

Appendix A – relief sought

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	Chapter 6 Landscapes		
#1	<p>Part 6.2 Values - Last paragraph: Delete.</p> <p>Landscapes have been categorised into three classifications within the Rural Zone. These are Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF), where their use, development and protection are a matter of national importance under Section 6 of the RMA. The Rural Landscapes Classification (RLC) makes up the remaining Rural Zoned land and has varying types of landscape character and amenity values. Specific policy and assessment matters are provided to manage the potential effects of subdivision and development in these locations.</p> <p>Insert in Section 6.3</p> <p><u>Policy 6.3.3.A</u> <u>Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zones, within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this chapter related to those categories do not apply.</u></p> <p><u>6.3.3B Classify the Open Space and Recreation zoned land located outside the Urban Growth Boundary as Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Rural Character Landscape, and provide a separate regulatory framework for the Open Space and Recreation</u></p>	<p>Oppose in part</p> <p>The relationship between the provisions of Chapter 6 and Chapter 3 and the lower order chapters has been the subject of discussion at the hearings for Topic 1 (Strategic Directions) and Topic 2 (Landscapes), as part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review. There is discrepancy between the two higher order chapters - for example, the Chapter 3 Strategic Objectives relating to rural landscapes do not reflect the same carve outs that are provided for in Chapter 6 (in relation to the application of the Landscape Classifications and associated policies to various rural and non-rural zones).</p> <p>Removal of the description of the Landscape Classifications contained within 6.2, the removal of rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3, and the addition of Policy 6.3.3A is opposed, to the extent that these amendments create the uncertainty that the Landscape Classifications and associated provisions may apply to development located outside of the Rural Zone, i.e.</p>	<p>Clarify how the policies established to manage the various landscapes of the District relate to the other chapters of the PDP, including to the Strategic Directions (Chapter 3), and the lower order chapters relating to the zones where landscapes are a relevant issue.</p> <p>Further consequential amendments may be required to the policies of Chapter 6 as decided in Stage 1, dependent on whether or not they are considered to apply to the Rural Zones and Wakatipu Basin.</p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	<p><u>Zones within which the remaining policies of this chapter do not apply.</u></p> <p>Part 6.4 Rules - Delete:</p> <p>6.4.1.2 The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone. The Landscape Chapter and Strategic Direction Chapter's objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at issue.</p> <p>6.4.1.3 The landscape categories assessment matters do not apply to the following within the Rural Zones:</p> <p>a. Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones.</p> <p>b. The area of the Frankton Arm located to the east of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line as shown on the District Plan maps.</p> <p>c. The Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>d. The Rural Lifestyle Zone.</p> <p>e. The Rural Residential Zone.</p>	<p>within the WBRAZ.</p> <p>Collectively the explanatory text and Rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 are important as they clarify the relationship between the Landscape Classifications and the various rural zones (including the WBRAZ), and specify the carves out that apply.</p> <p>However, the purpose of 6.2 is to set out the 'values' of the rural landscape resource and this is possibly not the right place to address the interpretation and application of the policies of Chapter 6.</p>	
Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin			
#2	<p>24.1 Zone Purpose</p> <p>New paragraphs 3 and 4</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The Zone Purpose does not address the range of activities that</p>	<p>1. Re-insert and rework the following paragraph from the Zone Purpose as notified (as a new paragraph 3 in the decision version Zone Purpose):</p> <p><i><u>A wide range of activities that rely on and seek to</u></i></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
		<p>are contemplated in the Zone other than rural living and rural activities. It is important to include reference to the range of non-residential and non-farming activities such as commercial and tourism activities that can be provided for in the Wakatipu Basin in the introductory parts of the Chapter.</p> <p>Following on from the proposed relief to create a new Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, the addition of new text is proposed to be included in the Zone Purpose to ensure this overlay and associated rules are suitably integrated into the chapter.</p>	<p><u>locate within the Wakatipu Basin are completed in the Rural Amenity Zone, including rural living at a variety of densities, recreation, commercial and tourism activities, as well as enabling farming and farming activities. There are also established industrial type activities that are based on rural resources or support rural type activities.</u></p> <p>2. Insert a new paragraph as paragraph 4 which identifies the proposed Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct as a node of commercial activity provided for within the Zone:</p> <p><u>Also within the Zone are areas of land containing commercial activity that for historical reasons, accommodate activities which are not entirely consistent with the amenity outcomes anticipated within the Zone.</u></p> <p><u>The Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct has been identified to recognise and provide for commercial activity within areas having access to primary road corridors, reticulated services and a scale of built form distinct from the remainder of the Zone. The Precinct seeks to minimise the adverse effects of commercial use and development of land on the wider Zone.</u></p>
