

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding
Chapter 24 and Wakatipu Basin Planning Maps

Report 18.1

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Rachel Dimery

Trevor Robinson

Quentin Smith

Table of Contents

1. PRELIMINARY.....	1
1.1 TERMINOLOGY IN THE REPORT	1
1.2 BACKGROUND	2
1.3 APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS	3
1.4 HEARING ARRANGEMENTS	3
1.5 PROCEDURAL STEPS	15
1.6 RESIDUAL HEARING ISSUES.....	18
1.7 DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY COMMISSIONERS	19
2. GENERAL ISSUES	19
2.1 GENERAL APPROACH TO STREAM 14 SUBMISSIONS AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS.....	19
2.2 SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN PROVISIONS.....	31
2.3 BACKGROUND TO CHAPTER 24.....	32
2.4 GENERAL CHALLENGES TO CHAPTER 24	35
2.5 AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 3 AND 6	44
2.6 SCOPE ISSUES	55
2.7 PROTECT AND/OR MAINTAIN AND/OR ENHANCE?	56
2.8 LAKE HAYES WATER QUALITY ISSUES.....	60
2.9 TRANSPORT NETWORK CAPACITY	65
2.10 QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT REVERSE SENSITIVITY ISSUES	69
3. TEXT OF CHAPTER 24.....	70
3.1 GENERAL APPROACH TO DISCUSSION OF SUBMISSIONS	70
3.2 PART 24.1: PURPOSE	73
3.3 PART 24: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OBJECTIVES	78
3.4 GENERAL APPROACH TO SUBMISSIONS ON OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES.....	79
3.5 OBJECTIVES.....	79
3.6 PART 24.2.1: POLICIES.....	91
3.7 PART 24.2.2: POLICIES.....	107
3.8 PART 24.2.3: POLICIES.....	114
3.9 PART 24.2.4: POLICIES.....	115
3.10 PART 24.2.5: POLICIES	124
3.11 PART 24.3.1: DISTRICT WIDE PROVISIONS	132
3.12 PART 24.3.2.: ADVICE NOTES	133
3.13 PART 24.3.3: GENERAL RULES	136
3.14 PART 24.4 – TABLE 24.1: ACTIVITIES IN THE WAKATIPU BASIN RURAL AMENITY ZONE.	137
3.15 PART 24.4 – TABLE 24.2: ACTIVITIES IN THE WAKATIPU BASIN LIFESTYLE PRECINCT	153
3.16 PART 24.5 – TABLE 24.3 - STANDARDS	160
3.17 PART 24.6 – NON-NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATIONS	180

3.18	PART 24.7 – ASSESSMENT MATTERS.....	181
3.19	SCHEDULE 24.8 – LANDSCAPE AND CHARACTER UNITS	193
4.	<u>CONSEQUENTIAL VARIATIONS</u>	<u>214</u>
4.1	VARIATION TO RURAL RESIDENTIAL AND RURAL LIFESTYLE CHAPTER 22	214
4.2	VARIATION TO DEFINITION OF SITE – CHAPTER 2	215
4.3	VARIATION TO SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT CHAPTER 27	217
4.4	VARIATION TO NOISE CHAPTER 36.....	228
5.	<u>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>230</u>

Appendix 1: Chapter 24 as Recommended

Appendix 2: Variations to Chapters 2, 22, 27 and 36 as Recommended

Appendix 3: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions Lodged on Chapter 24 and Associated Variations to Stage 1 Chapters

Appendix 4: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions Transferred from Stage 1 to Chapter 24

Appendix 5: Recommendations to Stream 15 Hearing Panel on Submissions and Further Submissions on Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 6

1. PRELIMINARY

1.1 Terminology in the Report

1. In this and accompanying Reports 18.2-18.11 inclusive, we use the following abbreviations:

Act	The Resource Management Act 1991 as at 23 November 2017 unless otherwise stated
Clause 16(2)	Clause 16(2) of the First Schedule to the Act
Council	Queenstown Lakes District Council unless otherwise stated
Decisions Version	The Proposed District Plan as modified by Council Decisions notified on 5 May 2018
LCU	Landscape Character Unit
NPSET	National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008
NPSFM	National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 (as amended in 2017)
NPSUDC	National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016
NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency
ONF	Outstanding Natural Feature
ONL	Outstanding Natural Landscape
Partially Operative RPS 1998	Those parts of the Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 that have not been revoked as a result of the approval of the Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019
Partially Operative RPS 2019	The Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement made operative on 14 January 2019
Precinct	Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct
Proposed District Plan (Stage 1)	The Proposed District Plan as modified by Council Decisions notified on 5 May 2018
Proposed District Plan (Stage 2)	The Proposed District Plan provisions (including maps and variations to previously notified provisions) notified on 23 November 2017

Proposed District Plan (or PDP)	The combination of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) and the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2).
Proposed RPS	The Proposed Regional Policy Statement for the Otago Region as at the date of this Report
QAC	Queenstown Airport Corporation
Rural Amenity Zone	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
Stage 1	The Proposed District Plan as modified by Council Decisions notified on 5 May 2018
Stage 2	The Proposed District Plan provisions (including maps and variations to previously notified provisions) notified on 23 November 2017
WB Landscape Study	The Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study dated March 2017 authored by Barry Kaye, Kerrin Norgrove and Bridget Gilbert

1.2 Background

2. This is the first of a series of reports regarding the matters considered by the independent commissioners appointed by Queenstown Lakes District Council to hear the submissions and further submissions on that part of the Council's Proposed District Plan related to the Wakatipu Basin. More precisely, the submissions and further submissions heard comprise:
- a. Submissions and further submissions specific to the text and planning maps relating to the Wakatipu Basin (including Arrowtown and the Crown Terrace) deferred from the relevant Stage 1 hearing streams;
 - b. Submissions and further submissions on the text of Chapter 24 of the Proposed District Plan, publicly notified on 23 November 2017;
 - c. Submissions and further submissions on variations publicly notified on 23 November 2017 regarding:
 - i. The definition of 'site' in Chapter 2 of the Proposed District Plan;
 - ii. Chapter 22 of the Proposed District Plan - to delete provisions relevant to the Wakatipu Basin;
 - iii. Chapter 27 of the Proposed District Plan - to both delete provisions of that Chapter related to the Wakatipu Basin and to insert new provisions;
 - iv. Chapter 36 of the Proposed District Plan - to insert provisions relevant to the Wakatipu Basin.
 - d. Submissions and further submissions on planning maps publicly notified on 23 November 2017¹;
 - e. Submissions and further submissions related to Table 24.2 of the Proposed District Plan which was the subject of a variation publicly notified on 9 August 2018²;
 - f. Further submissions lodged in relation to the submission of Millbrook Country Club Ltd that was inadvertently omitted from the summary of submissions originally notified, and which was notified on 26 July 2018.

¹ Other than in respect of matters considered as part of the Stream 15 hearing

² The circumstances giving rise to that variation are discussed further at section 1.6

3. The submissions and further submissions described in a-f above were collectively labelled 'Stream 14'. A separate hearing stream (Stream 15) is devoted to consideration of submissions and further submissions on the balance of Proposed District Plan provisions notified on 23 November 2017.

1.3 Appointment of Commissioners

4. By Council resolutions dated 23 March and 3 May 2018³:
 - a. Denis Nugent was appointed Chair of the Hearing Panels for Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan with delegated authority to hear and determine procedural and jurisdictional matters relating to the Proposed District Plan;
 - b. A Panel of Commissioners was appointed for Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan from which Rachel Dimery and Trevor Robinson were drawn to sit on the Stream 14 Hearing Panel;
 - c. All Councillors on the Council who had completed the Ministry for the Environment "*Making Good Decisions*" course were appointed as a pool of commissioners for Stage 2 of the PDP, from which Quentin Smith was drawn to sit on the Stream 14 Hearing Panel.
5. Messrs Nugent and Robinson had previously been appointed Chair and Commissioner respectively for the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) by Council resolutions dated 29 October and 26 November 2015.

1.4 Hearing Arrangements

6. Stream 14 occupied eleven days of hearing commencing 9 July 2018 at Queenstown. We sat 9-12 July (inclusive), 17-18, 23-26 July (inclusive) and 24 October 2018.
7. Parties we heard from were:

Council

- Sarah Scott and Heidi Baillie⁴ (Counsel)
- Craig Barr
- David Smith
- Anita Vanstone
- Helen Mellsop
- Andrea Jarvis
- Vaughn Crowther
- Marcus Langman
- Glenn Davis
- Luke Place
- Bridget Gilbert

