

Further Submission on Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation to Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan

Under Clause 8 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council / pdpsubmission@qldc.govt.nz

Further Submitter: Maryhill Limited

- 1 This is a further submission on Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation to the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan (**Variation**).
- 2 The Further Submitter is a person who has an interest in the Variation that is greater than the interest the general public has, as it has an interest in land affected by the content of a submission (clause 8(1) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA 1991), and made a submission on the Variation.
- 3 The Further Submitter supports or opposes submissions on the Variation as set out in the table below:

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support or opposition are:
Glenpanel Development Limited Submitter # 73	Entire Submission	Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular, the Further Submitter supports amendments to development triggers relative to infrastructure upgrades, minimum density obligations, and the over-prescriptive nature of the Variation (including as set out within submission points OS73.4-8, 11, 14, 29, and 42)
Waka Kotahi Submitter # 104	Entire Submission	OS104.1, 105.4, 10.5, 105.11, 105.13, 105.15, 105.17, 105.18, 105.20, 105.23, 105.36, 105.45,	The Further Submitter supports OS104.1 in principle supporting the vision and principles for the Variation and rezoning of Ladies Mile, and submission points relevant to achieving realistic densities of development, simplifying over-prescriptive rules and standards related to urban design, providing greater flexibility in mixed use, commercial, and seasonal worker accommodation (non residential) activities within the Master Plan.

2200976 | 8126422v1

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support or opposition are:
		105.48, 105.62, 105.63,- support Remainder of submission - Oppose	The Further Submitter otherwise opposes the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular, the Further Submitter opposes the relief sought by Waka Kotahi 'avoidance' provisions relating to completion of infrastructure prior development including within (OS104.3, 104.14)
Sanderson Group Submitter # 93	Entire Submission	Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission.
Winter Miles Airstream Limited Submitter # 94	Entire Submission	OS94.4, 94.5, 94.10, 94.11, 94.20, 94.23, 94.31, 94.42, 94.43, 94.44, 94.45, 94.48, 94.49, 94.58 - Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular the Further Submitter supports the relief sought by Winter Miles Airstream Limited for a change to minimum density, to provide a mix of housing typologies; and the enablement of residential flats.
Department of Conservation Submitter # 44	Parts of submission relating to bird habitat and off setting	Oppose	In particular the Further Submitter opposes the relief sought by the Department of Conservation to require bird habitat off setting and monitoring of bird populations in order for developments to proceed.
Caithness Developments Ltd Submitter #4 5	Entire Submission	Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular the Further Submitter supports the relief sought by Caithness Developments that removes the delivery of necessary infrastructure prior to development; supports the premise that developers pay a development contribution towards the work rather than be dependent on external agencies funding; and support the reconsideration of the activity status of residential flats.

The submission supported or opposed is:	The particular parts of the submissions supported or opposed are:	Support or Oppose	The reasons for support or opposition are:
Shotover Country Limited Submitter # 46	Entire Submission	Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular the Further Submitter supports the reconsideration so the activity status of residential flats from a non-complying activity.
Ladies Mile Property Syndicate Submitter # 77	Entire Submission	Support	The Further Submitter supports the submission to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in its own submission. In particular the Further Submitter supports the flexible Density within the High Density Residential precinct; the enablement of visitor accommodation in the Medium and High Density Residential precincts; and supports the clarification of rules relating to infrastructure and transport staging and the removal of the requirement for infrastructure to be developed by third party agencies to enable development.

- 4 The Further Submitter wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
- 5 The Further Submitter will consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar further submissions.
- 6 A copy of this further submission has been served on the original submitters to which this further submission relates.

Maree Baker-Galloway

Maryhill Limited
Signed by my duly authorised agents
Anderson Lloyd
Per: Maree Baker-Galloway
Maree.baker-galloway@al.nz
Address for service: maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz