

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Streams 18
Stage 3b Proposed
District Plan

**REPLY OF EMMA JANE TURNER
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

PLANNER: ARTHURS POINT NORTH REZONING – PROVISIONS AND MAPPING

7 September 2020

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / R Mortiaux
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. SPATIAL EXTENT OF ARTHUR’S POINT NORTH.....	1
3. ADDITIONAL CROSSING AT EDITH CAVELL BRIDGE	2
4. KOIA AND DAVID HAPPS FOR KOIA ARCHITECTS QUEENSTOWN LIMITED, KOIA INVESTMENTS QUEENSTOWN LIMITED AND RAKAU QUEENSTOWN LIMITED (31004) (KOIA) – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 100M2 COMMERCIAL GROUND FLOOR AREA	2
5. ROBERT STEWART (31038) - REZONING	5
6. GOLDSTREAM PROPERTIES LIMITED (31028).....	9
7. NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT 2020	9

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Emma Jane Turner. I prepared the section 42A report¹ (**s42A**) and statement of rebuttal² for Arthurs Point North Rezoning filed in Hearing Stream 18. My qualifications and experience are set out in my s42A.

1.2 I attended the hearing on 3 July 2020 and have been provided with reports of what has taken place at the hearing where relevant to my evidence.

1.3 This reply evidence covers the following issues:

- (a) Spatial Extent of Arthurs Point North;
- (b) Additional crossing at Edith Cavell Bridge;
- (c) Koia submission (**31004**) - HDR 100m2 commercial GFA;
- (d) Robert Stewart (**31038**) requested rezoning;
- (e) Goldstream Properties Limited (31028);
- (f) National Policy Statement on Urban Development as it relates to Arthur's Point North.

1.4 The following are attached to my reply evidence:

- (a) **Appendix A:** Recommended Revised provisions for Chapter 9;
- (b) **Appendix B:** Final recommendations on submissions.

2. SPATIAL EXTENT OF ARTHUR'S POINT NORTH

2.1 There was comment made throughout the hearing by the Panel and by Counsel for the submitter³ that Arthurs Point North does not have a defined spatial extent. To provide some clarification to the Panel, I referred to Arthurs Point North, in my s42A⁴, as the area notified in Stage 3b, as what was the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) Rural Visitor Zone (**RVZ**) area. It is a term used to discuss the scope of what was

1 Dated 18 March 2020.

2 Dated 12 June 2020.

3 Arthurs Point Land Trustees (31042).

4 Figure 5 of my s42a report.

notified and used in a general sense only, it is not meant to have any 'status' in the PDP. As I have not recommended any bespoke Rules for this area, I do not consider it necessary to identify Arthur's Point North on the planning maps.

3. ADDITIONAL CROSSING AT EDITH CAVELL BRIDGE

3.1 The Regional Transport Plan 2015-2021 identifies an additional crossing near the Edith Cavell as a priority 1 with the detailed business case to be completed in 2020. At the Hearing, the Panel queried whether this has been affected by Covid-19. To my knowledge, there has been no official update to the Plan. QLDC has undertaken community consultation on this project and, as far as I know the business case for the crossing is still on track to be completed in 2020.

4. KOIA AND DAVID HAPPS FOR KOIA ARCHITECTS QUEENSTOWN LIMITED, KOIA INVESTMENTS QUEENSTOWN LIMITED AND RAKAU QUEENSTOWN LIMITED (31004) (KOIA) – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 100M² COMMERCIAL GROUND FLOOR AREA

4.1 At the Hearing the Panel questioned the evidence supporting the permitted activity limit of 100m² Gross Floor Area (**GFA**) for commercial activities⁵. This is relevant as the submitter⁶ requests a larger GFA for commercial activities at Arthurs Point North. The 100m² limit was determined through Stage 1 of the PDP review and was not re-notified as part of Stage 3b. Only the zoning of the Arthurs Point North area was notified as part of Stage 3/3b.

4.2 As a result, I had not considered the appropriateness of the 100m² GFA limit specifically. I have reviewed the Stage 1 documentation and the Stage 1 Hearings Panel considered a notified rule which subsequently became Rule 9.4.1. However, the focus of the Stage 1 recommendations, as I understand it, was on other aspects of the rule rather than the permitted 100m² limit for commercial activities.

⁵ Rule 9.4.1.

⁶ Koia Architects Queenstown Ltd, Koia Investments Queenstown Ltd and Rakau Queenstown Ltd (31004).