#3	<p>Policy 24.2.1.1</p> <p><i>Require an 80 hectare minimum net site are be maintained within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone outside of the Precinct.</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>An 80ha minimum lot size in the WBRAZ is opposed and consequentially this policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete the PDP (decisions version) of the policy and reinstate the notified version with the amendments sought in original submission:</p> <p>Policy 24.2.1.1: <i>Implement minimum and average lot sizes within the</i></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
		Further, the focus of this policy should be on the maintenance of landscape character and visual amenity values.	<i>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct to protect <u>maintain</u> landscape character and visual amenity values.</i>
#4	Policy 24.2.1.10 <i>Enable residential activity within building platforms created prior to 21 March 2019 subject to achieving appropriate standards.</i>	Support in part The inclusion of a policy recognising existing building rights is supported, however the policy should not be date limited, as all approved development within the Wakatipu Basin should be enabled.	Amend Policy 24.2.1.10: <i>Enable residential activity within <u>approved building platforms</u> created prior to 21 March 2019 subject to achieving appropriate standards.</i>
#5	Policy 24.2.1.11 <i>Provide for activities, whose built form is subservient to natural landscape elements and that, in areas Schedule 24.8 identifies as having a sense of openness and spaciousness, maintain those qualities.</i>	Oppose The wording of the policy is opposed as it ambiguous and poorly drafted. "Openness and spaciousness" are words capable of wide interpretation and characteristics associated with Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features. In particular, in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (WBLP), the policy is inappropriate as it is difficult to see how a sense of "openness and spaciousness can be retained with a density of 1ha average".	Delete policy 24.2.1.11.
#6	Policy 24.2.4.8 <i>Encourage the removal of wilding exotic trees at the</i>	Support in part The intention of these policies is	Amend Policy 24.2.4.8: <i>Encourage the removal of wilding exotic trees at the</i>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	<p><i>time of development.</i></p> <p>Policy 24.2.4.9</p> <p><i>Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability.</i></p>	<p>supported as read together they provide sufficient policy direction regarding retention or removal of vegetation in the Zone.</p> <p>An amendment is proposed to policy 24.2.4.8 as it is not always appropriate or practical to remove wilding pines at the time of development. The policy should provide flexibility where appropriate and its focus should be on preventing wilding spread.</p> <p>An amendment is proposed to policy 24.2.4.9 as the policy should be general to all areas suitable for replanting.</p>	<p><i>time of development, <u>in particular where there is a risk of wilding spread.</u></i></p> <p>Amend Policy 24.2.4.9</p> <p><i>Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability</i></p>
#7	<p>Policy 24.2.5.1</p> <p><i>Provide for rural living, subdivision, development and use of land where it maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units.</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The uncertainty created through the wording of this policy is opposed, as it subjects subdivision, use and development to maintaining or enhancing the values described within the landscape character units defined in Schedule 24.8. Within the WBLP development should be enabled in the first instance. The landscape character units are of greater importance for establishing the limits of appropriate development in the parts of the Wakatipu Basin with lower capacity to absorb development.</p>	<p>Amend policy 24.2.5.1:</p> <p><i>Provide for rural living, subdivision, development and use of land <u>within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u> where it maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units.</i></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
#8	<p>Policy 24.2.5.6</p> <p><i>Retain vegetation that contributes to landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, provided it does not present a high risk of wilding spread.</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Policy 24.2.5.6 is opposed as it reads as a blanket requirement to retain all vegetation within the Zone, which is not appropriate or likely to produce the best landscape outcomes in all cases.</p> <p>The retention of the two additional policies 24.2.4.8 and 24.2.4.9 (with the amendments discussed above) is supported as these policies are more specific and are considered appropriate guidance on vegetation management in the Zone.</p>	Delete Policy 24.2.5.6
#9	<p>New objective 24.2.X Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct</p>	<p>Following on from the proposed relief to create a new Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, the addition of a new objective is sought to recognise the unique role of the LHCP within the Zone, and to ensure the LHCP is appropriately enabled.</p>	<p>Insert new Objective 24.2.X Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>24.2.X Objective – Wakatipu Basin Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Recognise and provide for the non-residential character of the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, which is distinct from other parts of the zone.</i></u></p>
