

Appendix B – a copy of the Appellant's original submission and further submissions

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN
UNDER CLAUSE 6 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE TO
THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072
QUEENSTOWN 9348

Submitter: Lake Hayes Limited
C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd
PO Box 110
CHRISTCHURCH

Attention: Chris Ferguson, Planner
Phone: (03) 353 7568
Mobile: 021 907 773
Email: Chris.Ferguson@boffamiskell.co.nz

Lake Hayes Limited (the "LHL") makes the submissions on Stage 2 of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan ("PDP") set out in the **attached** document.

LHL confirms their submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

LHL would like to be heard in support of its submission.

If other persons make a similar submission then LHL would consider presenting joint evidence at the time of the hearing.



Chris Ferguson

Lake Hayes Ltd

23rd day of February 2018

OUTLINE OF SUBMISSION

This submission has been structured under the following headings:

Section A: Overview

Section B: Reasons for Submission

Section C: Specific Submissions to the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan

SECTION A: OVERVIEW

1. LHL owns land at 270 Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, located on the south-eastern corner of Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road and Hogans Gully Road. Its land has been identified within the Rural Lifestyle Zone under the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (“PDP”) and has the same zoning under the operative District Plan.
2. LHL has made submissions on Stage 1 of the PDP generally supporting a continuation of Rural Lifestyle Zone on its land and seeking minor amendments to the rules, policies and objectives for the Rural Lifestyle zone to achieve a better alignment between the relevant objectives of the PDP and the proposed methods.
3. LHL are generally opposed to the new planning regime proposed through the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct and considers it less capable of implementing the purpose and principles of the Act than the operative District Plan regime or of the provisions of the rural lifestyle zone included within Stage 1 of the PDP. In the event the Council adopts the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone as part of the Stage 2 proposal, this submission details a number of changes to better integrate with the high order strategic directions and landscape chapters, as well as to make an efficient use of the available land resource without unnecessary regulation.

SECTION B: REASONS FOR SUBMISSION

General Opposition

4. LHL generally opposes the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (‘the Zone’) and the provisions that are proposed to apply within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (‘the Precinct’). The basis for this variation was a minute from the Chair of the Hearings Panel, issued at the completion of the hearings on the rural zone, observing that further development in the Wakatipu Basin has the potential to cumulatively and irreversibly damage the character and amenity value which attracts residents and other activities to the areas and additionally, that the rural character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin do not derive predominantly from farming and agricultural practices.
5. The Zone seeks to reframe the management of subdivision, use and development within the rural landscape classification based on a more comprehensive and informed analysis of landscape values through the mapping of and associated descriptions of landscape character units. Taking into account the nature of existing development, including development of Special Housing Areas, the Precinct has been identified over areas having greater potential to accommodate change.
6. Unfortunately, the provisions for the Zone extinguish development rights created through the provisions of the operative District Plan by failing to recognise and provide for residential building platforms. A minimum allotment size is also proposed for the Zone that creates an expectation for subdivision and development across the Zone within areas having higher landscape values and closer to the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features that border

the Zone. The provisions also fail to address the relationship to the higher order objective and policies for the Rural Landscape Classification, including whether in light of the new provisions, are appropriate as higher order support for the Zone. Together, LHL submits that the provisions fail to achieve the objective of the hearings Panel to manage cumulative effects and to implement the higher order objectives relating to strategic directions and landscape (in particular).

7. Through this submission, LHL seeks the following general relief:
 - a) Based on the general concerns raised above, withdraw the provision of Chapter 24 and the associated changes to other chapters sought through the Stage 2 PDP and reinstate the provision of the rural lifestyle zone; or
 - b) In the alternative:
 - i. Amend the provisions of Chapter 3 Strategic Directions and Chapter 6 Landscapes to provide appropriate objective and policy support for the Zone, including to:
 - Recognise that the Wakatipu Basin has landscape qualities distinct from the Rural Landscape Classification;
 - Identify the characteristics and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin through the mapping of the landscape character areas;
 - Provide for areas of rural living within the Wakatipu Basin through identification of the lifestyle precinct;
 - Recognising the opportunities for low density housing within the rural setting;
 - Provide an appropriate policy structure in support of the proposed areas of landscape character and guidelines underpinning Chapter 24; and
 - Ensure that the landscape categories within Chapter 6 do not apply within the Precinct.
 - ii. Amend the provisions of Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone in the manner described below.
8. The specific changes sought to the PDP provisions are detailed within Section C of this submission.

Description of the Site

9. LHL owns land at the bottom of a broad valley that extends along Speargrass Flat and a part of Hogans Gully Road. Towards the southern part of the site the topography rises through a series of rolling hills. A prominent escarpment lies close to part of the western boundary parallel and the Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. Vegetation within the site is dominated by pasture grasses with several mature stands of exotic trees. Building development includes a single dwelling centrally located above the valley floor, horse stables to the north and a semi enclosed barn alongside the boundary with Hogans Gully Road. Consent has been recently granted to locate a cottage on the property and construction is well underway. Vehicle access is established to the main dwelling from the Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. There are no natural watercourses within the site, although a drain runs east – west, approximately mid-way along the site.
10. The land to which the submission relates includes four titles, legally described as follows:
 - (a) Lot 101 DP 314349, being 18.8282 ha in area and contained within Computer Freehold Register 56913;

- (b) Lot 1 DP 308629, being 2.1001 ha in area and contained within Computer Freehold Register 33516;
 - (c) Lot 10 DP 314349, being 2.4189 ha in area and contained within Computer Freehold Register 56912; and
 - (d) Lot 7 DP 308629, being 1.2213 ha in area and contained within Computer Freehold Register 33518.
11. The overall area of the LHL land subject to this submission is approximately 24.5685 hectares.