- 4.3** In the PDP, the permitted activity limit of 100m² GFA applies across the High Density Residential Zone (**HDRZ**) in the District. This includes areas, such as near the Queenstown Town Centre, where there is quite a lot of existing commercial and visitor accommodation activities, similar to the situation in the Arthurs Point North area. Applying the 100m² GFA limit to the Arthurs Point North area would, in my view, provide consistency across the District.
- 4.4** The submitter⁷ has provided no economic assessment of whether a larger commercial GFA in Arthurs Point could have a negative economic impact on the Queenstown town centres.⁸ Without this evidence, I was unable in my s42A or rebuttal to recommend a larger permitted activity limit for commercial GFA at Arthur's Point North.
- 4.5** However, I have given further consideration to whether it may be appropriate to apply an area-specific exception, and allow for a 'stepped' approach to commercial GFA along Arthurs Point Road. To explain further, under the HDRZ rules, commercial activities with a GFA higher than 100m² trigger a non-complying consent under Rule 9.4.10. I have considered whether it is appropriate for there to be a restricted discretionary activity rule for commercial activities with a GFA between 101m² and 200m².
- 4.6** Strategic objective 3.2.3 seeks a quality built environment taking into account the character of individual communities and Policy 9.2.5.2 provides direction to ensure that any commercial development is compatible with the existing surrounding context of Arthurs Point North. I note that many of the existing commercial activities along Arthurs Point Road are approximately 200m² in area⁹. Larger commercial GFA fit with the existing activities and character at Arthurs Point North, and in my opinion, would give effect to Policy 9.2.5.2 and Objective 3.2.3.
- 4.7** In my opinion, providing for up to 200m² of commercial GFA through a restricted discretionary rule in the HDRZ would meet the policy direction for commercial activities in the HDRZ zone while also resulting in positive economic impacts for the Arthurs Point North area.

⁷ Koia Architects Queenstown Ltd, Koia Investments Queenstown Ltd and Rakau Queenstown Ltd (31004).

⁸ S.O 3.2.1.2, S.P 3.3.3.

⁹ From available existing building information (including building and resource consents).

Objective 9.2.5 seeks that commercial development is small scale and generates minimal amenity value impacts. Policies 9.2.5.1 and 9.2.5.2 require that commercial development is of low scale and intensity, does not undermine the local transport network and that the commercial development is compatible with the surrounding context. The matters of discretion I recommend provide a method to manage the potential negative economic effects on the Queenstown town centres while ensuring commercial activity is kept small scale and does not result in impacts on amenity value or on the transport network¹⁰.

4.8 While the Koia submission encompasses the whole Arthurs Point North area, the submission had a particular focus on some specific properties. To limit the potential negative economic effects on the Queenstown town centre and create positive social effects for the Arthurs Point North area, my view is that a larger GFA should not apply to the whole Arthurs Point North HDRZ. Instead, I consider it should be focused to where a larger GFA might be most appropriately integrated into the existing character and amenity of the Arthurs Point North area. I agree that the larger GFA limit should apply to the properties identified by Koia and consequently, recommend that the restricted discretionary rule apply to these properties.

4.9 My recommended drafting of a Restricted Discretionary rule is as follows (and also reflected in Appendix A):

Activities located in the High Density Residential Zone	Activity Status
<p>At 158, 164, 170 and 172 Arthurs Point Road, commercial activities comprising between 101m² and 200m² gross floor area.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Economic impact on the Queenstown town centre; b. Effects on residential amenity; c. Hours of operation; d. Traffic generation and access; e. Location, design, scale and appearance 	<p>RD</p>

¹⁰ Objective 9.2.5, Policy 9.2.5.1 and 9.2.5.2.

5. ROBERT STEWART (31038) - REZONING

Visitor Accommodation Sub Zone (VASZ) over the existing building

- 5.1 During the hearing the Panel asked questions of me in relation to the conflict between VASZ and the Building Restriction Area (**BRA**). To avoid confusion, I confirm that providing for Visitor Accommodation through a VASZ over the existing building (as shown on Figure 1 below) would be consistent with the objectives and policies of the MDRZ:



Figure 1: Recommended extent of VASZ over Robert Stewarts Property (Lot 1 DP 515200).

Hazards

- 5.2 Risk from natural hazards was a key issue discussed at the Hearing for this submission. My s42A recommended that re-zoning part of the site to MDRZ would not be appropriate because urban development is not appropriate when the risk levels have been assessed as moderate to high and potential mitigation is likely to be cost prohibitive.

5.3 At the Hearing, Mr Vivian (for the submitter) explained that he considered my approach to be risk averse. He recommended an MDRZ with a restricted discretionary rule for buildings, to allow consideration of natural hazards on a case-by-case basis. In my opinion, this is not sufficient to address the concerns raised by Mr Bond (for the Council) in his evidence in chief,¹¹ rebuttal¹² and reply, or to meet the requirements of the objectives and policies in Chapter 28 (Natural Hazards).

5.4 An important factor in my consideration of the management of the risk from natural hazards on this site is that a change from a rural zone to an urban zone indicates that the increased level of risk is appropriate / tolerable. With a Rural Zone, the risk is lower as there is a very low density of buildings, financial investment and less people affected by the hazard when an event occurs. If the zone were to change to an urban zone such as the MDRZ requested, the risk increases due to the increase in density and investment in buildings as well as an increased number of people on the site. Therefore, the risk increases with a change to an urban zone, even though the hazard remains the same.