#10	<p>New policies 24.2.X.1 – 24.2.X.4</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>Insert new Policies below the new Objective 24.2.X Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>24.2.X.1 Enable commercial activities within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct, where their effects on the environment can be appropriately managed.</i></u></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought																		
			<p><u>24.2.X.2 Encourage building associated with commercial activities within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct to achieve a high level of design and external appearance.</u></p> <p><u>24.2.X.3 Recognise the scale of building associated with commercial activities within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct as being greater than development anticipated within the zone.</u></p> <p><u>24.2.X.4 Recognise that noise and hours of operation of activities located within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct are different in character from the surrounding zone and other Precincts.</u></p>																		
#11	<p>24.3.2.5</p> <p><i>The Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct is a sub-zone of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and all rules in Table 24.1 apply to the Precinct. Where specific rules and standards are identified in Tables 24.2 and 24.3, these prevail over the Rural Amenity Zone rules in Table 24.1.</i></p>	<p>Support in part</p> <p>An amendment is sought to this general rule to ensure that the new Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct is properly integrated into Chapter 24</p>	<p>Amend provision 24.3.2.5 as follows:</p> <p><i>The Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct <u>and the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct are a sub-zones of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and all rules in Table 24.1 apply to the Precincts.</u> Where specific rules and standards are identified for the Precincts in Tables 24.2, and 24.3, these shall prevail over the Zone rules in Table 24.1.</i></p>																		
#12	<p>Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</p> <p>Rules 24.4.4, 24.4.6, 24.4.7, 24.4.8 and 24.4.18</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rule</th> <th>Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ</th> <th>Activity status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Residential activities and buildings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24.4.4</td> <td>The alteration of any</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rule	Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ	Activity status	Residential activities and buildings			24.4.4	The alteration of any	P	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The blanket approach to construction of buildings across the Zone is opposed. The WBLP has been identified as having the capacity to absorb greater development than the remainder of the Zone. Buildings within the</p>	<p>Amend Table 24.1 to include the following changes:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rule</th> <th>Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ</th> <th>Activity status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Residential activities and buildings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24.4.4</td> <td>The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity.</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rule	Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ	Activity status	Residential activities and buildings			24.4.4	The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity.	P
Rule	Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ	Activity status																			
Residential activities and buildings																					
24.4.4	The alteration of any	P																			
Rule	Table 24.1 – Activities in the WBRAZ	Activity status																			
Residential activities and buildings																					
24.4.4	The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity.	P																			

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	<i>lawfully established building used for residential activity.</i>		<u>24.4.x</u> <u>The construction of buildings for residential activity within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.</u> <u>P</u>
24.4.6	<p><i>The construction of buildings for residential activity that are located within a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold register before 21 March 2019.</i></p> <p><i>Control is reserved over:</i></p> <p><i>a. Landscape character;</i></p> <p><i>b. Visual amenity values</i></p> <p><i>c. Access;</i></p> <p><i>d. Infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).</i></p>	<p>WBLP should be enabled without the requirement for resource consent, as the standards regarding building density, coverage, height, and setbacks are sufficient to ensure positive development outcomes.</p> <p>Appropriate non-residential development should similarly be enabled in Precincts specifically created to provide for such activities, such as the proposed Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct which, subject to site specific standards, can accommodate a greater level of commercial development that the remainder of the Zone.</p> <p>In respect of alterations to lawfully established buildings for non-residential purposes, it is considered that such alterations should be permitted, in line with Rule 24.4.4 for the alteration of buildings for residential activities.</p> <p>In the remainder of the Zone, buildings within approved building platforms should be permitted. There is no justification for requiring additional resource consent once a building platform has been approved and development is contemplated.</p>	<p>24.4.6 <u>The construction of buildings for residential activity within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone that are located within a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold register before 21 March 2019.</u> <u>C-P</u></p> <p>Control is reserved over:</p> <p>a. Landscape character;</p> <p>b. Visual amenity values</p> <p>c. Access;</p> <p>d. Infrastructure;</p> <p>e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).</p>
24.4.7	<i>The construction of buildings for residential activity that are not provided for in Rule 24.4.5 or 24.4.6 and</i>		<p>24.4.7 <u>The construction of buildings for residential activity that are not provided for in Rule 24.4.x, Rule 24.4.5 or 24.4.6 and are not contrary to Rule 24.4.8.</u> <u>RD</u></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Landscape character;</i></p> <p><i>b. Visual amenity values;</i></p> <p><i>c. Access;</i></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	<p><i>are not contrary to Rule 24.4.8.</i></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Landscape character;</i></p> <p><i>b. Visual amenity values;</i></p> <p><i>c. Access;</i></p> <p><i>d. Infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed);</i></p> <p><i>f. Natural hazards.</i></p>	Again, the standards regarding building density, coverage, height and setbacks will ensure development within approved building platforms maintains landscape character and amenity values.	<p><i>d. Infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed);</i></p> <p><i>f. Natural hazards.</i></p>
	24.4.8	NC	<p><i>The construction of buildings for residential activity outside a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register on a site where there is such a building platform.</i></p> <p>Non-residential activities and buildings</p>
			<p><u>24.4.xx</u> <i>The alteration of any lawfully established building used for non-residential activity</i></p>
			<p><u>24.4.xx</u> <i>The construction of buildings for non-residential activities within the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct</i></p>
	24.4.18	RD	<p><i>The construction and alteration of non-residential buildings not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1.</i></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Landscape character;</i></p> <p><i>b. Visual amenity values;</i></p>
	Non-residential activities and buildings		

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)		Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	24.4.18	<p><i>The construction and alteration of non-residential buildings not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1.</i></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Landscape character;</i> <i>b. Visual amenity values;</i> <i>c. Access;</i> <i>d. Natural hazards</i> <i>e. Infrastructure;</i> <i>f. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed);</i> 	RD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>c. Access;</i> <i>d. Natural hazards</i> <i>e. Infrastructure;</i> <i>f. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed);</i>
#13	<p>Clearance of exotic vegetation</p> <p>Rule 24.4.29</p> <p><i>Clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation that is of a height greater than 4 metres.</i></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The extent of clearance;</i> <i>• Trimming and works within the root protection zone;</i> 		<p>Oppose</p> <p>The introduction of this new rule for the Zone requiring resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity for clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation greater than 4m in height is opposed. The rule is considered inefficient, difficult to</p>	Delete Rule 24.4.9

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Replacement planting.</i> <p>Activity status: RD</p>	administer and would act against the higher order objectives of the plan to avoid the spread of wilding trees and to also enhance natural ecosystems. The rule is sought to be deleted.										
#14	New Table 24.x Activities in the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct	<p>Following on from the relief sought to establish a new Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct, new site specific rules are sought to manage commercial activities within the LHCP, which differ from the limited commercial activities provided for in the remainder of the Zone.</p> <p>Given the established commercial character, central location, and natural features of the Lake Hayes Cellar land, and the building standards proposed, providing for commercial activities, cafes and restaurants as controlled activities is considered appropriate. These are activities which are anticipated on the Land at present and which can suitably occur whilst maintaining landscape character and visual amenity.</p>	<p>Insert a new Table 24.x into the Chapter (after Table 24.2)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Table 24.3 Activities in the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct</th> <th>A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Rule 24.4.x</u></td> <td> <p><u>Commercial activities, limited to conferences and events, exhibitions, the retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, located within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct.</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The bulk, location and external appearance of the building</u> <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u> <u>Servicing infrastructure</u> <u>Signs</u> <u>Landscaping</u> </td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Rule 24.4.x</u></td> <td> <p><u>Cafes and restaurants</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to the matters provided for within Rule 24.4.30</u></p> </td> <td>C</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Table 24.3 Activities in the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct		A	<u>Rule 24.4.x</u>	<p><u>Commercial activities, limited to conferences and events, exhibitions, the retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, located within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct.</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The bulk, location and external appearance of the building</u> <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u> <u>Servicing infrastructure</u> <u>Signs</u> <u>Landscaping</u> 	C	<u>Rule 24.4.x</u>	<p><u>Cafes and restaurants</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to the matters provided for within Rule 24.4.30</u></p>	C