Existing Resource Consent

12. LHL hold an existing resource consent RM090703 for the subdivision of three titles into 11 new allotments and for the creation of 9 residential building platforms. This resource consent lapses on 12 February 2021. The density of this subdivision enables one dwelling per 2.1 ha of the Site (gross areas).

Integration with Strategic Directions and Landscape Chapters

13. The Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone is a new zone that has been created because of its distinctive characteristics. It has been designed to manage the land identified within the Rural Landscape Classification, but differs in significant ways on how it proposes to manage this resource from the remainder of the district. Those differences are underpinned by a detailed study that identifies areas of landscape character and formulates a suite of landscape guidelines into the new zone. Despite this, the scope of the Stage 2 PDP changes includes no higher order objective or policy support.
14. LHL considers that the district wide strategic directions and landscape chapters chapter need to be modified to provide appropriate policy support for the Zone and avoid unnecessary tensions within the existing policies, including to recognise that the basin has landscape qualities distinct from the rural landscape classification; that the character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin are mapped and landscape guidelines are formulated; that areas of rural living are provided through the lifestyle precinct; and that subdivision, use or development within the basin responds to the identified characteristics and values.

Application of the Landscape Categories

15. Other changes made to Chapter 6 through Chapter 38 Open Space and Recreation, seek to broaden the application of the landscape provisions to apply across all zones within the PDP, inclusive of all rural and urban zones and to also apply the landscape assessment matters (Chapter 21) to the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. LHL opposes these changes and considers the rules within Chapter 6 should be amended to clarify that with respect to assessing the effects of subdivision or development the objectives and policies relating to the three classifications of landscapes within this chapter should not apply to the Precinct.
16. Under Chapter 6 (as notified), the landscapes of the district have been categorised into three classifications within the rural zone¹, being the outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features and the rural landscape classification. This is reflected within Policy 6.3.1.2 which establishes the policy basis for the landscape classification within the rural zone. The variation to Chapter 6 introduced at the rear of the new Chapter 38 Open Space and recreation does not alter this policy.

¹ 6.2, Page 6 – 2, Chapter 6, PDP - Values

17. The provisions of Chapter 22 include a specific objective and policies relating to landscape values and thereby establish the basis for the management of those values independent of the three-way landscape classification established by Policy 6.3.1.2. The suggested change to the wording of Rule 6.4.1.3 to include assessment matters and for those to apply to the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones makes no sense because Chapter 6 does not contain any assessment matters and nor does Chapter 22 (relevant to landscape matters). The effect of this change would therefore be to require subdivision and development to be assessed against the assessment matters for the three landscapes under Chapter 21. LHL submit that neither the landscape categories or assessment matters contained within Chapter 21 are designed to relate to a rural living zone.
18. In the event the Panel are satisfied that either the Precinct or operative rural lifestyle zone across the LHL land is appropriate for this landscape, LHL submits that the outcomes from subdivision or development undertaken in accordance with either rules would create considerable tensions with the objectives and policies for Rural Landscapes. In particular, Policy 6.3.1.4 provides that subdivision or development location within the Rural Landscape is inappropriate in many locations in these landscapes.
19. LHL submits that these policies and the objectives and policies applying to the three landscape classifications fundamentally conflict with the purpose of any rural lifestyle zone or precinct to provide residential living opportunities.
20. LHL submits that the Council has failed to consider the implications of the proposed changes to Chapter 6, including any s32 analysis of the impact of this changes on urban land beyond the proposed Open Space and Recreation Zones.
21. Where the rule (as originally notified as part of Stage 1) includes the term “landscape categories”, LHL considers that the plan is not referring to Part 2 of the Act but rather the objectives, policies and assessment matters that apply to the three landscape classifications under the PDP. Accordingly, LHL submits that the wording of this rule could be improved to reflect that it is the classification of landscapes of the District and related objectives and policies for each classification within Chapter 6, which apply to the Rural Zone.
22. In order to remain consistent with the policies, LHL submits that the Rule should also be amended to clarify that the Rural Zone is just that and does not include the rural lifestyle zone and the rural residential zones (Chapter 22) or the recently notified Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Chapter 24).

Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin

23. LHL seeks a number of detailed changes to the objectives, policies and rules of chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin. These changes are designed to achieve the following:
 - a) A more balanced range of objectives and policies appropriate to a high value (but not outstanding natural) landscape;
 - b) Enabling the construction of any building within the Precinct as a permitted activity, including within an established residential building platform, subject to compliance with standards as proposed through the Stage 1 Rural Lifestyle Zone rules;
 - c) Removal of the rules relating to clearance, works or trimming of exotic vegetation above 4m in height;
 - d) Modify the rules relating to maximum building coverage, building height and setbacks from roads; and
 - e) Establish a minimum and average density requirement reflecting the subdivision rules.

Chapter 25 Earthworks

24. LHL supports integration of the earthworks provisions into a new standalone chapter, subject to proper integration with Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin. LHL seeks a number of changes to the Earthworks Chapter to achieve the following outcomes:
- (a) A more balanced policy structure that provides for earthworks while minimising the adverse effects of such works on the environment;
 - (b) A range of minor edits to Advice Notes and Rules to improve administration and clarity of language; and
 - (c) Amendments to the new standards that introduce further controls over earthworks within the Wakatipu Basin Zone that did not otherwise apply under the operative Rural Lifestyle Zone or are considered unnecessary.