5.5 Council's approach to assessing risk from landslide hazards in the case of a re-zoning request is to use the best practice guidance as set out in Australia Geomechanics Society (AGS) 2007. This is the approach applied by Mr Bond. It requires taking the following steps:

- (a) Qualitative assessment of risk, taking into account likelihood of events and the consequences of the event occurring to the type of development proposed (in this case MDRZ);
- (b) If level of risk is low, no further information is required, and risk from natural hazards is not a barrier to the re-zoning;
- (c) If risk is moderate or above, further investigations are required, which may be semi-quantitative or quantitative (such as an assessment of Average Individual Fatality Risk);

¹¹ Dated 18 March 2020.

¹² Dated 12 June 2020.

(d) The refined level of risk to considered against any available mitigation measure. Any re-zoning should ensure risk levels are low, or that risk levels can be mitigated so they are low.

5.6 If there is no evidence that risk is low, or that risk can be reduced to low, re-zoning should not proceed. In this case, a preliminary risk assessment has determined the level of risk to be moderate to high.

5.7 When considering the steps above, there should be further investigations undertaken to provide a greater understanding of risk. I note that Mr Bond has recommended this occur. Based on current information, it is not clear whether the risk is high or moderate. I also note that the submitter has not demonstrated that practical mitigation measures are available to lower the risk on the site to low. In the absence of evidence that the risk is low, I consider that re-zoning should not occur.

5.8 In my opinion, applying this approach is consistent with the precautionary approach required by Policy 28.3.1.9. On the information available, the risk could be significant, therefore, the precautionary approach is appropriate¹³.

5.9 In my opinion, Mr Vivian's summary of what the objectives and policies require¹⁴ misses a number of key aspects of Chapter 28 including that of community tolerance, an issue that was discussed with representatives from Otago Regional Council and the submitter's counsel at the Hearing.

5.10 Community tolerance of risk is a key aspect of the approach to managing risk from natural hazards in the PDP. The objectives of Chapter 28 seek that risk to people and the built environment posed by natural hazards is managed to a level tolerable to the community¹⁵, and that development on land subject to natural hazards only occurs where the risks to the community and the built environment are appropriately managed¹⁶.

13 Policy 28.3.1.9.

14 Paragraph 7 of Mr Carey Vivian's evidence summary.

15 Objective 28.3.1.

16 Objective 28.3.2.

- 5.11** Chapter 28 sets out matters to consider when assessing tolerance of risk¹⁷. Considering these, I consider the nature and scale of the re-zoning represents a significant up-zone where there is no existing land use on the portion of the site (limbs (a) and (b) of 28.3.1.2). Mr Bond has undertaken a preliminary risk assessment for the site and considered the potential adverse effects as well as the potential cost of mitigating the hazard (limb (c) and (f) 28.3.1.2)). Additionally, I consider that because there has been no experience of the risk (i.e. no previous events), the community has low to no awareness or experience of the hazard (limbs (d) and (e) 28.3.1.2)). These conclusions suggest that tolerance for the risk posed by this re-zoning would be low, and in my opinion, a level of moderate to high risk would be intolerable.
- 5.12** A suggestion was made by the submitter's counsel that the submitter's tolerance of the risk is most relevant. I refer to Council's Legal Reply that addresses the precedent that community tolerance is not landowner tolerance.
- 5.13** There were a number of questions from the Panel at the hearing related to the resource consents on the neighbouring property. I consider it is important to note that a change of zoning requires a different type of assessment than an individual resource consent application. Mr Bond's advice in his reply is that the level of assessment undertaken for the resource consents referred to were not of the standard that should be applied to a rezoning application.
- 5.14** I also note that it is the recently released consent order version of Chapter 28 that is relevant to the assessment of the re-zoning request, and this was not considered in either of the consents for the subdivision of the neighbouring property as these were assessed under the ODP. The second consent only considered the PDP Earthworks provisions and not Natural Hazards provisions (RM190926 and RM180844). In addition, these consents were assessed under a very permissive planning regime, being the operative Rural Visitor Zone, where the assumption is that development is appropriate. As noted in the Council's Legal Reply, the neighbouring consents are not an

¹⁷ Policy 28.3.1.2.

appropriate indication of community tolerance and the decision on the rezoning needs to be made by the hazard information presented to the panel.

6. Goldstream Properties Limited (31028)

6.1 The submitter provided a statement¹⁸ prior to the hearing which outlined a refined request to move the ONL to the 427m contour and rezoning the higher land from Rural Zone to HDRZ. At the hearing, the Panel suggested to Mr Devlin (for the submitter) that he should have a conversation with me in relation to this. Since Mr Devlin's appearance at the hearing I have discussed this issue and been to an additional site visit to assess the request of the submitter.

