the indigenous vegetation and biodiversity values would be achieved. Should the Council decline the relief seeking the Queenstown Park Special Zone, QPL requests that the SNAs be removed from its land and the clearance of vegetation be enabled throughout the site. (a) That a Special Zone is applied to Queenstown Park and the SNAs be removed from QPL's land; or (b) If the request for a Special Zone to apply to Queenstown Park is declined, then QPL requests that the SNAs are deleted from the site and the clearance of indigenous vegetation is permitted.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.5             |                       | Queenstown Park Limited                      | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | The ONL classification is amended as outlined in paragraph 3.7 of the submission.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.5             | FS1313.59             | Darby Planning LP                            | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Support/Oppose Seek that the whole of the submissions seeking rezoning of land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zone be disallowed. DPL supports rezoning where that is based on a thorough assessment of infrastructure, protection of open space, provision of public benefits and landscape and visual amenity is protected, but opposes submissions to the PDP seeking to rezone land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zones where infrastructure and visual amenity matters have not been fully investigated or provided for or real risk of adverse effects arises, particularly landscape or cumulative effects. The reasons for this further submission relates to the potential for submissions to result in disparate development across the District, adverse effects on landscape and amenity values and also the inefficient use of natural and physical resources and infrastructure. DPL believes that decisions relating to rezoning requests should be informed by thorough analysis of the natural and physical resources of an area, an appropriate design response and a section 32 evaluation to support a robust framework for making decisions on the sustainable management of those resources. | Accept                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.7             |                       | Queenstown Park Limited                      | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | (i) Remove the ONL from the river terraces on Queenstown Park. The landscape character of these terraces is distinct from the Remarkables mountain range backdrop, and their ability to absorb development should be recognised, or at least not constrained, within the PDP; (ii) The gondola corridor that links the Remarkables Park zone to Queenstown Park and the Remarkables ski field should be exempt from the ONL classification; and (iii) Recognise the importance of the Kawarau River as an access route. Enable the location of jetties for the purposes of water based public transport and provide for foot/cycle bridges which result in greater connectivity across the river.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.7             | FS1057.1              | Mandy Kennedy                                | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | In reference to point (iii) of #806.7 "...there are potential locations for providing foot/cycle bridges to provide access across the Kawarau River. These bridges would enhance the existing trail network significantly and provide opportunities for links to commuter trails."  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |

| Original Point No | Further Submission No | Submitter                   | Lowest Clause   | Submitter Position | Submission Summary  | Planner Recommendation | Transferred | Issue Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 806.7             | FS1229.30             | NZSki Limited               | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Support            | NZSki Limited support gondola access the Remarkables Ski Area and consider that such access will be complimentary to recreational use of the Ski Area Sub-Zone on a year round basis.<br>NZSki Limited do however consider it necessary that a plan of the proposed gondola corridor is provided by the submitter to ensure that any future gondola is complimentary to NZSki Limited's existing and future proposed buildings, infrastructure and recreational activities.<br>Overall, NZSki Limited requests that the submission points be allowed.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.7             | FS1313.60             | Darby Planning LP           | Map 13 - Gibbston Valley, Cecil Peak and Wye Creek (Insets) | Oppose             | Support/Oppose Seek that the whole of the submissions seeking rezoning of land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zone be disallowed. DPL supports rezoning where that is based on a thorough assessment of infrastructure, protection of open space, provision of public benefits and landscape and visual amenity is protected, but opposes submissions to the PDP seeking to rezone land located within the rural, rural lifestyle and rural residential zones where infrastructure and visual amenity matters have not been fully investigated or provided for or real risk of adverse effects arises, particularly landscape or cumulative effects. The reasons for this further submission relates to the potential for submissions to result in disparate development across the District, adverse effects on landscape and amenity values and also the inefficient use of natural and physical resources and infrastructure. DPL believes that decisions relating to rezoning requests should be informed by thorough analysis of the natural and physical resources of an area, an appropriate design response and a section 32 evaluation to support a robust framework for making decisions on the sustainable management of those resources. | Accept                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.94            |                       | Queenstown Park Limited     | 6.4.1.3   | Other              | Amend. Recognise that as the proposed Queenstown Park Special Zone is a special zone, not rural zone, it is exempt from the landscape categories. 