Chapter 27 Subdivision

25. LHL oppose restricted activity status for subdivision within the Precinct and having the same status as subdivision within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. This status is at odds with the detailed process of mapping and recognition of these areas as having greater capacity to absorb change. LHL seeks to amend the subdivision rules to provide for subdivision within the Precinct as a controlled activity.

Consequential and Further Changes

26. LHL seeks any similar, alternative and/or consequential relief that may be necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission or the specific relief requested in this submission.

SECTION C: SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS TO THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN (STAGE 2 TOPICS)

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i></i></u> and deleted text shown as <i></i>]
Chapter 3 – Strategic Directions		
New Policies 3.2.5.2.2, 3.2.5.2.3 and 3.2.5.2.4 (notified proposal)	The provisions of the new Chapter 24 recognise and provide for subdivision, use and development within the Wakatipu Basin in a way that is distinct from the remainder of the Rural Landscape Classifications of the District. These provisions have been formulated from a detailed study that identifies areas of landscape character and landscape guidelines that are proposed to be incorporated into the plan. LHL considers that the strategic directions policies should to provide an appropriate policy structure to support the provisions which follow within Chapter 24.	<p>Add a new Policy 3.2.5.2.2 (Notified proposal), as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Recognise the Wakatipu Basin as having landscape qualities distinct from the Rural Landscape Classification of the District</i></u></p> <p>Add a new Policy 3.2.5.2.3 (Notified proposal), as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Identify the characteristics and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin through the mapping of areas of landscape character and the formulation of associated landscape guidelines.</i></u></p> <p>Add a new Policy 3.2.5.2.4 (Notified proposal), as follows</p> <p><u><i>Provide areas for rural living within the Wakatipu Basin through identification of a lifestyle precinct located within those parts of the landscape having higher capacity to absorb change.</i></u></p>
New Policy 3.2.6.2.4 (notified proposal)	Objective 6.2.6.2 appropriately recognises for a mix of housing opportunities and is part of the broad structure of support for rural lifestyle zones. LHL consider that the addition of a further policy associated with this objective would assist in recognising and understanding the role of the lifestyle areas (zones and precincts) in providing opportunities for housing within a rural setting.	<p>Add a new Policy 3.2.6.2.4 (notified proposal), as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Opportunities for low density housing are enabled within a rural setting to provide greater access to open space, recreation, nature conservation and rural amenity values.</i></u></p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
Chapter 6 Landscapes		
6.2 Values	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL opposes removal of the description of the values contained within 6.2, to the extent that it creates the potential for the landscape policies to apply to development located outside of the rural zone.</p>	Retain 6.2 Values, as detailed within Stage 1 of the PDP
Rule 6.4.1.2	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL opposes the modification to this rule that have the effect of broadening the application of the Chapter 6 landscape categories to land located outside of the Rural Zone.</p> <p>The landscapes of the district have been categorised into three classifications <u>within the rural zone</u>², being the outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features and the rural landscape classification. This is reflected within Policy 6.3.1.2 which establishes the policy basis for the landscape classification within the rural zone. The changes introduced through the Variation at the back of proposed Chapter 38 does not change this policy. The clarification under Rule 6.4.1.2 stating that the landscape categories apply only to the rural zone and that the landscape chapter and strategic directions chapters objectives and policies is a correct reflection of the structure of the unmodified policies and the proposed changes by the council conflict with this policy direction.</p> <p>Where the rule includes the term “landscape categories”, LHL considers that the plan is not referring to Part 2 of the Act but rather the objectives, policies and assessment matters that apply to the</p>	<p>Amend Rule 6.4.1.2, as follows:</p> <p><i>The <u>classification of landscapes of the District and related objectives policies for each classification within Chapter 6</u> 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.</i></p>