6.2 I understand that the type of development the submitter is anticipating on the steep, currently Rural Zone Outstanding Natural Landscape, part of the site is low impact prefabricated 'eco pods' of approximately 30m² GFA that are installed on piles for use as visitor accommodation, with some form of building to check in and possibly a café on the higher flat section¹⁹. This portion of the site has been identified as having high landscape sensitivity²⁰. My view is that the requested extension of the HDRZ provides for a level of development which would have more than minor impacts on the landscape values and will not achieve S.O 3.2.4 and S.O.3.2.5. I consider that in the absence of any landscape evidence to the contrary, in order to protect the landscape values the most appropriate location for the ONL boundary is that which was notified and the most appropriate zone for this section of the site is the notified Rural Zone.

7. NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT 2020

7.1 The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (**NPS-UD**) was gazetted on 23 July 2020 and replaces the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (**NPS-UDC**). It takes effect from 20 August 2020. Queenstown Lakes District Council is a "Tier 2" local authority under the NPS-UD.

18 Statement of Blair Jeffrey Devlin on behalf of Mandela Properties Ltd Goldstream Properties Submitter (#31028).

19 Which I have recommended HDRZ.

20 QLDC Rural Visitor Zone Review Landscape Assessment May 2019.

- 7.2** The Memorandum of Counsel²¹ provided to the Panel on 31 July 2020 set out a summary of the Council's position as relevant to Stage 3 and 3B, including the Arthurs Point North Rezoning. I agree with the position set out in that memorandum, in particular at paras 6.1 – 6.4(a) – (h).
- 7.3** Arthurs Point North is within the Queenstown urban environment as it is within the Urban Growth Boundary and has urban style development. As a result, the NPS-UD objectives and policies relevant to existing urban environments apply. I have considered these objectives and policies and confirm that my recommendations for the zoning at Arthurs Point North are consistent with the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD.
- 7.4** I consider that my recommendation of the mixed zoning approach - in particular rezoning the flat area of Arthurs Point North to HDRZ and other areas that are not Outstanding Natural Landscape to MDRZ - will assist in creating a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their wellbeing now and into the future²². Increasing density where I have recommended²³ will also support competitive land and development markets.²⁴
- 7.5** My view is that my recommended HDRZ and MDRZ mixed zoning approach as well as my recommendation in response to the submission by Koia to increase commercial GFA would enable more people to live in and have businesses located at Arthurs Point.²⁵ Additionally, HDRZ allows for urban development to develop over time and respond to the needs of the community²⁶ through allowing for levels of commercial and residential activities as permitted activities and many other activities as restricted discretionary activities in an area where infrastructure already exists and with planned improvements to the transport infrastructure.²⁷

21 Memorandum of Counsel Regarding National Policy Statement On Urban Capacity 2020, 31 July 2020.

22 NPS-UP Objective 1.

23 Figure 9 of my s42a.

24 NPS-UD Objective 2.

25 NPS-UD Objective 3.

26 NPS-UD Objective 4.

27 NPS-UD Objective 6.

7.6 My view is that submissions²⁸ seeking significantly more permissive rules or zoning for their property would, if granted, result in dispersed areas of density on steep slopes that are less accessible to active and public transport networks, which would result in negative impacts for the well-functioning urban environment.²⁹ Further, I consider that the submission of Robert Stewart³⁰ to rezone an area in a hazard zone conflicts with the part of Objective 1 which seeks for all people and communities to provide for their health and safety now and into the future.

7.7 As such, I consider my recommendations are consistent with the NPS-UD.



Emma Jane Turner

7 September 2020

28 Such as Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited.

29 NPS-UD Objective 1.

30 31038.

APPENDIX A
RECOMMENDED REVISED PROVISIONS FOR CHAPTER 9

Key:

Red underline and ~~strikethrough~~ text are recommended amendments made in my s42A report, 18/03/2020

Blue underline and ~~strikethrough~~ text are recommended amendments made in my Reply Evidence, 07/09/2020

9 High Density Residential

9.1 Zone Purpose

The High Density Residential Zone provides for efficient use of land within close proximity to town centres and Arthurs Point~~North~~ that is easily accessible by public transport, cycle and walk ways. In conjunction with the Medium Density Residential Zone, the zone plays a key planning role in minimising urban sprawl and consolidating growth in existing urban areas.

In Queenstown, the High Density Residential zone enables taller buildings than in the other residential zones, subject to high design quality. In Wanaka, lower building heights are anticipated, accounting for its distinctive urban character, however relatively high densities are still achievable. Such development will result in a greater diversity of housing supply, help support the function and vibrancy of town centres, and reduce reliance on private transport. Over time, low-rise apartments and terraced housing are envisaged to become commonplace within the zone.

Development in the zone will facilitate effective non-vehicular connections and access to high quality public open space.

Development controls provide minimum protections for existing amenity values, and are otherwise prioritised towards enabling the community's wellbeing by promoting growth and development. Given the focus on intensification, moderate to substantial change is anticipated including to both public and private views as the character of land within the zone develops into one that is characteristically urban.

Small scale commercial activities are enabled, either to support larger residential developments, or to provide low impact local services.

