

#1

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 10:42:47 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 10:44:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:21  
**IP Address:** 122.57.79.138

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Livi Hess

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

There needs to be another supermarket in order to accommodate more housing developments. It would be ludicrous for the council to approve this special housing area without immediate plans for another supermarket.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

#2

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 8:27:01 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 8:28:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:28  
**IP Address:** 49.224.37.84

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Nicola

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

Jargon and labling "special" is setting up for discrimination.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

# #3

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, February 26, 2018 8:10:07 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, February 26, 2018 8:27:11 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:17:04  
**IP Address:** 118.92.82.74

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

## Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

## Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Anwyn Walker

---

## Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

My major concern is the increased traffic flow on Cardrona Valley Road. The turn from Golf Course Road to Cardrona Valley Rd towards Wanaka is dangerous at the present volume of traffic without increasing it with the subdivision. I would imagine the turn from the subdivision would be similarly risky.

The retirement village is located close by and these elderly people will be walking and driving in the area. Increased traffic will add to their risk.

The designs of the houses look so urban and unattractive for the landscape of Wanaka. The slanting off-centre roofs don't sit well to me. We need to be very mindful not to destroy the very thing about Wanaka that all the local people love about it. It is expanding beyond control- the traffic, the car parks, the roads are all straining under the expansion.

Water pressure in the area is very poor at times and one can assume with the increased housing there will be more demand on the weakened water system.

I am not in favour of any more subdivision taking place.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

#4

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, February 27, 2018 2:26:13 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 10:11:38 AM  
**Time Spent:** 19:45:25  
**IP Address:** 103.29.31.15

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Lindsey Brown

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

The Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing area has my full support. Wanaka is in desperate need of affordable housing and it's imperative that people from all walks of life and various socio-economic backgrounds can afford to live here, or the town is at risk of becoming a place where only wealthy holiday home owners and retirees can afford to live.

As a young person who was lucky enough to have bought a house here prior to the boom, I now see many of my friends who are prospective first home buyers struggle to find housing in the region, whilst others suffer from a severe rental shortage.

The proposal successfully addresses Wanaka's need for diverse housing options, with smaller blocks of land and townhouse style living, and its location near the Three Parks development and Ballantyne Road is ideal.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

# #5

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 10:55:51 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 11:01:43 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:52  
**IP Address:** 103.29.31.15

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

## Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

## Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Vicky Osborne

---

## Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

Being close to town and Three Parks, I think this is a great area for special housing. This will mean local workers can afford to live and work in Wanaka, something that is becoming increasingly hard at the moment.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

#6

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 12:44:59 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, February 28, 2018 4:27:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 03:42:08  
**IP Address:** 114.23.100.34

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation

Orchard Road Holdings Limited

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Alison Devlin

---

Page 4: Feedback

## Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing Area

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

Orchard Road Holdings Ltd (ORHL) owns the Industrial, Residential Zoned and Open Space land to the south east of the proposed Special Housing Area (SHA).

The ORHL land was rezoned through plan changes 36 and 46. These plan changes created an Industrial (B) Zone and a Low Density Residential Zone with a wide tract of open space in between to buffer the effects of the future industrial activities on the future residential activities, and also to provide a corridor for a road and a cycleway/walkway to adjoining land.

It was envisaged that the road servicing the ORHL industrial land would connect through to Frederick Street, which would avoid residential traffic travelling through industrial areas. Consistent with this, a future road link to Frederick Street is shown on the recently approved ODP for the industrial land (RM171176) and on the subdivision application (RM171177). The proposed SHA does not create this link through to the industrial land, instead it shows residential land being accessed from Frederick Street through the existing industrial area. This creates a low amenity approach to the residential areas with potential safety conflicts between the residential and industrial traffic.

The proposed 'Block 12' in the SHA is proposed to be immediately adjacent to the ORHL industrial land. ORHL considers that, given the type of industrial activity that is permitted in the Industrial B Zone and given that there are no setback requirements, the amenity of Block 12 will be compromised. ORHL considers that the Block 12 area would be better used for industrial activity in conjunction with the formation of the road linking Frederick Street and the ORHL industrial land.

If the Frederick Street access is to be used to service the residential area, ORHL considers that there is little point in forming an additional access from Ballantyne Road to the south of Enterprise Drive.

