



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO,
SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED PLAN CHANGE,
VARIATION OR PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT



Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name of submitter [full name]



FURTHER SUBMISSION // In support of (or opposition to) a submission on the following:

I AM [state whether you are]

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

[in this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category]

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or

[in this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category]

The local authority for the relevant area.



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

[Include: name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available]



THE PARTICULAR PARTS // Of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]

**THE REASONS** // For my support (or opposition) are:

[give reasons]

**I SEEK** // That the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):

[give precise details]

I wish / do not wish* to be heard in support of my further submission.I will / will not* consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.

* Select one.

 **SIGNATURE******Signature**

[or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter]

Date

** A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

**YOUR DETAILS** // Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email**

Electronic address for service of submitter [email]

Telephone [work]

[home]

[mobile]

Postal Address

[or alternative method of service
under section 352 of the Act]

Post code

Contact person [name and designation, if applicable]

**NOTE** // To person making further submission**A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- > it is frivolous or vexatious:
- > it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- > it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- > it contains offensive language:
- > it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.



The further submission of Ladies Mile Pet Lodge Limited is as follows:

- [1] This is a further submission from Ladies Mile Pet Lodge Limited ('Pet Lodge') in response to certain submissions made on the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation to the Proposed District Plan ('Variation').
- [2] Details of submissions and whether they are supported or opposed along with the reasons for opposition is contained in Schedule 1 below.
- [3] The Pet Lodge further submits that the land is not suitable for development, as the roading and related infrastructure will not support the scale and intensity of development proposed in the Variation and the area proposed is not suitable for the form and scale of development.
- [4] The Pet Lodge further submits that certain submissions are not ON the Variation and there is no jurisdiction to include land in the Variation and for it to be rezoned.
- [5] The Pet Lodge has significant concerns regarding the disconnect between the transport network in the Variation and Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency plans for State Highway 6.
- [6] The submitter wishes to be heard in support of its original and this further submission.
- [7] The submitter is a person having an interest greater than the public interest as they are a landowner directly affected by the Variation.

Dated 3 August 2023



.....
Graeme Todd / Charlotte Clouston

Schedule 1: Further Submission Points

Submission No.	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Relevant Part of Submission	Reasons for Support/Opposition	Decision Sought
OS36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Lydia Shirley, Beca)	Oppose	The submissions that support the general direction of, or retention of the provisions of, the proposed Variation as notified.	The Pet Lodge opposes the retention of the Variation as notified, on the basis that the land is not appropriate for development of this scale and intensity. The infrastructure is not yet in place to service the development that the Variation proposes, therefore the Variation should not be supported.	These submission points are disallowed.
OS51	Gary Erving	Oppose			
OS56.1	AA Southern Lakes (Heath Copland)	Oppose			
OS73	Glenpanel Development Ltd (Werner Murray, The Property Group)	Oppose			
OS80	Koko Ridge Limited and Wayne Foley (Kristy Rusher)	Oppose			
OS83	Otago Regional Council (Warren Hanley)	Oppose			
OS85	No. 1 Hansen Road Limited (Emma Ryder, John Edmonds and Associates)	Oppose			
OS86	Ministry of Education (Sara Hodgson, Beca Ltd)	Oppose			
OS93.51	Sanderson Group and Queenstown Commercial Limited (Erin Stagg, Edgar Planning)	Oppose			

OS94	Winter Miles Airstream Limited (Simon Berry, Berry Simons)	Oppose			
OS95.1	Charlie Evans	Oppose			
OS99.1	Corona Trust (Brett Giddens, Town Planning Group)	Oppose			
OS100	Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Papatipu Rūnanga (Rachael Pull)	Oppose			
OS101.1	David Finlin	Oppose			
OS102.1	Alexander Reid	Oppose			
OS103.1	Tim Allan (Kristy Rusher)	Oppose			
OS105.1	Maryhill Limited (Maree Baker- Galloway, Anderson Lloyd)	Oppose			
OS45	Caithness Developments Ltd (Blair Devlin, Vivian Espie)	Oppose	The submission accepting the proposed 25m Building Restriction Area on the submitter's site as a space for active trail and landscaping.	Inclusion of the Building Restriction Area will prevent sections of land from being able to be developed for the purposes for which it is proposed to be zoned. This restriction area will have adverse effects on the Pet Lodge in how they can use their land.	These submission points are disallowed.
OS50.3	Kim Netzler	Oppose	The submission seeking to increase the building restriction area to 50 metres along State Highway 6.		
OS104.1	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Rodney Albertyn)	Oppose	The submission that the proposal is supported in principle as the vision and principles set out in the Transport Strategy are consistent		

			with the outcomes sought by Waka Kotahi.	proposed roundabout and crossing facilities.	
OS107	Anna Hutchinson, Tim Hutchinson and John Tavendale, as trustees of the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (Werner Murray, The Property Group)	Oppose	The submission that the Urban Growth Boundary be amended to include the area to the west of the notified Variation boundary and that the provisions of the Variation be amended to include and rezone such land.	The Pet Lodge opposes the expansion of the area affected by the Variation and the Urban Growth Boundary, on the basis there is no jurisdiction for this land to be included in the Variation , that additional areas have not been through any form of statutory or public consultation to date and such areas were outside of the 'Area of Focus' put forward by QLDC to the Minister for approval to proceed the Streamlined Planning Process and for all such reasons are not ON the Variation .	These submission points are disallowed.
OS108.1	Milstead Trust (Gabriela Glory, Vivian Espie)	Oppose	The submission that the Urban Growth Boundary be extended further north and that the provisions of the Variation be amended to include and rezone such land.		