Small scale community facilities are anticipated, given the need for community activities within residential areas. However, large scale community facilities are not anticipated as this will reduce the effectiveness of the zone at its primary purpose of accommodating housing.

Visitor accommodation, residential visitor accommodation and homestays are anticipated and enabled in this zone, which is located near the town centres and within Arthurs Point ~~North~~, to respond to projected growth in visitor numbers, provided that adverse effects on the residential amenity values of nearby residents is avoided, remedied or mitigated.

9.2 Objectives and Policies

9.2.1 Objective – High density housing development occurs in urban areas close to town centres, to provide greater housing diversity and respond to expected population growth.

Policies

9.2.1.1 Provide sufficient high density zoned land that enables diverse housing supply and visitor accommodation close to town centres.

9.2.1.2 Promote high density development close to town centres to reduce private vehicle movements, maximise walking, cycling and public transport patronage and reduce the need for capital expenditure on infrastructure.

9.2.2 Objective - High density residential development provides a positive contribution to the environment through quality urban design.

Policies

9.2.2.1 Require that development within the zone responds to its context, with a particular emphasis on the following essential built form outcomes:

- a. achieving high levels of visual interest and avoiding blank or unarticulated walls or facades;
- b. achieving well-overlooked, activated streets and public open spaces, including by not visually or spatially dominating street edges with garaging, parking or access ways;
- c. achieving a variation and modulation in building mass, including roof forms;
- d. use landscaped areas to add to the visual amenity values of the development for on-site residents or visitors, neighbours, and the wider public.

9.2.2.2 Support greater building height where development is designed to achieve an exemplary standard of quality, including its environmental sustainability.

9.2.2.3 Promote a distinct streetscape for the [Arthurs Point North High Density Residential](#) neighbourhood that is based upon a shared and integrated public realm.

9.4 Rules - Activities

	Activities located in the High Density Residential Zone	Activity status
9.4.1	Commercial activities comprising no more than 100m ² of gross floor area	P
9.4.2	Home Occupation	P

	Activities located in the High Density Residential Zone	Activity status
9.4.3	Residential Unit comprising three (3) or less per site	P
9.4.4	Residential Visitor Accommodation and Homestays	P
9.4.5	<p>At 158, 164, 170 and 172 Arthurs Point Road, Commercial Activities comprising between 101m² and 200m² gross floor area.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Economic impact on the Queenstown town centre; g. Effects on residential amenity; h. Hours of operation; i. Traffic generation and access; j. Location, design, scale and appearance. 	RD