The large swathe of open space created through PC46 is intended to be part of a future green network and this was an important aspect of the PC46 plan change. ORHL has sought and obtained landscape and earthworks approval to develop this open space area, which includes the formation of a cycleway/walkway (RM161241). Earthworks to form this area are already underway. ORHL considers that the SHA plan does not take appropriate consideration of this approved open space area and undermines what could be a very important asset to the green network for Wanaka. The green space shown in the SHA does not appear to link up to the ORHL green space and any cycleway/walkway link will have to cross Frederick Street, which could become a busy through-road carrying both industrial and residential traffic.

ORHL considers that the SHA plan has not given due consideration to the development which has been approved on the ORHL land. This is a missed opportunity to create a safe road, pedestrian and cycle network and to appropriately manage the integration of the Industrial B Zone with the residential areas.

Overall, the proposed housing area layout appears to be poorly designed and compromises the overall future amenity of this area of Wanaka. It appears the main driver of this design is to minimise section size and maximise the number of houses on the premise that this approach will create affordable housing. There are better ways to achieve affordable housing aims whilst retaining amenity values that are important to Wanaka.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I  
understand

#7

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, March 02, 2018 9:46:19 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 02, 2018 9:50:27 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:04:07  
**IP Address:** 122.57.232.236

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Allen Victor Hogan

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

I have felt for some time that there is a need for this form of accommodation. The constant list of adverts for staff in the many small businesses in town seems to be to a large part due to the cost and availability of accommodation for young people. This project will help address this problem,. I would therefore support this project.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---



#8

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, March 02, 2018 10:37:10 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 02, 2018 11:19:08 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:41:57  
**IP Address:** 219.88.77.139

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Alison Southwick

---

Page 4: Feedback

## Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing Area

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

I am concerned with the haphazard town planning that is occurring in Wanaka. This SHA proposal puts forward a very high density residential development extremely close to the industrial area surrounding Frederick St. The industrial area is described in the proposal as "light" but it is a mix of heavy industry with the concrete plant located there also. Upper Clutha Transport on Ballantyne Road could also be considered heavy industry. Frederick St is already congested with both heavy and light truck traffic, boat trailers, vans and cars. The concrete mixers enter and exit via Frederick St. Some of the semi trailer trucks making deliveries to Placemakers are huge. Parking is intensive during working days, with all available parking areas taken up most of the day. Visiting businesses in Frederick St is becoming harder as parking is hard to find. Some delivery vehicles are double parking for short periods as there is no alternative.

I note that the SHA proposal says that the residential development will be within walking distance to the new Three Parks development. Unfortunately, it will not be a pleasant walk, having to negotiate pavements across which trucks are entering and leaving industrial lots. Crossing Ballantyne Rd will also be tricky as it is also now very busy with heavy truck traffic, it is a 70kph zone, and there are very few pavements for pedestrians. At the moment the road seal just falls away into gravel and then weeds

I note that Block 12 on the plan has no green buffer between it and the existing industry in Frederick St and is placed up against an industrial lot.

Letting such a high density residential area be built next to a busy industrial area through Frederick St, Connell Terrace and Gordon Rd will only lead to noise and dust problems for the residents. A visit to Frederick St on a windy day will show that a lot of dust is blown around in the air from the concrete plant and the unsealed land around the Upper Clutha Transport Depot and their open bins of soil and sand.

While there is a main road connection to the proposed development from Cardrona Road, there are also access routes via Gordon Road and Frederick St. With 281 houses in the plan, traffic congestion will be diabolical in those two streets. During week days parked cars, trailers and trucks take up both sides of the roads, so increasing the flow of traffic in these streets will add to the existing mess.

It is time Wanaka planners started to look at roading improvements, such as widening roads and proper off street parking for businesses. You only have to look at the narrowness of Anderson Rd when there are two sides full of parked cars to realise there is only a narrow corridor for traffic flow, made even tighter when two trucks are passing each other. This is also the case with all of the streets in the Reece Crescent, Cliff Wilson Dr industrial area; and Plantation Drive is being made quite narrow with parking outside of Mitre 10.