² 6.2, Page 6 – 2, Chapter 6, PDP - Values

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	<p>three landscape classifications under the PDP. Accordingly, LHL seeks that the wording of this rule could be amended to reflect that it is the classification of landscapes of the District and related objectives and policies for each classification within Chapter 6, which apply to the Rural Zone</p>	
<p>Rule 6.4.1.3</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The effect of the proposed change to Rule 6.4.1.3 it to focus the application of the rule to “assessment matters”. This is confusing because Chapter 6 does not contain any assessment matters and the only other relevant assessment would be those included within Chapter 21 Rural Zone. Chapter 22 does not have any assessment matters relevant to subdivision and development (except with respect to hazards in the Makarora Lifestyle Zone). In addition, because this rule is worded in the negative i.e. the assessment matters do not apply to the certain areas, it could be interpreted that the assessment matters do apply to all other zones, including the Rural Residential Zone, outside of those listed exemptions.</p> <p>On this basis, the effect of the proposed changes to Rule 6.4.1.3 would be to apply assessment matters for the three landscape classifications within Chapter 21 Rural Zone to subdivision or development across all other zones, including the Rural Residential Zone. As detailed in the submission made above on Rule 6.4.1.2 the policies of Chapter 6 apply the landscape classifications and related provision to the Rural Zone. The Council hasn’t sought to amend these policies and the changes to this Rule would not change how the policies relating to the three landscape classifications would apply.</p> <p>Where the rule (as originally notified as part of Stage 1) includes the term “landscape categories”, LHL considers that the plan is not referring to Part 2 of the Act but rather the objectives, policies and</p>	<p>Amend Rule 6.4.1.3, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>The landscape categories classification of landscapes of the District, the related objectives policies for each classification within Chapter 6 and the landscape assessment matters within provision 21.7 (Chapter 21), do not apply to the following within the Rural Zones:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones.</i> b. <i>The area of the Frankton Arm located to the east of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line as shown on the District Plan maps.</i> c. <i>The Gibbston Character Zone.</i> <p><u><i>For the avoidance of doubt, the Rural Zone does not include the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (or Precincts) (Chapter 24), the the Rural Lifestyle Zone or the Rural Residential Zone (Chapter 22).</i></u></p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	<p>assessment matters that apply to the three landscape classifications under the PDP. Accordingly, LHL seeks that the wording of this rule could be amended to reflect that it is the classification of landscapes of the District and related objectives and policies for each classification within Chapter 6, which apply to the Rural Zone</p> <p>In order to remain consistent with the policies, LHL submits that the Rule should also be amended to clarify that the Rural Zone is just that and does not include the rural lifestyle zone and the rural residential zones (Chapter 22) or the recently notified Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Chapter 24).</p>	
Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin		
24.1 Purpose	<p>Oppose</p> <p>The description of the Zone purpose includes numerous references to “protection” of landscape character and landscape values. The Zone excludes any outstanding natural landscape and features where the provisions of s6(b) do not apply to protect landscape values. LHL submits that “protection” elevates landscape values above that required under s7of the Act.</p>	<p>a) Amend 24.1 Purpose to remove wording relating to the “protection” of landscapes.</p> <p>b) Amend the second to last paragraph, as follows: “<i>In the Precinct a limited opportunity for subdivision is provided with a minimum lot size of 6,000m² ...</i>”</p>
Objective 24.2.1	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose the inclusion of “protection” within the objectives. As the Zone does not include land located within the outstanding natural landscapes or features it is not subject to s6(b) of the Act.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 24.2.4.1, as follows:</p> <p><i>Landscape and visual amenity values are protected, maintained and enhanced.</i></p>
Policy 24.2.1.1	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Amend Policy 24.2.1.1, as follows:</p> <p><i>Implement minimum and average lot sizes within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu</i></p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	LHL supports the policy support for establishing a minimum and average lot size, but submit this is not necessary to “protect” landscape character as the Zone is not subject to s6(b) of the Act.	<i>Basin Lifestyle Precinct to protect maintain landscape character and visual amenity values.</i>
Policy 24.2.1.8	Oppose LHL oppose the inclusion of “protect” within this policy as the landscape is not subject to s6(b) of the Act and does not need to further establish policy direction for the wider Wakatipu Basin beyond the Zone.	Amend Policy 24.2.1.8, as follows: <i>Ensure land use activities protect, maintain and enhance the range of landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Zone, <u>and Precinct</u> and wider Wakatipu Basin area.</i>
Policy 24.2.1.9	Oppose LHL opposes the wording of this policy as openness and spaciousness are words capable of wide interpretation and characteristics associated with outstanding natural landscape or features.	Delete Policy 24.2.1.9
New Policy 24.2.1.13	LHL submits that the policies for the Zone need to recognise the established development rights created through residential buildings platforms and enable building. This policy supports further changes sought to the rules to provide for building within established building platforms as a permitted activity and to retain the rights created under the operative District Plan. LHL submits that there is no resource management justification for the removal of these established development rights.	Add a new Policy 24.2.1.13, as follows: <i><u>Recognise established residential building platforms and enable building subject to achieving appropriate standards.</u></i>
Policy 24.2.5.1	Oppose LHL oppose the uncertainty created through the wording of this policy, which subjects’ subdivision, use and development to achieving the values described within the landscape character units defined in Schedule 24.8. LHL submits that the landscape character	Amend Policy 24.2.5.1, as follows: <i>Provide for rural residential subdivision, use and development <u>within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u> only where it protects, maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values as</i>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i></i></u> and deleted text shown as <i></i>]									
	units are important for establishing the extent of the Precinct and for managing subdivision, use and development within the more sensitive areas of the Zone, outside of the Precinct. Accordingly, LHL seeks amendments to reflect the expectation of enabling subdivision, use or development within the Precinct.	described within the landscape character unit as defined in Schedule 24.8.									
Policy 24.2.5.6	Oppose LHL oppose the policy (and rules) seeking to retain all vegetation within the Zone and consider the policy is contrary to the higher order policies relating to wilding species clearance and enhancing natural conservation values.	Delete Policy 24.2.5.6									
Rules 24.4.5	Oppose LHL opposes the effect of this rule to require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity across the whole of the Zone, including the Precinct and for the construction of any building within an existing approved or registered building platform. The Precinct has been identified as an area appropriate to absorb greater change, due in part to the outcome of the detailed mapping of landscape character areas and recognition of the pattern of development which exists within the operative District Plan rural lifestyle and rural residential zones. Within the Precinct, the provisions seek to enable subdivision to a density of 1ha (average) and LHL submits that restricted discretionary activity status for all building acts against the establishment of such a density limit. LHL submits that building should be a permitted activity within the Precinct and outside of the Precinct where it is located within an established building platform.	Amend Rule 24.4.5, as follows: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;"><u>Rule 24.5.4.1</u></td> <td style="width: 50%;"><u><i>The construction and exterior alteration of building located within a building platform registered on the computer register</i></u></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;"><u>P</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Rule 24.5.4.2</u></td> <td><u><i>Building within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>P</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Rule 24.5.4.3</u></td> <td><u><i>Building and the identification of a building platform within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, outside of the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>RD</u></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>Building location scale and form.</i></u> • <u><i>External appearance including materials and colours.</i></u> • <u><i>Access ways.</i></u> 	<u>Rule 24.5.4.1</u>	<u><i>The construction and exterior alteration of building located within a building platform registered on the computer register</i></u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Rule 24.5.4.2</u>	<u><i>Building within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Rule 24.5.4.3</u>	<u><i>Building and the identification of a building platform within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, outside of the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u>	<u>RD</u>
<u>Rule 24.5.4.1</u>	<u><i>The construction and exterior alteration of building located within a building platform registered on the computer register</i></u>	<u>P</u>									
<u>Rule 24.5.4.2</u>	<u><i>Building within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u>	<u>P</u>									
<u>Rule 24.5.4.3</u>	<u><i>Building and the identification of a building platform within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, outside of the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u>	<u>RD</u>									