APPENDIX B

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS

No.	Last Name	First Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Point No.	Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.1	Oppose	That the residential density proposed for Arthurs Point (medium residential) be increased.	Accept
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.2	Support	That the objective to increase residential in the Queenstown Area be retained.	Accept
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.3	Oppose	That the area next to Arthurs Point Road should lean towards commercial development that supports the residential and visitor accommodation in the area.	Accept in part
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.4	Oppose	That the outstanding natural landscape lines be refined and adjusted following more detailed analysis.	Reject
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.5	Oppose	That more analysis and consideration be undertaken to arrive at a cohesive strategy for the development of Arthurs Point.	Accept in part
31004	Happs	David	Koia Architects Queenstown	Tony Koia, Koia Architects Queenstown LTD, Koia Investments Queenstown LTD	31004.6	Oppose	That the current Rural Visitor Zone at Arthurs Point be changed to a mixed-use zone with both commercial and visitor activities and higher density residential activities.	Accept in part
31009	Wallace	Chelsea	Public Health South	Southern District Health Board	31009.4	Support	That the re-zoning of the Rural Visitor Zone at Arthurs Point to medium density residential with a visitor accommodation subzone be retained as notified.	Accept in part
31009	Wallace	Chelsea	Public Health South	Southern District Health Board	31009.8	Support	That the zoning of Mount Dewar and the Shotover River as Rural Zone be retained as notified.	Accept
31009	Wallace	Chelsea	Public Health South	Southern District Health Board	31009.9	Oppose	That Plan Change 3b ensures that access to public and active transport supports the growth of Arthurs Point and a reduction in the use of cars.	Accept
31009	Wallace	Chelsea	Public Health South	Southern District Health Board	31009.10	Oppose	That appropriate three waters infrastructure is mandated for any new developments at Arthurs Point.	Accept
31017	Baumfield	Matt and Yuko			31017.1	Oppose	That the Building Restriction Area be entirely removed from Lot 7 DP 520106 (7 Powder Terrace).	Accept
31017	Baumfield	Matt and Yuko			31017.2	Oppose	That Lot 7 DP 520106 (7 Powder Terrace, Arthurs Point), being approximately 995 m2, be re-zoned High Density Residential rather than the notified zone of Medium Density Residential (Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone).	Reject
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.1	Support	That the Arthurs Point Medium Density Residential Zone and applicable provisions be retained as notified.	Accept in part
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.2	Support	That the Arthurs Point Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone and applicable provisions be retained as notified.	Accept in part
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.3	Support	That the provisions for Visitor Accommodation to be undertaken within the proposed Medium Density Residential Sub-Zone and the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone in Arthurs Point as a Restricted Discretionary Activity be retained as notified.	Accept
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.4	Support	That the Rural Outstanding Natural Landscape Zoning and applicable provisions in Arthurs Point be retained as notified.	Accept
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.5	Oppose	That the Arthurs Point Building Restriction Area be extended to align with the Right of Way easement areas on Lot 3 DP 376799 and Lot 1 DP 20925 (identified in Figure 2 of this submission) and provides for all built form in these areas to be treated as a non-complying activity.	Reject
31026	Dent	Sean	Southern Planning	Totally Tourism Limited	31026.6	Oppose	That any similar alternative, consequential and/or other relief as necessary to address the issues raised in this submission be provided.	Accept in part
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.1	Oppose	That the notified zoning and standards as they relate to Arthurs Point be rejected.	Accept in part
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.2	Oppose	That the Operative District Plan Rural Visitor Zone at Arthurs Point be retained.	Reject
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.3	Support	That the standard for glare (Rule 46.5.3) be retained as notified.	Reject
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.4	Support	That 46.5.4 (setback of buildings from waterbodies) be retained as notified.	Reject
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.5	Support	That Rule 46.5.5 (setback of buildings) be retained as notified.	Reject
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.6	Oppose	That zoning standards in Arthurs Point focus on enabling both residential and visitor accommodation of varying scale that supports the existing character, amenity and environment.	Reject
31028	Rivai	Natasha	The Property Group	Goldstream Properties Limited	31028.7	Oppose	That the Operative District Plan Rural Visitor Zone and standards be retained on the submitter's property at 146 Arthurs Point Road.	Reject
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.1	Support	That the Medium Density Residential Zone and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone on 155 Arthurs Point Road (Lot 3 DP 331294) be retained as notified.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.2	Support	That the zone purpose (8.1) for the Medium Density Residential Zone that deals with increased densities for residential development be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.3	Support	That Objective 8.2.1 and associated policies that support the residential density provisions within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.4	Support	That Objective 8.2.2 and associated policies that support the residential density provisions within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.5	Support	That Objective 8.2.3 and associated policies that support the residential density provisions within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.6	Support	That Rule 8.4.6.2 that provides for three or more residential units as a permitted activity within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.7	Support	That the seventh paragraph of the zone Purpose (8.1) of the Medium Density Residential Zone about visitor accommodation be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.8	Support	That Objective 8.2.11 and relevant supporting policies that seek to enable visitor accommodation in the Medium Density Residential Area be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.9	Support	That Rule 8.4.11 that provides for visitor accommodation as a restricted discretionary activity within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone be retained.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.10	Support	That Rule 8.6.1.2 that provides for visitor accommodation within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone to be processed without limited or public notification and no written approval of affected persons be retained as notified.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.11	Support	That the permitted height of 8 m for the Medium Density Residential Zone in Rule 8.5.1.2 be retained for Arthurs Point.	Accept
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.12	Oppose	That a restricted discretionary activity resource consent be required to build between 8 m and 12 m on 155 Arthurs Point Road, with matters of discretion for buildings being building design, appearance, sunlight access, and amenity/privacy effects.	Reject
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.13	Oppose	That buildings which exceed 12 m in the Medium Density Residential Zone at 155 Arthurs Point Road require a non-complying resource consent.	Reject
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.14	Oppose	That a 20 m setback from the northern boundary of 155 Arthurs Point Road be imposed for buildings the exceed 8 m in height.	Reject