While I support the introduction of affordable housing areas in Wanaka, I suggest that the roading access should be reconsidered, so that residential areas do not have to be accessed through already busy industrial areas. I would also suggest that additional landscaped areas be provided between the industrial lots and the housing blocks, and especially Block 12, by way of large built up mounds and intensive tree/hedge planting. This should reduce noise and dust problems to an extent.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I  
understand

#9

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, March 02, 2018 10:05:37 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 02, 2018 10:12:54 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:16  
**IP Address:** 203.118.172.150

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Mrs Margaret Hall

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

Market affordable housing is definitely needed in Wanaka. I understand the sections are small being no more than 400 square metres and there will be some multi story apartments. My real concern is that the area have some green spaces with trees and that aesthetic landscaping be a top priority, otherwise the area could well be an unsightly blot on what is a very special landscape. I ask that the planners and developers ensure that this is included in the final plan of the area.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

# #10

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, March 05, 2018 5:32:10 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, March 05, 2018 5:40:39 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:29  
**IP Address:** 103.198.185.26

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

## Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation

Active Transport Wanaka

---

## Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Simon Telfer

---

## Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

As with all new sub division activity Active Transport Wanka would like to see the developer's plans for connection with, and enhancement of, Wanaka's urban cycle way network.

This is particularly the case for special housing areas where the ease of accessing amenities (schools, shopping centres, recreational facilities) by foot and bike will reduce individual's transport costs and enhance health and well being.

If the walking and cycle infrastructure is provided then uptake and use will follow.

The requirement for developers should not only be the provision of safe walking and biking \*within\* the sub division but also how they can contribute to and enhance the \*wider\* urban cycle network.

Let's ensure we future proof Wanaka's transport infrastructure.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I understand

---

#11

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 9:25:10 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 11:28:44 AM  
**Time Spent:** 02:03:34  
**IP Address:** 122.57.190.70

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Raewyn and David Wilson

---

Page 4: Feedback

## Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing Area

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

### 1. Heights

We understand the need for additional affordable housing in Wanaka and consider a residential area to be the best use of the proposed area if it is to be developed. However, we consider the usual height restriction of 7 - 8 metres to be more appropriate than 11 metres. Higher buildings adjacent to rural residential, rural zones and the retirement village will have a significant adverse visual impact on the landscape and are not in keeping with the surrounding area. The proposed development is large enough to provide sufficient Affordable Housing options while still being commercially viable, without including units that exceed 7-8 metres in height.

### 2. Gordon Rd/Ballantyne Rd safety

We have serious concerns about Gordon Road/Ballantyne Rd being one of the main access roads to the site. We walk, bike and drive on this route very regularly. It is already a dangerous route for cyclists, pedestrians and drivers due to the high number of trucks, service vehicles, trade premise accessways, trade vehicles and customers/clients parked on the roadside on Gordon Rd. Very rarely do you go down Gordon road without having to stop for a truck or trade vehicle loading/unloading etc.

This would be very dangerous especially for school children. Consideration would need to be given to an alternative cycle route option for children to get to the current schools.

Also, the intersection of Gordon Road and Ballantyne Road is already dangerous for traffic turning right onto Gordon Rd. The high speed limit (70km), increasing traffic volumes (high at peak times) and lack of any room for a following car to pass a turning vehicle makes it very risky for the vehicle turning off Ballantyne Rd. At a minimum, a Right Hand Turning Bay on Ballantyne Rd would reduce the risk at this intersection, especially as the traffic numbers would be much higher if a residential subdivision is built.

Ballantyne Road is also dangerous for cyclists & pedestrians. Some sort of controlled crossing for children to get across Ballantyne Road from Gordon Rd would need to be considered and current tracks on Ballantyne Rd would need upgrading/adding to in order to prevent cyclists being on the actual road which would be very dangerous.

The increased traffic volumes on Ballantyne Rd will further increase the need for council to consider alternative traffic control at the Ballantyne Rd/Golf Course Rd intersection and the Ballantyne Rd/Ardmore St intersection which will have many more vehicles travelling to the schools which are present on the other side of the State Highway. These intersections are already problematic and dangerous with the current traffic flows.

### 3. Green Belts

Please note that the Green Belt Bund behind our property at 72A Golf Course Rd, which cannot be planted on (apart from grass) or built on, was constructed by agreement with the Industrial B developer and QLDC to mitigate the effects of the Industrial B Zone. Any development of the area now or in the future needs to ensure the developer realises this bund is to remain as is.