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	<p>LHL submits that the rules should also provide for the establishment of building platform with the Zone (outside of the Precinct), both as part of the subdivision and land use provisions, as this has proven to be an effective means of managing the potential impact of buildings in more sensitive parts of the landscape.</p> <p>Once a building platform has been created and associated conditions established through covenant or consent notice, LHL submit there is no further need to require resource consent as any failure to comply with the conditions of the prior approval would require resource consent through s221 or s127 as a discretionary activity. LHL submit that the Council has failed to adequately assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed rules in terms of implementing the higher order objectives of the PDP and of the significant social and economic consequences of removing the rights secured through historic resource consents. LHL supports the approach taken under the notified stage 1 rural residential and rural lifestyle zone zones and seeks to have a similar regime established within the Precinct.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>Servicing and site works including earthworks.</i></u> • <u><i>Retaining structures.</i></u> • <u><i>Infrastructure (e.g. water tanks).</i></u> • <u><i>Fencing and gates.</i></u> • <u><i>External lighting.</i></u> • <u><i>Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).</i></u> • <u><i>Natural hazards</i></u> <p>Excludes farm buildings as provided for in Rule 24.4.8</p>
Rule 24.4.29	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose 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. The rule is considered inefficient, difficult to 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. LHL seeks to have this rule deleted.</p>	Delete Rule 24.4.29
Rule 24.5.1	<p>Support in Part</p>	Amend Rule 24.5.1 Building Coverage, as follows:

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	LHL generally support the introduction of a building coverage standard as it is similar to the approach proposed within Chapter 22 (PDP Stage 1). As notified the rule is considered overly restrictive and should be amended to relate to the ground floor area of any individual building and not the cumulative gross floor area.	<i>The maximum building coverage for all <u>any individual buildings</u> shall be 15% of lot area, or 500m² <u>gross ground floor area</u> whichever is the lesser....</i>
Rule 24.5.3	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose the proposed height limitation of 6m within (at least) the Precinct on the basis that 6m is overly restrictive considering the character of the existing environment, comprising generally larger but appropriately recessive buildings and the attributes of the Precinct as having higher capacity to absorb change. LHL seeks to the rule to provide a maximum height of 8m, consistent with the operative District plan and PDP rural lifestyle zone.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.3 Height of Buildings, as follows:</p> <p><i>The maximum height of any building shall be <u>8m</u></i></p>
Rule 24.5.4	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose a 75m setback from road boundaries within the Precinct. The Precinct has been identified as having greater capacity for change, deriving in part from the nature of existing development undertaken in accordance with operative District Plan zone. 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. Moreover, where having a standard of 20m for the Zone, outside of the Precinct, will exacerbate problems in the context of areas with supposedly high landscape qualities. Accordingly, LHL seeks to remove the 75m building setback within the Precinct and rely on a 10m setback across all of the Zone.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.4 Setback from Roads, as follows:</p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be <u>10m anywhere within the Zone</u> and 75m in the Precinct.</i></p>
New Rule 24.5.17 Density	LHL support establishment of a minimum and average lot size for subdivision within the Precinct and submits that the Chapter 24 rules should provide for an equivalent mechanism for land use	<p>Add a new Standard (Table 24,3), Rule 24.5.17, as follows:</p> <p>a) There shall be no more than one residential unit per site</p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	activity, complimenting the proposed permitted activity status for building. LHL seeks the addition of a new standard to enable a density of development having a minimum site area of 6,000m ² and an average of 1ha.	b) For sites equal or greater than 1ha, there shall be no more than 1 residential unit per hectare, on average.
New Rule 24.5.18 Building Materials and Colours	LHL seeks to enable the construction of any building within the Precinct as a permitted activity, including within an established residential building platform, subject to compliance with standards as proposed through the Stage 1 Rural Lifestyle Zone rules. A new rule is proposed to be inserted relating to Building Materials and Colours, as promoted through the Stage 1 PDP hearing.	<p>Insert new Rule 24.5.18 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:</p> <p>a. <u><i>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m², new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</i></u></p> <p>b. <u><i>Exterior colours of buildings materials shall be:</i></u></p> <p>i. <u><i>in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</i></u></p> <p>ii. <u><i>have a light reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</i></u></p> <p>iii. <u><i>have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to schist.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</i></u> • <u><i>Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</i></u>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied</i></u>
Provision 24.7.2	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose the cross-references to the higher order strategic directions, urban development and landscape chapters to this zone without the specific amendments to these provisions as detailed in this submission. LHL submits that the existing chapters would create fundamental conflicts that would undermine the specific direction offered through the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.</p>	Delete provisions 24.7.2
Chapter 25 Earthworks		
Policy 25.2.1.2	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL are opposed to the proposed wording of this policy seeking to “protect” the listed resources as it is overly restrictive and conflicts with the objective to minimise adverse effects.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 25.2.1.2, as follows:</p> <p><i>Protect</i> <u><i>Minimise the adverse effects of earthworks on the following valued resources including those that are identified in the District Plan from the inappropriate adverse effects of earthworks:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;</i> <i>b. the amenity values of Rural Landscapes and other identified amenity landscapes;</i> <i>c. significant Natural Areas and the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands;</i> <i>d. the exposure of aquifers, in particular the Wakatipu Basin, Hāwea Basin, Wanaka Basin and Cardrona alluvial ribbon aquifers;</i>
Policy 25.2.2.1	<p>Oppose</p>	Amend Policy 25.2.2.1, as follows:

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i></i></u> and deleted text shown as <i></i>]
	LHL oppose prefacing this policy with “subject to Objective 25.2.5.1” as it has the effect of undermining the significance of social and economic wellbeing and the community benefits of earthworks and the appropriate balancing of provisions.	Subject to Objective 25.2.1, e Enable earthworks that are necessary to provide for people and communities wellbeing, having particular regard to the importance of: ...
25.3.3 Advice Notes 25.3.1	Support in Part LHL support in part the inclusion of this Advice Note to clarify how the volume of earthworks is calculated. It is suggested that as earthworks are a dynamic process during construction phase, it would be assist in the understanding of the rule if volume was calculated at the completion of such work.	Amend Advice Note 25.3.3.1, as follows: <i>Volume shall mean the sum of all earth that is moved within a site and includes the total of any combined cut and fill, <u>measured at the completion of that work</u>. Refer to Interpretive Diagrams 25.1 to 25.3 located within Schedule 25.9.</i>
Advice Note 25.3.3.3	Support in Part LHL supports the meaning of this Advice Note and suggests a minor wording change to better express its meaning.	Amend Advice Note 25.3.3.3, as follows: <i>Refer to Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity for land disturbance activities within Significant Natural Areas. No The provisions of this chapter <u>do not</u> prevail over those of Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity.</i>
Advice Note 25.3.3.4	Support in Part LHL supports the meaning of this Advice Note and suggests a minor wording change to better express its meaning.	Amend Advice Note 25.3.3.4, as follows: <i>Earthworks are also managed as part of development activities and modifications to Historic Heritage items and settings identified on the Planning Maps and in Chapter 26 Historic Heritage. NoThe provisions of this chapter <u>do not</u> prevail over those of Chapter 26 Historic Heritage.</i>
Advice Note 25.3.3.11	Support in Part	Amend Advice Note 25.3.3.11, as follows:

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	LHL supports the meaning of this Advice Note and suggests a minor wording change to better express its meaning.	<p><u><i>The provision of this chapter do not apply to are the following activities managed in Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities:</i></u></p> <p>...</p>
25.3.4 General Rule	<p>Support in Part</p> <p>LHL supports this rule in part, but considers that it should be broadened to apply to all subdivision, not just subdivision that is a controlled or restricted discretionary activity. Changes to the structure of the rule are also proposed as earthworks are not “subject to” subdivision consent, being the very point of the rule. It is suggested instead that “earthworks associated with subdivision” be exempt.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.3.4.1, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Earthworks associated with subject to resource consent applications for Controlled or Restricted Discretionary activity subdivisions pursuant to section 11 of the Act and the provisions of Chapter 27, shall be:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>i) exempt from the following Rules:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Table 25.2 volume;</i> <i>b. Rule 25.5.16 cut; and</i> <i>c. Rule 25.5.17 fill.</i> <p><u><i>ii) Applications for subdivision involving any earthworks shall be considered against the matters of discretion for earthworks in Part 25.7 and assessment matters in Part 25.8.</i></u></p> <p><i>All other rules in the Earthworks Chapter apply to applications for subdivision consent.</i></p>
General Rule 25.3.4.3	<p>Support in Part</p> <p>LHL support the intent of this rule and proposed a change to enable volume and areas of earthworks to be calculated across “any” consecutive 12 month period, rather than only “one” 12 month period.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.3.4.3, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>The maximum volume and area of earthworks shall be calculated per <u>sSite</u>, within one <u>any</u> consecutive 12 month period</i></u></p>
Rule 25.5.11	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.5.11 to add the following statement:</p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <i><u>underlined bold italics</u></i> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	LHL opposes the inclusion of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, including the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, within the area thresholds and seek to exempt this zone.	<i><u>Except this rule shall not apply within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (and Lifestyle Precinct), Chapter 24.</u></i>
Rule 25.5.12	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose non-complying activity status for a breach of this rule, which is considered able to be appropriately managed as a restricted discretionary activity. In addition, non-complying activity stratus does not follow from the wording of the relevant policies.</p>	Amend Rule 25.5.12 to change the status of non-compliance to restricted discretionary.
Rule 25.5.13	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose non-complying activity status for a breach of this rule, which is considered able to be appropriately managed as a restricted discretionary activity. In addition, non-complying activity stratus does not follow from the wording of the relevant policies.</p>	Amend Rule 25.5.13 to change the status of non-compliance to restricted discretionary
Rule 25.5.15	<p>Support</p> <p>LHL supports the intent of this rule to establish a permissive approach for managing accidental discovery, archaeological sites and contaminated land through the relevant legislation applying to these matters and not as a separate rule trigger.</p>	No changes
Rule 25.5.18	<p>Support in Part</p> <p>LHL is unclear whether access ways are intended to capture roads, including roads created through subdivision and seeks changes to ensure roads to vest or private roads are exempt from this rule. The reasons being that their effects are appropriately managed through the broader consideration of subdivision works and the other standards within this chapter.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.5.18, as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Earthworks for farm tracks and access ways, but not roads vest or private road created by subdivision consent, in the following Zones and Activity Area shall comply with rules (a) to (c).</u></i></p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u>italics</u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
Rule 25.5.20	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose the introduction of a new 10m setback for all earthworks from the bed of any water body. In relation to water bodies the operative earthworks rules provide for 20m³ of earthworks within 7m of a water body. The 7m setback is also consistent with rules within the Otago Regional Water Plan. No assessment has been made to justify this departure. LHL seek to change the rule to retain the ability to undertake 20m³ of earthworks within 7m of a waterbody.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.5.20, as follows:</p> <p><i>Earthworks greater than 20m³ in volume shall be setback a minimum distance of 10 7 metres from the bed of any water body.</i></p> <p>...</p>
Rule 25.5.22 Cleanfill	<p>Oppose</p> <p>It is unclear how this rule is intended to operate when all earthworks to operate a Cleanfill are listed as a discretionary activity through Rule 25.4.</p>	Delete this rule or otherwise amend to relate to Rule 25.4.3.
Schedule 25.10 Accidental Discovery Protocol	<p>Support</p> <p>LHL supports the addition of an accidental Discovery Protocol into the PDP, in the event its wording has been agreed to by the relevant agencies and Mana Whenua.</p>	
Definition of Earthworks	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL oppose the addition of cleanfill into the definition of earthworks on the basis that Cleanfill is separately defined and supplemented by a separate discretionary activity rule regardless of volume.</p>	Amend the definition of Earthworks to remove the deposition and removal of Cleanfill.
Subdivision		
Rule 27.4.3 b.	<p>Oppose</p>	Amend Rule 27.4.3 b., as follows:

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i></i></u> and deleted text shown as <i></i>]
	<p>LHL oppose restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision located within the Precinct and having the same status as subdivision within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. The precinct has been identified following detailed mapping of landscape values and character units across the basin and identified on the basis of having generally greater capacity to absorb change. In the event the boundaries of the precinct are determined to satisfy the objectives of the Plan, LHL considers controlled activity status would be appropriate for subdivision within this area. Evidence for LHL presented at the PDP Stage 1 subdivision hearing proposed a new Rule 27.5.6 for the rural residential and rural lifestyle zone and is considered a suitable basis to provide for the precinct.</p>	<p><i>Any subdivision in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, excluding the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, meeting the minimum and/or average lot sizes specified in Rule 27.5.</i></p> <p>Add a new Rule 27.5.6, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>All subdivision activities within any Rural Lifestyle Zone, Rural Residential Zone or the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Council's control is limited to:</i></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>The matters of control listed within Rule 27.5.5;</i></u> <u><i>The location of building platforms in any rural lifestyle zone;</i></u> <u><i>Orientation of lots to optimise solar gain</i></u>
<p>Rule 27.5.1 Minimum Lot Size table</p>	<p>Support in Part</p> <p>LHL supports the establishment of a minimum and <u>minimum</u> average lot area for subdivision within the Precinct. LHL seeks to amend the wording of the standard to ensure that the density of subdivision achieves a minimum lot area of 6,000m² and <u>minimum</u> average lot area of 1ha, <u>so that it is clear a subdivision may achieve an average of lot sizes that are larger than 1ha.</u></p>	<p>Change heading of table 27.5.1 to "No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, average, less than the <u>minimum lot area or minimum average</u> specified"</p>
<p>Planning Maps</p>		
<p>All Stage 2 PDP Planning Maps, including 13d, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 31</p>	<p>Oppose</p> <p>LHL generally oppose the creation of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct under the</p>	<p>Amending each of the PDP Stage 2 Planning Maps to remove the new areas of Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct and reinstate the zones as notified under the PDP Stage 1.</p>

Specific Provision	Submission	Decisions Sought [New text shown <u><i>underlined bold italics</i></u> and deleted text shown as <i>italic strike-through</i>]
	regime of proposed objectives, policies and rules as notified within Chapter 24 and seeks to reinstate with the PDP Stage 1 zones.	

- 27. LHL opposes the Variations and Stage 2 chapters in their entirety if the deficiencies identified in this submission are not addressed, and seeks that the Stage 2 Variations and Chapters be declined in the event the deficiencies are not addressed.
- 28. LHL seeks any other consequential or other changes / relief as necessary or appropriate in order address the issues raised in this submission

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN
UNDER CLAUSE EIGHT OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE TO
THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072
QUEENSTOWN 9348

Submitter: Lake Hayes Limited
C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd
PO Box 110
CHRISTCHURCH

Attention: Chris Ferguson, Planner
Phone: (03) 353 7568
Mobile: 021 907 773
Email: Chris.Ferguson@boffamiskell.co.nz

Lake Hayes Limited ("LHL") makes further submissions on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan as set out in the **attached** document.

LHL confirms it is a person who is representing a relevant aspect of the public interest, and has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has (it is affected by the content of a submission).

LHL wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.

If other persons make a similar further submission then LHL would consider presenting joint evidence at the time of the hearing.

A copy of this further submission has been served on the original submitters to which this further submission relates.