6.4.1.3 The landscape categories do not apply to the following within the Rural Zones: a. Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones b. the Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.95            |                       | Queenstown Park Limited     | 6.4.1.4   | Other              | Amend. Oppose classification of Kawarau River as an ONL. Seek confirmation that the ONL boundary line is at the edge of the river corridor and does not extend into either Remarkables Park or Queenstown Park.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.95            | FS1085.8              | Contact Energy Limited      | 6.4.1.4   | Support            | Support confirmation of ONL boundary. This is appropriate.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.95            | FS1085.8              | Contact Energy Limited      | 6.4.1.4   | Support            | Support confirmation of ONL boundary. This is appropriate.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 806.95            | FS1341.18             | Real Journeys Limited       | 6.4.1.4   | Support            | Allow relief sought to the extent that it does not undermine or prevent the relief originally sought by Real Journeys (unless otherwise agreed through the submission process)  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 807.76            |                       | Remarkables Park Limited    |   | Oppose             | Move the ONL line near the RPZ to the foot of the slopes of the northern face of the Remarkables  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 811.15            |                       | Marc Scaife                 | 22.4.10   | Not Stated         | Opposes the VA subzone over the Matakauri Lodge. The proposed sub zone for Matakauri has no planning rationale. Submits that the creation of special Rural Lifestyle visitor accommodation subzones will not solve potential conflicts between the Rural Lifestyle zone and visitor accommodation, but rather enhance them. The site has been developed to a level of intensity that is now in excess of twenty times the standard for visitor accommodation activity.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 826.2             |                       | Tim Taylor                  | Map 15 - Kingston Rural, Lake Wakatipu & Gibbston (Inset)   | Not Stated         | The submitter seeks that the properties are rezoned to provide for residential and commercial land uses.<br>The submitter's properties are located at or about 87 State Highway 6 (Kingston-Garston Highway), legally described as Section 1 and 2, Block I Kingston SD, and Pt Run 323A and shown on planning map 15.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 826.2             | FS1348.3              | M & C Wilson                | Map 15 - Kingston Rural, Lake Wakatipu & Gibbston (Inset)   | Support            | Allow relief sought - The submitter requests that its properties are rezoned for residential and commercial purposes. The Further submitter supports this relief as this will help provide for the continued growth of Kingston.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 827.2             |                       | Gibbston Valley Station Ltd | Map 15 - Kingston Rural, Lake Wakatipu & Gibbston (Inset)   | Not Stated         | Rezone the properties located in <b>Annexure A</b> of the submission (described as Gibbston Valley Station and shown on Planning Maps 13 & 15) to an alternative zone that allows for a range of uses including residential, viticulture, commercial, visitor accommodation and commercial recreation.<br>Any other additional or consequential relief to the Proposed Plan including but not limited to, maps, issues, objectives, policies, rules, discretions, assessment criteria and explanations that will full give effect to the matters raised in this submission.   | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 848.2             |                       | M & C Wilson                | Map 15 - Kingston Rural, Lake Wakatipu & Gibbston (Inset)   | Oppose             | The submitter seeks that the property legally described as Lot 3 DP 12725 (84 Glen Nevis Station Road, Kingston) and its surrounds be rezoned from Rural general to Large Lot Residential. Accordingly, the submitter seeks that Planning Map 15 is updated to reflect the change.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |
| 848.2             | FS1344.3              | Tim Tayler                  | Map 15 - Kingston Rural, Lake Wakatipu & Gibbston (Inset)   | Support            | Allow relief sought - The submitter opposes the rural general zoning of its property and seeks that its land be zoned Large Lot Residential. The further submitter supports this relief.  | Reject                 |             | Group 2 Report  |