All other Green Belt areas shown on the plans (outside the SHA outlined in red) should be required as part of any conditions allowing a residential area to proceed. This will provide a better transition to the rural residential areas to the North & North/East and to the Industrial areas to the East & North/East. It is not clear in the plans and notes whether this will occur as the Green Belts are situated outside the SHA outlined in red. As the proposed sections are small at less than 400 m<sup>2</sup>, resulting in a High Density Residential area, ensuring ongoing retention of sufficient green belt areas is important if the site is to be significantly changed from its Operative District Plan Rural General Zone or the Proposed District Plan Low Density Zone.

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I understand

---



# #12

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, February 27, 2018 1:18:09 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 2:43:39 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a week  
**IP Address:** 222.152.82.79

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

## Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

## Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Murray William Briggs / Judith Emma Briggs

---

## Page 4: Feedback

## Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing Area

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

Our objections to the Bright Sky Land Ltd considerations as SHA are the proximity to Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village, Gordon Road will become a main thoroughfare, and the high density and section size being considered.

We note very little reference in submissions to adjacent subdivision Aspiring Retirement Village, which has been completed some 18 months with approx. 110 villas of high quality, one level, with well maintained lawns and gardens, with associated medical facilities.

Gordon Road which is a paper road at present looks set to become a main arterial road from Cardrona Valley road to Ballantyne Road and link up with Three Parks.

Many villas in the Village front onto Gordon Road, so concern with traffic and noise pollution. There seems to be no buffers or plantings in this area.

Density and maximum building height of 11 metres are totally unacceptable for this area and would have a visible and mental affect on residents in the said Village (170 at present). A village of this quality deserves more respect than Bright Sky Land Ltd are according it, because like many fellow residents it is our front window.

We strongly oppose the density of this subdivision and hope that common sense will prevail.

One of our missions in life is to protect and care for our beautiful landscape and hopefully preserve the "space" so we can actually "think" and observe the uniqueness and tranquility of what we have-noise is not a quality of life-lets hope it is not too late to convince our leaders that we do not all need to live on top of each other. Privacy and peacefulness is a great commodity that man seems intent on destroying in our beautiful country, it has been taken over by greed and no respect for the environment or peoples quality of life.

Finally what is wrong with appreciating our natural beauty rather than destroying with high density housing.

May we still be able to live in peace and "smell the roses"

Murray and Judy Briggs

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I  
**understand**

# #13

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 8:39:20 AM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 16, 2018 1:00:03 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 202.36.149.5

---

## Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An organisation**

---

## Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation

Public Health South, Southern DHB

---

## Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Emily Nelson

---

## Page 4: Feedback

## Bright Sky Proposed Special Housing Area

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

As outlined on the QLDC website, the objective of a Special Housing Area (SHA) is “to boost our housing supply and improve housing affordability in the district by facilitating development that meets the needs of the growing population”. This will be achieved by fast-tracking the consent process under the HASHAA. PHS supports this in recognition of the reported housing shortage and cost of accommodation in the Central-Lakes district.

An online survey was conducted by the developer, and “17 of 45 respondents saw a desperate need for the delivery of housing in Wanaka for less than \$575K.” It is unclear from the pack what the expected price-point will be, and how many/ % of dwellings in the development will fit this criteria. The rationale is sound, however PHS is am unsure of the impact this development will have in meeting the housing needs of low income workers. The median multiple (the ration of median house prices to median income) in Queenstown-Lakes is the highest in the country at 10.71 (Feb 2017) (Ministry of Business, 2018). PHS is concerned that the Bright Sky proposal will do little to address housing affordability by reducing the median multiple, and therefore not satisfy the criteria to be deemed a SHA. The Bright Sky Expressions of Interest pack outlines the rationale to be considered a SHA, and the scheme comprises of an approach of ‘Affordability by Design’. Of particular note, they claim to “provide new housing that is priced at a ‘market affordable’ price point; and, contribute to affordable housing in Wanaka”. Progressing a development under SHA legislation should not come at the expense of good urban planning and design. PHS encourages QLDC to hold Bright Sky to account on design and sustainability under the WHO Sustainable Development Goals (World Health Organisation, 2018).