Chris Ferguson

For and behalf of Lake Hayes Limited

27th day of April 2018

FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support/opposition are:
<p>#2376 –Darby Planning LP</p>	<p><i>Chapter 24</i></p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The relief sought by the Submitter regarding Chapter 24 is supported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the first instance, to withdraw Chapter 24 and associated changes from the PDP and undertake a thorough landscape study; • If the WBRAZ is retained, to amend the objectives, policies and rules of Chapters 24, 27, 3 and 6 so as to more accurately reflect the landscape qualities of the Basin, and to recognise and provide for reasonable development, commercial activities, and existing land use rights. <p>The submission is supported because GSL shares the Submitters general concerns on the WBRAZ Variation regarding;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timing and inefficiency of the DPR process for stages 1 and 2, which has resulted in unnecessary costs, delays and uncertainty for land owners and business owners; • The development of the Variation based on the WBLUS, which lacks specificity, objectivity and thorough landscaping analysis; • The method by which boundaries for and within the WBRAZ have been established, the assessment methodology for establishing LCUs, and the associated conclusions on the ability to absorb change. • The inability of the WRBAZ Variation to recognise and provide for reasonable development, commercial activities, and existing land use rights in the Basin.
	<p><i>Chapter 21 Visitor Accommodation Variation</i></p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The relief sought by the Submitter to delete changes to Chapter 21 in relation to visitor accommodation in the WBRAZ/Rural zones in supported.</p> <p>GSL shares the Submitter's concerns regarding further visitor accommodation restrictions within the WBRAZ/Rural zones and agrees that the effects of short term visitor accommodation within rural zones do not justify the proposed restrictions because:</p>

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support/opposition are:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rural zone contributes comparatively little to housing stock across the district, therefore visitor accommodation in rural areas has little impact on availability of houses for residential living; • As rural housing is generally more expensive than urban housing, a reduction in residential capacity in the rural zone has little impact on housing affordability across the district; • The majority of short term accommodation is in urban areas; • Visitor accommodation in rural residences provides for the economic wellbeing of people and communities without having adverse effects on the rural environment.
#2291 - Lake Hayes Investments Limited	<i>Chapter 24 Planning Maps 13d, 26 and 30</i>	Support	<p>The relief sought in the submission to rezone the submitter's land (and surrounding Lake Hayes land) as set out in the original submission from WBRAZ to WBLP is supported.</p> <p>In general the proposed WBRAZ rezoning is inefficient and ineffective because it does not accurately reflect the existing character and development of the area. The area referred to in the submission has a long-established rural residential/rural lifestyle character. The proposed rezoning will unnecessarily hinder reasonable development in the area, as there is potential to absorb additional development compatible with the existing zoning. The rezoning undermines the existing development rights and economic investments of landowners without reasoned basis or an adequate section 32 assessment.</p> <p>Zoning of the land as WBLP is preferred as this zoning more accurately reflects existing land use and development, and mitigates unnecessary disruption to landowners' social and economic wellbeing. Therefore this zoning better achieves the objectives and policies of the higher order planning documents.</p>
	<i>Chapter 24</i>	Support	<p>The relief sought in the submission to amend certain provisions of Chapter 24 is supported, to the extent that the amendments are consistent with the relief sought by LHL in their original submission.</p> <p>With these amendments the provisions of Chapter 24 better reflects the existing character and land use of the area, allow greater opportunities for</p>

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support/opposition are:
			reasonable development, and better protect the existing land use rights of landowners.
	<i>Chapter 3 and Chapter 6</i>	Support	It is supported that various modifications to the objectives and policies of Chapters 3 and 6 are necessary for integration of the WBRAZ and WBLP with these Chapters.
	<i>Chapter 6</i> Rule 6.4.1.3	Support	<p>The relief sought in the submission to amend Rule 6.4.1.3 is supported, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought by LHL in their original submission.</p> <p>There is no adequate justification for exclusion of the WBLP, RRZ and RLZ from the list of exemptions from assessment under the landscape categories. These zones have their own objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria which are better suited for determining applications.</p>
#2231 - Bruce McLeod	<i>Chapter 24</i> <i>Planning Maps 13d, 26, 29, 30</i>	Support	<p>The submitter's proposed rezoning of the East Lake Hayes area to Rural Residential Zone is supported.</p> <p>The WBRAZ Variation is not supported by sufficient evidence or research, and lacks adequate section 32 analysis. The proposed WBRAZ/WBLP boundaries and LCUs are not consistent with the development patterns of the basin.</p> <p>There is a lack of research to support the densities and minimum lot sizes proposed. The zoning of the East Lake Hayes area and other land as WBRAZ results in inefficient land use and uncertainty of building rights for landowners.</p>
#2385 – Boxer Hills Trust	<i>Chapter 24</i> Various provisions	Support in part	<p>The relief sought to amend certain provisions of Chapter 24 is supported, in so far as they relate to LHL's land and are not consistent with the relief sought by LHL.</p> <p>These amendments to Chapter 24 better enable the purpose of the PDP and allow for appropriate development within the WBLP.</p>

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support/opposition are:
#2449 - Morven Ferry Limited	<i>Chapter 24, chapters 3, 6, 27</i>	Support	<p>The relief sought to amend chapters 3 and 6 as a consequence of amendments to the chapter 24 variation are supported so as to ensure that higher order provisions in the plan are aligned with lower order chapters, and that the entire plan is considered in the round, as the review was anticipated to achieve.</p> <p>Appendices 1 and 2 of the submission set out various amendments to the chapter 24 provisions, including objectives, policies, rules and standards. These amendments are generally supported so as to recognised and provide for rural living and development within Precinct Zones, and to provide for development within those areas identified as having ability to absorb change in particular landscape classification units. Amendments to chapter 27 are supported to provide for a default controlled activity subdivision regime, subject to standards.</p>