Middleton Farm Trust⁵

- Jayne Macdonald (Counsel)
- Ben Espie

³ Pursuant to sections 34A(1) and (2) of the Act

⁴ Appeared for Council on 24 October 2018 only

⁵ Submission 2332

- Neil McDonald
- Mike Copeland
- Jason Bartlett
- Nick Geddes

Queenstown Lakes Community Trust⁶

- Julie Scott
- Tim Williams

Tony McQuilkin⁷

- Ben Espie

Bloomfield Family⁸

- Evan Bloomfield

Millbrook Country Club⁹

- Ian Gordon (Counsel)
- Ben O'Malley
- Andrew Craig
- Joanna Fyfe

Ladies Mile Consortium (GW Stalker Family Trust, Mark Tylden, Sam Strain)¹⁰; Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust¹¹; Felzar Properties Limited¹²)

- Rosie Hill (Counsel)
- Nick Geddes

Spruce Grove Trust¹³

- Rebecca Holden
- Robin Miller

Dave Boyd¹⁴

- Daniel Thorne

Robert and Marie Wales¹⁵

- Marie Wales

⁶ Submission 2299
⁷ Submission 459
⁸ Submission 2423
⁹ Submissions 2295 and 2605; Further Submission 2773
¹⁰ Submissions 535 and 2489;
¹¹ Submission 532
¹² Submission 229
¹³ Submission 560
¹⁴ Submission 838
¹⁵ Submission 2270

Michaela Meehan¹⁶

- Warwick Goldsmith (Counsel)
- Paddy Baxter

Arcadian Triangle Limited¹⁷

- Warwick Goldsmith (Counsel)

Oasis in the Basin¹⁸

- Warwick Goldsmith (Counsel)

Dalefield Trustees Limited¹⁹

- Nicola Sedgley

Spruce Grove Trust²⁰ and Boundary Trust²¹

- Josh Leckie (Counsel)
- Nicola Smetham
- John McCartney
- Amanda Leith

Burgess Duke Trust²² and Ashford Trust²³

- Josh Leckie (Counsel)
- Stephen Skelton
- Ben Farrell

Philip Smith²⁴

- Rosie Hill (Counsel)
- Ben Farrell

Debbie MacColl²⁵ and Roger Monk²⁶

- Debbie MacColl
- Roger Monk
- Ben Espie
-

Morven Residents Society Incorporated²⁷

- Debbie MacColl

¹⁶ Submission 526
¹⁷ Submission 497
¹⁸ Further Submission 1289
¹⁹ Submission 2097
²⁰ Submissions 2512 and 2513
²¹ Submission 2444
²² Submissions 669 and 2591
²³ Submission 2535
²⁴ Submission 2500
²⁵ Submission 2350
²⁶ Submission 2281
²⁷ Submission 2490

- Ben Espie

D Hamilton and L Hayden²⁸

- Tony Milne
- Amanda Leith

J B French, CR French and ME Burt²⁹

- John French

Susan Todd³⁰ and Alan Hamilton³¹

- Susan Todd

Geoffrey Clear³²

WK and FL Allen³³

- Bridget Allen
- King Allen

Katie Dunlop and SA Green³⁴

- Sandy Dunlop

Skipp Williamson³⁵; Wakatipu Investments Limited³⁶; D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited³⁷; Richard and Jane Bamford³⁸; Martin McDonald and Sonya Anderson³⁹

- Carey Vivian

Boxer Hill Trust⁴⁰ and Trojan Helmet Limited⁴¹

- Rebecca Wolt (Counsel)
- Emma Hill
- Richard Tyler
- Stephen Peakall
- Anna Marie Chin
- Yvonne Pflüger
- Anthony Penny
- Fraser Colegrave

²⁸ Submission 2422

²⁹ Submission 2417

³⁰ Submission 2439

³¹ Submission 2260

³² Submission 2264

³³ Submission 2482

³⁴ Submission 2609

³⁵ Submission 2272

³⁶ Submission 2275

³⁷ Submission 2276

³⁸ Submission 492

³⁹ Submissions 451 and 454

⁴⁰ Submissions 2385 and 2386

⁴¹ Submissions 437 and 2387; Further Submission 1157

- Jeff Brown

Andrew and Ursula Davis⁴²

- Andrew Davis

P Blakely and M Wallace⁴³

- Phillip Blakely

David Shepherd⁴⁴

Waterfall Park Developments Limited⁴⁵

- Warwick Goldsmith (Counsel)
- Gary Dent
- Jayne Richards
- Dr Ruth Goldsmith
- Andy Carr
- Paddy Baxter
- Stephen Skelton
- Jeff Brown