31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.15	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.5 is amended as it relates to 155 Arthurs Point Road as follows: The maximum site density shall be one residential unit per 250 m2 net site area, "or one residential unit per site for any site less than 250 m2 net site area".	Reject
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.16	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.8 be amended so that the minimum road setback requirement is 1.5 m for the Medium Density Residential Zone at Arthurs Point.	Reject
31031	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	Arthurs Point Woods Limited Partnership	31031.17	Oppose	That such further or consequential or alternative amendments are made that are necessary to give effect to the submission.	Accept in part
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.1	Support	That the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone on the submitter's land at 157 Arthurs Point Road (Lot 2 DP 331294) be retained as notified.	Accept in part
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.2	Support	That the zone purpose (8.1) for the Medium Density Residential Zone that deals with increased densities for residential development be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.3	Support	That Objective 8.2.1 and its associated policies which support residential density within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.4	Support	That Objective 8.2.2 and its associated policies which support residential density within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.5	Support	That Objective 8.2.3 and its associated policies which support residential density within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.6	Support	That Rule 8.4.6.2 that provides for three or more residential units as a permitted activity within the Medium Density Residential Zone be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.7	Support	That the seventh paragraph of the Medium Density Residential Zone Purpose (8.1) be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.8	Support	That Objective 8.2.11 and its associated policies be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.9	Support	That Rule 8.4.11 be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.10	Support	That Rule 8.6.1.2 be retained.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.11	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.1.2 be amended to provide for a permitted building height of 8 m for the Medium Density Residential Zone at Arthurs Point.	Accept
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.12	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.1.2 be amended to provide for buildings between 8 m and 12 m in height as a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion relating to building design, appearance, sunlight access, amenity/privacy effects.	Reject
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.13	Oppose	That Rule 8.5.1.2 be amended to specify buildings greater than 12 m in height as non-complying activities.	Reject
31032	Freeman	Scott	Southern Planning Group	QRC Shotover Limited	31032.14	Oppose	That such further or consequential or alternative amendments necessary to give effect to the submission be provided.	Accept in part
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.1	Oppose	That the Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) boundary be amended so that the entirety of Lot 1 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road is excluded from the ONL classification (i.e. the deletion of the ONL boundary as amended by Stage 3 of the PDP and the re-instatement of the	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.2	Oppose	That the Arthurs Point Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) be amended so that the entirety of Lot 1 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road is included within the UGB (i.e. the deletion of the UGB as amended by Stage 3 of the PDP and the re-instatement of the UGB as per the Stage 1 Decisions	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.3	Oppose	That the Building Restriction Area over part of Lot 1 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road be rejected.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.4	Oppose	That the Rural zoning proposed over part of Lot 1 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road be deleted.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.5	Oppose	That the default activity status for subdivision in the Arthurs Point Medium Density Residential Zone Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone be a controlled activity.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.6	Oppose	That the construction of all buildings in the Arthurs Point Medium Density Residential Zone Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone be made a controlled activity.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.7	Oppose	That all Visitor Accommodation and Residential Visitor Accommodation activities be made a controlled activity in the Arthurs Point Medium Density Residential Zone Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.8	Oppose	That if submission point 31038.10 is not accepted, Lots 1 and 2 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road be rezoned to the Operative District Plan Rural Visitor Zone, or in the alternative rezoned to the Proposed District Plan Rural Visitor Zone subject to amendments to the Rural Visitor Zone to	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.9	Oppose	That alternative, consequential, or necessary additional changes be made to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Reject
31038	Robb	Vanessa	Anderson Lloyd	Robert Stewart	31038.10	Oppose	That Lots 1 and 2 DP 515200 at 201 Arthurs Point Road be rezoned Medium density Residential Zone with a Visitor Accommodation subzone, subject to the amendments to the MDRZ as set out in submission points 31038.5, 31038.6 and 31038.7.	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.1	Oppose	That 161 Arthurs Point Road, that contains the Swiss-Belresort Coronet Peak and 10-pin bowling alley, contained within Lot 1 DP 376236 and Lot 2 DP 3762362 with a land area of approximately 1.5ha, be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone with that land referenced as the Arthurs Point	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.2	Oppose	That the balance of the Arthurs Point neighbourhood notified as Medium Density Residential be zoned High Density Residential, with reference to that land as the Arthurs Point Terrace precinct or neighbourhood.	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.3	Oppose	That any additional or consequential relief to the Proposed Plan, including but not limited to the maps, issues, objectives, policies, rules, matters of control or discretion, assessment criteria and explanations that will fully give effect to the matters raised in this submission be made.	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.4	Oppose	That 46.1 be amended as follows: (...) Visitor accommodation, residential visitor accommodation and homestays are anticipated and enabled in this zone, which is located near the town centres and within Arthurs Point Terrace, to respond to projected growth in visitor numbers, provided that	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.5	Oppose	That a new objective be added to 9.2 as follows; 9.2.X Objective - Arthurs Point Terrace: Enhance and develop the amenity, character and unique streetscape qualities of the Arthurs Point Terrace neighbourhood.	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.6	Oppose	That a new policy be added to 9.2 as follows; 9.2.X.X To provide a range of residential and visitor accommodation options within the neighbourhood that positively contribute to the amenity and character of the area.	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.7	Oppose	That a new policy be added to 9.2 as follows; 9.2.X.X To promote a distinct streetscape for the neighbourhood that is based upon a shared and integrated public realm.	Accept in part
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.8	Oppose	That a new policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X To develop a high density residential neighbourhood that is characterised by 4-5 level buildings, and where the effects of additional building height is offset by topography.	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.9	Oppose	That a new policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X Encourage buildings to be located to address the street, with car parking generally located behind or between buildings	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.10	Oppose	That a new policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.9.5 Ensure that the design of buildings contribute positively to the visual quality of the environment through the use of connection to the street, interesting built forms, landscaping, and response to site context.	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.11	Oppose	That a new rule be added to 9.4.6 as follows: 9.4.6X Visitor Accommodation including licensed premises within a visitor accommodation development in Arthurs Point Terrace Activity Status: Controlled Control is restricted to: a. The location, nature and scale of activities; b. Parking and	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.12	Oppose	That a new rule be added to 9.5.3.4 as follows: 9.5.3.4a Except sites within the Arthurs Point Terrace where a maximum building height of 12m applies.	Reject
31040	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates	Coronet Peak Properties Limited	31040.13	Oppose	That the following be added to 29.8.41.1: (...) f. When calculating the overall parking requirements for a development, the separation of area into different activities (for the purposes of b. above) will be required where the gross floor area of an activity (or public floor space or other such	Reject
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.1	Support	That the removal of the Rural Visitor Zone from Arthurs Point be retained as notified.	Accept