Otherwise, the PHS is encouraged by the consideration of a number of important aspects for community development and health. These include the consideration for a ‘village’ neighbourhood, which is ‘inclusive’ not ‘exclusive’; a focus on a low-speed vehicle pedestrian-centric environment; a safe low-impact (noise, conflicts) environment conducive to higher density living; and the integration of a neighbourhood park. This development is an opportunity to support young and transient workers, and benefit long-term stability and community development in Wanaka. PHS encourages the QLDC to carefully examine if this development will satisfy the objectives of a SHA, and the needs of the region for quality, yet affordable housing.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

**I understand**

#14

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, March 12, 2018 2:31:44 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, March 18, 2018 9:30:10 AM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 111.69.157.5

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

Peter and Elaine Herbert

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

We, Peter and Elaine Herbert, wish to submit an expression of interest in the Special Housing Area proposed by Bright Sky Land Ltd, Lot 1 DP477622.

We are very concerned that there is no mention or recognition in the proposal re the Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village Complex which is sited directly opposite this proposed development. All the Villas in the Village are presently completed and occupied.

There is a major concern that the most densely housed area of Block 6 on Common Ground Plan CO3 has 15 housing units on 2149 square metres; this housing area is within 100 metres of the closest Villa of the Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village.

There appears to be no provision for a Greenway/Buffer or Landscaping to soften the impact of such a densely populated area looking straight on to the Village.

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details. **I understand**

---

# #15

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, March 14, 2018 4:13:45 PM  
**Last Modified:** Sunday, March 18, 2018 3:38:10 PM  
**Time Spent:** Over a day  
**IP Address:** 111.69.156.197

---

Page 1: Personal Details

**Q1** I am giving feedback as: **An individual**

---

Page 2: Personal Details

**Q2** Name of organisation **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 3: Personal Details

**Q3** Full name

James Jopp Feehly

---

Page 4: Feedback

**Q6** Please provide your feedback on the proposed Bright Sky Special Housing Area here:

1. I agree that additional housing is required in Wanaka and the SHA system is an acceptable way of providing it.

2. Bright Sky SHA.

a. I note that in their submission Bright Sky refer to most of their boundaries and the effect that the development will have on the occupants of those boundaries.

b. However, I note that no reference is made to the North West boundaries and the Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village (ALRV) that is sited on that boundary (across proposed Road). The ALRV is a fully occupied, modern, well designed village that cognizance should be taken of.

c. In the submission reference is made to the QLDC Proposed District Plan and that the Low Density Residential requirements will be one dwelling per 300 square metres but that in this case it is only 1 dwelling/250 square metres. On the gross area of the development this is true, but if the nett area (gross minus roads and lanes) is used then the density is 1 dwelling/163 square metres!!!!!!!

d. North West Boundary.

On the North West boundary the developers propose three building blocks. These blocks have building densities as follows;

i. Block 2 has three building densities - 1 dwelling/300 - 349 square metres, 1 dwelling/250 - 299 square metres and 1 dwelling/180 - 199 square metres.

ii. Block 4 also has three building densities - 1 dwelling/200 - 249 square metres, 1 dwelling/180 - 199 square metres and 1 dwelling/150 - 179 square metres.

iii. Block 6 has only one density - 1 dwelling/120 - 149 square metres.

As can be seen most of these densities are well below the requirements of the proposed QLDC District Plan.

The occupants of the ALRV deserve to have a similiar outlook as the Village provides internally and as could be expected for them of any new subdivision bordering their Village. Because of the high dwelling densities proposed by the Bright Skies SHA this will not be the case here.

Recommendations. It is recommended that the developers of the Bright Skies SHA be required, along the subdivision's North West Boundary, fronting the ALRV, to provide all building lots to meet the requirement of the proposed QLDC District Plan (one dwelling per 300 square metres).

---

**Q7** I understand that all submissions will be treated as public information. Your name and comments will be publicly available, however we will not disclose your contact details.