Spark New Zealand Trading Limited⁴⁶; Vodafone New Zealand Limited⁴⁷; Chorus New Zealand Limited⁴⁸

- Matthew McCallum-Clark

New Zealand Transport Agency⁴⁹

- Nicky McIndoe (Counsel)
- Matthew Gattenby
- Anthony MacColl
- Tony Sizemore

Jon Waterston⁵⁰

- Paddy Baxter
- Alyson Hutton

⁴² Submission 2028

⁴³ Submission 2499

⁴⁴ Submission 2135

⁴⁵ As successor to Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited (Submission 430) and Submission 2388

⁴⁶ Submission 2195

⁴⁷ Submission 2478

⁴⁸ Submission 2194

⁴⁹ Submission 2538

⁵⁰ Submission 2308

Darby Planning LP⁵¹; Lake Hayes Limited⁵²; Lake Hayes Cellar Limited⁵³;Glencoe Station Limited⁵⁴; Crown Investment Trust⁵⁵

- Maree Baker-Galloway (Counsel)
- Chris Ferguson
- Ben Espie (Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd only)

Queenstown Airport Corporation⁵⁶

- John Kyle
- Rachel Tregida

Keri and Roland Lemaire-Sicre⁵⁷

- Keri Lemaire-Sicre

A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited⁵⁸

- Adam Feeley
- John Kyle

BSTGT Limited⁵⁹

- Rebecca Wolt

Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited⁶⁰

- Warwick Goldsmith (Counsel)
- Paul Faulkner
- Gary Dent
- Hayden Knight
- Stephen Skelton
- John Duthie

Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc⁶¹

- Mike Hanif
- Dr Marc Schallenberg

Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn and LA Green⁶²; Morven Ferry Limited⁶³

- Maree Baker-Galloway and Vanessa Robb (Counsel)
- Debbie MacColl

51 Submission 2376
52 Submission 2377
53 Submission 2378
54 Submission 2379
55 Submission 2307
56 Submission 433; Further Submission 1340
57 Further Submission 1068
58 Submission 2397
59 Submission 2487; Further Submission 2719
60 Submission 655
61 Submission 2140
62 Submission 2509
63 Submission 2449

- Susan Cleaver
- Carol Bunn
- James Hadley
- Jason Bartlett
- Ben Espie
- Scott Freeman

Upper Clutha Environmental Society Incorporated⁶⁴

- Julian Haworth

McGuinness Pa Limited⁶⁵

- Mark McGuinness

Wendy McGuinness⁶⁶

- Hamish Wilton

Bendemeer Residents Group⁶⁷

- Ben Farrell

Lake Hayes Investments Limited⁶⁸; Crosby Developments⁶⁹; L McFadgen⁷⁰; Slopehill Joint Venture⁷¹

- Rosie Hill (Counsel)
- Jeff Brown
- Ben Espie (Lake Hayes Investments Ltd only)

Stoneridge Estate Limited⁷²; R Dayman⁷³; D Duncan⁷⁴;

- Ben Espie
- Jeff Brown

M McGuinness⁷⁵; DJ Robertson⁷⁶; G Wills and T Burdon⁷⁷; P Chittock⁷⁸;

- Jeff Brown

64 Submission 2016
 65 Submission 2447
 66 Submission 2603
 67 Further Submissions 1369 and 2794
 68 Submission 2291
 69 Submissions 2526 and 2527
 70 Submission 2296
 71 Submission 2475
 72 Submission 2314
 73 Submission 2315
 74 Submission 2319
 75 Submission 2292
 76 Submission 2321
 77 Submission 2320
 78 Further Submission 2787

A J Robins, AJ Robins and HJM Callaghan⁷⁹; TJ and MA Harrison⁸⁰; Tui Trustees (2015) Ltd⁸¹; Mandeville Trust and S Leck⁸²; C Batchelor⁸³; Waterfall Park Developments Limited⁸⁴; JC Martin, CJ Doherty and KW Fergus⁸⁵

- Ben Espie

Hogans Gully Farm Limited⁸⁶

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)
- Simon Beale
- Ryan Brandeburg
- Adam Vail
- Jason Bartlett
- Paddy Baxter
- Jeff Brown

X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust⁸⁷

- Jayne Macdonald (Counsel)
- Phillip Blakely
- Jayne Richards
- Emma Hutchinson
- Louise Taylor

Tucker Beach Residents Society Incorporated⁸⁸ and James Muspratt⁸⁹

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)

Underdown Trust⁹⁰ and PH Archibald⁹¹

- Vanessa Robb (Counsel)
- Carey Vivian

Robert Stewart⁹²

- Vanessa Robb (Counsel)

Michael and Maureen Henry⁹³

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)

⁷⁹ Submission 2104

⁸⁰ Submission 2163

⁸¹ Submission 2316

⁸² Submission 2317

⁸³ Submission 2318

⁸⁴ Submission 2389

⁸⁵ Submission 2517

⁸⁶ Submission 2313; Further Submission 2786

⁸⁷ Submission 2619

⁸⁸ This entity appeared as the successor to Further Submission 2802.