Table 24.3 Activities in the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct		A										
<u>Rule 24.4.x</u>	<p><u>Commercial activities, limited to conferences and events, exhibitions, the retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, located within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct.</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The bulk, location and external appearance of the building</u> <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u> <u>Servicing infrastructure</u> <u>Signs</u> <u>Landscaping</u> 	C										
<u>Rule 24.4.x</u>	<p><u>Cafes and restaurants</u></p> <p><u>Councils control is limited to the matters provided for within Rule 24.4.30</u></p>	C										

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
#15	<p>Building Size and Building Coverage</p> <p>Rule 24.5.4 - Building Size <i>Where a residential building is constructed within a building platform under Rule 24.4.6, the ground floor area of all buildings must not exceed 500m².</i></p> <p>Rule 24.5.5 Building coverage <i>The ground floor area of all buildings not subject to Rule 24.5.4 must not exceed 15% of net site area, or 500m² ground floor area, whichever is lesser.</i></p>	<p>Support in part</p> <p>Amendments are sought to both rules so that the building size and coverage standards are assessed per individual building, to ensure the standards are not overly restrictive and provide for planning flexibility</p> <p>An amendment is sought to Rule 24.5.5 to include a specific carve out for buildings within the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct (LHCP). Within the LHCP a slightly higher coverage is appropriate given the framework of the requirement for resource consent for any new building associated with a commercial activity and the emphasis on achieving a high quality of building design.</p>	<p>Amend Rules 24.5.4 and 24.5.5 as follows:</p> <p>Rule 24.5.4 - Building Size <i>Where a residential building is constructed within a building platform under Rule 24.4.6, the ground floor area of all any individual buildings must not exceed 500m².</i></p> <p>Rule 24.5.5 Building coverage <i>The ground floor area of all any individual buildings not subject to Rule 24.5.4 must not exceed 15% of net site area, or 500m² ground floor area, whichever is lesser, <u>except within the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct where the maximum ground floor area of any building shall be limited to 25% of the net site area.</u></i></p>
#16	<p>Rule 24.5.7 – Height of buildings</p> <p>Rule 24.5.7.1 <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 6m.</i> [non-compliance: RD]</p> <p>Rule 24.5.7.2 <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.</i> [non-compliance: NC]</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The effect of the two rules is that it is a restricted discretionary activity to have a building between 6 and 8m in height. The proposed height limitation of 6m as a permitted activity is considered overly restrictive. An 8m height limitation is more consistent with the ODP and PDP zones.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.7 as follows:</p> <p>Rule 24.5.7.1 <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 68m.</i> [non-compliance: RD]</p> <p>Rule 24.5.7.2 <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.</i> [non-compliance: NC]</p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
#17	<p>Rule 24.5.8 – Setback from roads</p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be 75m in the Precinct and 20m elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>A 75m setback from road boundaries within the Lifestyle Precinct is opposed. The Lifestyle Precinct has been identified as having greater capacity for change, deriving in part from the nature of existing development undertaken in accordance with the Operative District Plan zoning. Imposing a setback 65m greater than under the existing regime will establish a meaningless standard that cannot be defended against the established environment in many instances.</p> <p>Moreover, having a standard of 20m for the Zone, outside of the Lifestyle Precinct, will exacerbate problems in the context of areas with supposedly high landscape qualities. Accordingly, it is considered more appropriate and practicably workable to rely on a 10m setback across the entire Zone.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.8 Setback from Roads, as follows:</p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be 75m in the Precinct and 20m <u>10m</u> elsewhere anywhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p>
#18	<p>24.7 Assessment Matters – Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>24.7.2 <i>All proposals for controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities will also be assessed as to whether they are consistent with the objectives and policies relevant to the identified matters of</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The cross-references to the higher order strategic direction, urban development and landscape chapters are opposed. Without the specific amendments to the</p>	<p>Delete provision 24.7.2</p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
	<i>control or discretion (as applicable) in this chapter 24 as well as those in chapter 3 – Strategic direction; Chapter 4 – Urban Development; Chapter 6 – Landscapes and Character and Chapter 28 – Natural Hazards.</i>	provisions of these higher order chapters, the existing chapters would create fundamental conflicts that would undermine the specific direction offered for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone through Chapter 24.	