31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.2	Oppose	That the location of the [Arthurs Point] Medium Density Residential Zone is amended so that it is not within, or directly adjoining Outstanding Natural Features or Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Reject
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.3	Oppose	That appropriate controls are included to ensure development within the Medium Density Residential Zone (or any other subsequent zone adopted) will not have adverse effects on Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Accept
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.4	Oppose	That the Proposed Building Restriction areas are extended.	Reject
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.5	Oppose	That all properties within Outstanding Natural Landscapes and containing Outstanding Natural Features are zoned Rural.	Accept
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.6	Oppose	That the locations of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Urban Growth Boundaries on the planning maps be amended to protect the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features of Arthurs Point.	Reject
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.7	Oppose	That any other additional or consequential relief is made to fully give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Accept in part
31041	Semple (The Secretary)	J	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	Arthurs Point Outstanding Natural Landscape Society Inc	31041.8	Oppose	That rules be included which make buildings and all other activities within Building Restriction Areas a prohibited activity.	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.1	Oppose	That the Building Restriction Area be removed from Lot 1-3 DP 300462, Lot 2 DP 24233 and Lot 1 DP 384462 (182 Arthurs Point Road) and replace it with a BRA that accurately represents the terrace edge at the western end of the mid-terrace only.	Accept
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.2	Oppose	That the upper and mid-terraces at 182 Arthurs Point Road, located between Arthurs Point Road and Shotover River, contained within Lot 1-3 DP 300462, Lot 2 DP 24233 that have a total area of 14.17ha, be rezoned to High Density Residential Zone with that land referred to as the Arthurs Point	Accept in part
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.3	Oppose	That the balance of the land currently proposed as Medium Density Residential in the Arthurs Point community be zoned High Density Residential and refer to that land as the Arthurs Point Terrace precinct or neighbourhood.	Accept in part
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.4	Oppose	That 46.1 be amended as follows: (...) Visitor accommodation, residential visitor accommodation and homestays are anticipated and enabled in this zone, which is located near the town centres and within Arthurs Point Terrace, to respond to projected growth in visitor numbers, provided that	Accept in part
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.5	Oppose	That a new objective be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X Objective - Arthurs Point Terrace Enhance and develop the amenity, character and unique streetscape qualities of the Arthurs Point Terrace neighbourhood.	Accept in part
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.6	Oppose	That a new Arthurs Point Terrace policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X To provide a range of residential and visitor accommodation options within the neighbourhood that positively contribute to the amenity and character of the area.	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.7	Oppose	That a new Arthurs Point Terrace policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X To promote a distinct streetscape for the neighbourhood that is based upon a shared and integrated public realm.	Accept in part
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.8	Oppose	That a new Arthurs Point Terrace policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X To develop a high density residential neighbourhood that is characterised by 4-5 level buildings, and where the effects of additional building height is offset by topography.	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.9	Oppose	That a new Arthurs Point Terrace policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.X.X Encourage buildings to be located to address the street, with car parking generally located behind or between buildings	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.10	Oppose	That a new Arthurs Point Terrace policy be added to 9.2 as follows: 9.2.9.5 Ensure that the design of buildings contribute positively to the visual quality of the environment through the use of connection to the street, interesting built forms, landscaping, and response to site context.	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.11	Oppose	That a new rule be added to 9.4.6 as follows: 9.4.6X Visitor Accommodation including licensed premises within a visitor accommodation development in Arthurs Point Terrace Activity Status: Controlled Control is restricted to: a. The location, nature and scale of activities; b. Parking and	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.12	Oppose	That a new rule be added to 9.5.3.4 as follows: 9.5.3.4a Except sites within the Arthurs Point Terrace where a maximum building height of 12m applies.	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.13	Oppose	That the following be added to 29.8.41.1: (...) f. When calculating the overall parking requirements for a development, the separation of area into different activities (for the purposes of b. above) will be required where the gross floor area of an activity (or public floor space or other such	Reject
31042	Edmonds	John	John Edmonds and Associates Limited	Arthurs Point Land Trustee Limited	31042.14	Oppose	That any additional or consequential relief to the Proposed Plan, including but not limited to the maps, issues, objectives, policies, rules, matters of control or discretion, assessment criteria and explanations that will fully give effect to the matters raised in this submission be made.	Accept in part
31044	Roth-Biester	Nicola			31044.1	Oppose	That further consideration be given in regard to the inclusion of Arthurs Point within the urban area of Queenstown.	Reject