⁸⁹ Further Submission 2714

⁹⁰ As successor to submission 2580

⁹¹ Submission 2501

⁹² Further Submission 1297

⁹³ Submission 2426

Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited & Others⁹⁴

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)
- Stephen Skelton
- Nick Geddes

R and M Donaldson⁹⁵

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)
- Jeff Brown

Wakatipu Equities Limited⁹⁶

- Maree Baker-Galloway (Counsel)
- Stephen Skelton
- Ben Farrell

Slopehill Properties Limited⁹⁷

- Stephen Skelton
- Ben Farrell

SYZ Investments Limited⁹⁸

- Ben Farrell

Simon Botherway⁹⁹

United Estates Ranch Limited¹⁰⁰

- Vicki Jones
- Jeff Brown

Rebecca Hadley¹⁰¹

- Rebecca Hadley
- James Hadley

Lesley and Judith Nelson¹⁰²

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)

Maxwell C Guthrie¹⁰³

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)

⁹⁴ Submissions 403 and 2400

⁹⁵ Submission 2229; Further submission 2797

⁹⁶ Submissions 515 and 2479/Further submissions 1298 and 2750

⁹⁷ Submissions 854 and 2584

⁹⁸ As successor to submission 693

⁹⁹ Submission 2610

¹⁰⁰ Submission 2126

¹⁰¹ Submission 2559; Further submission 2772

¹⁰² Submission 2403; Further submission 2762

¹⁰³ Submission 2412; Further submission 2717

GM Todd, JW Todd, JE Todd and Michael Brial¹⁰⁴

- Graeme Todd (Counsel)

Rohan and Di Hill¹⁰⁵

- Rohan Hill

Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (NZ) Inc¹⁰⁶

- Robert J Tapper

Skipp Williamson¹⁰⁷

- Vanessa Robb (Counsel)
- Stephen Quin
- Carey Vivian

8. In addition to the witnesses listed above, we received pre-circulated evidence but did not require to hear from:
 - Brendan Allen for Trojan Helmet Limited
 - James Hadley for A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited
 - Dr Shayne Galloway for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn and LA Green, and Morven Ferry Limited
 - Ciaran Keogh for Waterfall Park Developments Limited
9. We also received tabled representations from Dame Elizabeth and Mr Murray Hanan¹⁰⁸ opposing the submissions of Trojan Helmet Limited and Banco Trustees and Ors, and from Mr David Cooper on behalf of Federated Farmers of New Zealand¹⁰⁹.
10. Lastly, we note receipt of written submissions from Mr Vance Boyd on behalf of Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (NZ) Inc¹¹⁰ attaching a bundle of material relevant to the Association's submission following reinstatement of part of that submission (discussed in the next section of this report), provided in lieu of a further appearance.
11. The Council responded in writing to Mr Boyd's submissions (and related material), filing the planning evidence of Ms Christine Edgley and acoustic evidence of Dr Stephen Chiles.
12. During the course of the hearing we asked a number of parties to supply us with additional information that we have also considered. Through this route, we received the following:
 - a. From Council:
 - i. A list of submitters on parts 6.2 and 6.4 of the Variation;