	Chapter 27 Subdivision		
#19	<p>Rule 27.5.9</p> <p><i>All subdivision activities, unless otherwise provided for, in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>[Activity status: Restricted discretionary]</i></p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Location of building platforms and accessways</i></p> <p><i>b. Subdivision design and lot layout including the location of boundaries, lot sizes and dimensions;</i></p> <p><i>c. Location, scale and extent of landform modification, and retaining structures;</i></p> <p><i>d. Property access and roading;</i></p> <p><i>e. Esplanade provision;</i></p> <p><i>f. Natural and other hazards;</i></p> <p><i>g. Firefighting water supply and access;</i></p> <p><i>h. Water supply;</i></p> <p><i>i. Network utility services, energy supply and telecommunications;</i></p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The activity status for subdivision within the WBLP and LHCP should not be the same as the activity status for subdivision in the WBRAZ. The WBLP has been identified following detailed mapping of landscape values and character units as having generally a greater capacity to absorb development. Similarly, the proposed LHCP is identified as being suitable for unique commercial activities specific to that site. The Standards regarding lot density, building size, coverage, height and setbacks, are considered an appropriate mechanism to ensure appropriate development within both precincts maintains landscape character and amenity values, without further discretion being required by Council.</p>	<p>1. Amend Rule 27.5.9 to refer only to subdivision in the WBRAZ:</p> <p>Rule 27.5.9</p> <p><i>All subdivision activities, unless otherwise provided for, in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or, <u>excluding the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.</u></i></p> <p><i>[Activity status: Restricted discretionary]</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Insert new Rule 27.5.9A to make subdivision within the WBLP and LHCP a controlled activity:</p> <p>Rule 27.5.9A</p> <p><i>All subdivision activities within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct and Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>[Activity status: Controlled]</i></p> <p><i>Control is limited-to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Location of building platforms;</i></p> <p><i>b. the effect of the site design, size, shape, gradient and location, including existing buildings.</i></p>

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought																													
	<p>j. Open space and recreation provision;</p> <p>k. Ecological and natural landscape features;</p> <p>l. Historic Heritage features;</p> <p>m. Easements;</p> <p>n. Vegetation removal, and proposed planting;</p> <p>o. Fencing and gates;</p> <p>p. Wastewater and stormwater management;</p> <p>q. Connectivity of existing and proposed pedestrian networks, bridle paths, cycle networks;</p> <p>r. Adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.</p>		<p><u>manoeuvring areas and outdoor living spaces;</u></p> <p><u>c. the effects of and on infrastructure provision.</u></p> <p><u>d. Orientation of lots to optimise solar gain</u></p>																													
#20	<p>27.6 rules – Standards for Minimum Lot Areas</p> <p>27.6.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, an average net site area less than the minimum specified.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Zone</th> <th>Minimum Lot Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Rural</td> <td>Rural</td> <td>No minimum</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gibbston Character</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</td> <td>80 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</td> <td>6000m² 1.0 ha minimum average</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone		Minimum Lot Area	Rural	Rural	No minimum	Gibbston Character			Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80 ha		Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	6000m ² 1.0 ha minimum average	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHC opposes the 80ha minimum lot density regime established for the WBRAZ, and opposes the zoning of the LHC land as WBRAZ.</p> <p>LHC support the establishment of a minimum lot area and minimum average lot area for subdivision within the WBLP, and considers this density regime is more appropriate for the proposed LHCP, as it is reflective of existing land use and lot size.</p>	<p>Amend 27.6 rules – Standards for Minimum Lot Areas</p> <p>27.6.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, an average net site area less than the minimum specified.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Zone</th> <th>Minimum Lot Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rural</td> <td>Rural</td> <td>No minimum</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Wakatipu Basin</u></td> <td>Gibbston Character</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</td> <td>80 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle</td> <td>6000m²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone		Minimum Lot Area	Rural	Rural	No minimum	<u>Wakatipu Basin</u>	Gibbston Character			Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80 ha		Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle	6000m ²
Zone		Minimum Lot Area																														
Rural	Rural	No minimum																														
	Gibbston Character																															
	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80 ha																														
	Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	6000m ² 1.0 ha minimum average																														
Zone		Minimum Lot Area																														
Rural	Rural	No minimum																														
<u>Wakatipu Basin</u>	Gibbston Character																															
	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80 ha																														
	Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle	6000m ²																														

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought																																		
			Precinct <u>Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u> 1.0 ha minimum average																																		
Chapter 36 Noise																																					