I  
**understand**

**From:** [Blair Devlin](#)  
**To:** [Rebecca Pitts](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Bright Sky Special Housing Area Proposal  
**Date:** Tuesday, 6 March 2018 11:00:25 AM

---

Note the last part of email below relates to a different topic not the Bright Sky EOI

---

**From:** Rik Deaton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 3 March 2018 6:21 PM  
**To:** Blair Devlin <Blair.Devlin@qldc.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** Bright Sky Special Housing Area Proposal

From: Rik Deaton  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Hello Blair

We live fairly close to this development site in the newly named Ironview Lane in on a section ironically formerly owned by one of the proponents, Dave Reid. Dave didn't build this home but those he and his colleagues now propose will no doubt be built to the same 1950's levels of energy efficiency as this thirteen year old thermal energy colander building that fire hoses thermal energy out through the weather envelope in wintertime almost faster than it can be added to the inside by the inadequate heating systems. At the same time as running two log burners (the Model T Ford of wood fired home heating appliances) we also have monthly wintertime power bills in the area of \$1,200 - \$1,300 because of the eleven electric radiators we run! This home will take a quarter million dollar deep energy retrofit to fix it and these proposed new spec-built buildings will be no different. Incorporate the necessary measures into the building at the time of construction and it adds a mere 8 to 12% to construction, at least those are the numbers in Europe where there is true competition in the supply of building materials and home building.

This proposal waxes lyrical with all the usual fatuous archibabble rubbish about being inclusive, not exclusive, the juxtaposition of the internal spaces with the external environment with the blah, blah - but says not a word about the levels of energy efficiency to be built into the weather envelope of the buildings. They do have the standard sop to environmental concern of, "we will include passive solar design to minimise wintertime heating bills" and then tell us that they will be using "standard building practices" to construct them and then one notices that all their drawings and photographic examples show buildings without either eaves or external shading devices. This tells us that what we have here is another set of new buildings for the area that will simply become energy consumption disasters the moment their new owners move in and then quickly find they will be unable to afford the heating and cooling costs of these buildings, that is of course, assuming that the region's rapidly failing electricity generation system can supply the energy in the first place. Uncontrolled thermal loss in winter (as guaranteed by "standard building practice" in this country) coupled with unregulated passive solar gain in summer (as guaranteed by lack of eaves and external shading devices) make this inevitable.

This will no doubt be allowed uncontested by our local consent authority as is standard practice for QLDC, but at least I suppose we can count on them being painted enviro-black, eco-brown or sustaino-grey. With Europe set to introduce its latest, and probably



final, energy efficiency mandate - Near Zero Energy Buildings - across the 26 member states of the EU in 2020, that society will have reduced energy consumption for space heating and cooling of its residential built environment (typically around 80% of total residential energy consumption) over the last 25 years from over 250 kwh/m2 to around 20!!! We here in Clean Green New Zealand don't even know what energy efficiency in the built environment actually is.

I have no specific objections to the essence of this proposal. We have a rapidly growing population and we run a growth based economic model so such new developments are simply inevitable. This is significantly higher density than any other development in the area and, from an Urban Design perspective, that too is inevitable. What is not necessarily inevitable however, is allowing the spec builders of this country to continue to get away with constructing incomplete buildings that masquerade as adequate and appropriate in energy terms

By definition, if a material is dense and rigid enough to act as the structural framework of a building it is a thermal conductor, not an insulator. The timber frame of a standard practice NZ home is therefore a thermal bridge and is continuously transmitting heat via the conductive pathway - how a steel framed home can be permitted is simply a mystery to me. The cavity between the timber frame, that we fill with bulk fibreglass insulation in an attempt to block the convective pathway, is subject to three gradients: temperature, pressure and vapour pressure. Bulk fibreglass insulation is quite effective at minimising temperature gradient driven interstitial convective current formation within such a cavity if, and only if, that cavity is hermetically sealed against through assembly convective drive caused by the pressure gradient. Since we make no attempt at airtightness in our building's, the cavities between timber framing members are not sealed at all, let alone hermetically, so therefore the far more powerful pressure gradient powered through-assembly convective drive simply sails right on through the fibreglass bulk insulation (which is something like 90% interstitial space) as if it were not there. For these reasons modern energy efficient European buildings place extreme emphasis on airtightness and then add a full 200mm of thermal insulation outboard of the structural fabric of the building ... Euro walls are 300mm thick whereas ours are 100.

If you are unaware of these realities of our residential buildings and the ramifications this has on our South Island energy situation you might care to read the following feedback I sent to the Clutha River Waterflow Taskforce of ORC recently. Other than that, my feedback here is that I have no fundamental objection to this particular proposal other than I strongly feel QLDC needs to bring its energy efficiency requirements for residential buildings, especially major spec build developments like this, into the 21st century and do it quickly.

Kind regards ... Rik Deaton

[Redacted signature line]

[Redacted signature block]