#21	36.5 Rules – Standards Table 2: General Standards Rule 36.5.1 New Rule 36.5.2A	Oppose LHC has lodged comprehensive submission on the Stage 1 PDP topics, including to the Chapter 36 Noise Rules to recognise and provide for an appropriate noise standard on the LHC land. Based on the proposed introduction of Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin, the relief sought in this appeal is to replicate a similar framework for the LHC land under this new framework, including the proposal to create a new Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct. LHC seeks to amend Rule 36.5.4 to exempt sound within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct sought by LHC. The creation of a new and more appropriate standard for that Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct is subject to the addition of a further rule (outlined below).	1. Amend Rule 36.5.1 to exclude noise within the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct from the application of the rule: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Rule</th> <th colspan="4">General Standards</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Zone sound is received in</th> <th>Assessment location</th> <th>Time</th> <th>Noise Limits</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">36.5.1</td> <td rowspan="2">Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, <u>except within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u> ...</td> <td rowspan="2">Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.</td> <td>0800h to 2000h</td> <td>50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000h to 0800h</td> <td>40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> 2. Insert new Rule 36.5.2A for the management of noise within the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Rule</th> <th colspan="4">General Standards</th> <th rowspan="2">C</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Zone sound is received in</th> <th>Assessment location</th> <th>Time</th> <th>Noise Limits</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">36.5.2A</td> <td rowspan="2"><u>Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u></td> <td rowspan="2"><u>Any point within the site.</u></td> <td>0800h to 2000h</td> <td>50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small></td> <td rowspan="2">D is re to</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000h to 0800h</td> <td>40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rule	General Standards				Zone sound is received in	Assessment location	Time	Noise Limits	36.5.1	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, <u>except within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u> ...	Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small>	2000h to 0800h	40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small>	Rule	General Standards				C	Zone sound is received in	Assessment location	Time	Noise Limits	36.5.2A	<u>Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u>	<u>Any point within the site.</u>	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small>	D is re to	2000h to 0800h	40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small>
Rule	General Standards																																				
	Zone sound is received in	Assessment location	Time	Noise Limits																																	
36.5.1	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, <u>except within the Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u> ...	Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small>																																	
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small>																																	
Rule	General Standards				C																																
	Zone sound is received in	Assessment location	Time	Noise Limits																																	
36.5.2A	<u>Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct</u>	<u>Any point within the site.</u>	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small>	D is re to																																
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB L <small>Aeq(15 min)</small> 75 dB L <small>AFmax</small>																																	

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought					
								the extent of effects of noise generated on adjoining zones
Planning Maps								
#22	Planning Maps 13d and 30	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The inclusion of the LHC land and the land within LCU 13 within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone is opposed.</p> <p>The WBRAZ zoning does not reflect the actual established character of the Land and the existing land uses – the land within LCU 13 is of a rural residential character, while the LHC land provides for established commercial activities unique in the Wakatipu Basin.</p> <p>The WBRAZ zoning fails to provide for the continued and improved operation of the established LHC activities, and therefore fails to provide for the social, cultural and economic benefits of both the landholders and residents and visitors of the District.</p>	<p>Amend Planning Map s13d and 30 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove all of the land within Landscape Character Unit 13 Lakes Hayes Slopes from the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone; 2. Identify a new Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct overlay over the LHC land, contained within Part Lot 1 DP 326378; and 3. Rezone the remainder of the land within the Lake Hayes Slopes Landscape Character Unit as Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct. 					

Appeal Point #	Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
		<p>The Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct provides the most appropriate way of achieving the relevant objectives of the PDP because:</p> <p>(a) It provides additional commercial opportunities in an area where such development would be consistent with the dominant character, and there is capacity to absorb visual change without degrading landscape character or visual amenity values; and</p> <p>(b) In so doing, it will reduce pressure for such development in other areas of the rural environment where there is limited capacity for commercial activity.</p> <p>(c) It will recognise and provide for the use, development and consolidation of commercial activities on the land that is an important part of the tourist infrastructure and will provide for the economic well-being of the District.</p>	