¹⁰⁴ Submission 2576

¹⁰⁵ Submission 2123

¹⁰⁶ Submission 2663

¹⁰⁷ Further Submission 2522

¹⁰⁸ Further submission 1004

¹⁰⁹ Submission 2540; Further submission 2746

¹¹⁰ Submission 2663

- ii. A map of the land the subject of submissions supported by evidence;
 - iii. Clarification of the additional capacity identified in the Waikato Basin Land Use Study as provided by the proposed Precinct Zone compared with that identified in Mr Barr's evidence;
 - iv. Clarification of the difference between Mr Barr's estimated additional capacity in the Proposed Precinct Zone compared with the baseline capacity which had formed the basis of Mr Smith's modelling;
 - v. Advice as to the formed width of Mooney Road compared to the requirements of Council's land development and subdivision code of practice;
 - vi. A clearer copy of the land the subject of submission by Jane and Richard Bamford;
 - vii. A clearer copy of the final approved subdivision plan for the Bridesdale development;
 - viii. Examples of land use consent for properties within the Bridesdale development;
 - ix. A map showing Area 5(c) in the Shotover Country Zones;
 - x. A copy of the subdivision decision that relates to the land the subject of submission by Broomfield and Woodlot;
 - xi. An annotated photograph showing the notified and recommended ONL lines at the south eastern extent of Slopehill¹¹¹;
 - xii. A map showing the outline of the Lake Hayes Catchment, the location of water and wastewater consents issued by Otago Regional Council and areas covered by Council or private sewer schemes¹¹²;
 - xiii. A revised version of the Lake Hayes Catchment as above¹¹³;
 - xiv. Information regarding the width of the Mooney Road reserve and the requirements of the Council's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice¹¹⁴
- b. For Tony McQuilkin, a series of additional drone shots of the land the subject of submission provided by Mr Espie;
 - c. For Millbrook Country Club Limited:
 - i. A map of the 440masl contour on the Williamson property¹¹⁵;
 - ii. Proposed Plan provisions to be inserted into Chapter 27¹¹⁶;
 - d. For Spruce Grove Trust¹¹⁷, a tabulation of residential and non-residential land uses in the Block contained within Arrow Lane, Wiltshire Street and Berkshire Streets provided by Ms Holden;
 - e. For Michaela Meehan:
 - i. Three resource consent decisions related to the land the subject of submission, together with an Environment Court consent order resolving an appeal against one of those decisions;

¹¹¹ All provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 24 July 2018

¹¹² Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 27 July 2018

¹¹³ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 29 August 2018

¹¹⁴ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 October 2018

¹¹⁵ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 13 July 2018 which also provided information and commentary regarding the scope of the submitter's submission and further submissions and advice as to visibility of rock outcrops on the Spruce Grove Trust land on Malaghans Road

¹¹⁶ The subject of a Joint Memorandum of Counsel for Millbrook Country Club Limited and R & Donaldson dated 7 August 2018

¹¹⁷ Submission 560

- ii. A map showing competing ONL lines in relation to consented building platforms and existing dwellings on the land the subject of submission, and on the adjacent Northridge land;
- iii. Annotated versions of the Stage 1 planning maps (decisions version) showing locations where the ONL boundary does not follow a zone boundary¹¹⁸;
- f. For Burgess Duke Trust and Ashford Trust, a three-dimensional topographical model of the area north and north-west of Slope Hill prepared by Mr Skelton¹¹⁹;
- g. For Trojan Helmet Limited:
 - i. Previous resource consent decisions relating to developments of the site the subject of the submission;
 - ii. Revised provisions for the proposed Hills Resort Zone;
 - iii. A plan showing vegetation taken into account in the visibility maps provided in the evidence, including a notation as to any protection provided for said vegetation, together with an indicative layout of two of the proposed activity areas¹²⁰;
 - iv. Photo montages of various aspects of the proposed development on the Hills site together with a revised structure plan, including an amended location for House Site 5¹²¹;
- h. For Waterfall Park Developments Limited:
 - i. Revised provisions for the proposed Ayrburn Zone;
 - ii. Additional plans showing flood prone areas of the site the subject of submission;
 - iii. An amended structure plan for the proposed Ayrburn Zone, together with covering comments by Mr Skelton on the implications of the amendment for the opinions he expressed at the hearing¹²²;
- i. For Jon Waterston, copies of the two Environment Court decisions relating to development of the site the subject of submission;
- j. For Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited, plans of the lots sought to be rezoned, showing existing and proposed contour levels¹²³;
- k. For Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, DE and ME Bunn and LA Green and Morven Ferry Limited:
 - i. A plan of existing and stopped unformed legal roads across the sites the subject of submission;
 - ii. A revised plan of the proposed Morven Ferry Road Visitor Precincts;
 - iii. Amended plan provisions showing proposed text providing for Morven Ferry Road Visitor Precincts¹²⁴;
- l. For Hogans Gully Farm Limited:
 - i. A revised set of provisions of the proposed Hogan's Gully Zone;
 - ii. A monitoring report dated November 2017 detailing progress of ecological regeneration on a site at Walter Peak;
 - iii. A number of plans showing the location of height profile poles on the site;

¹¹⁸ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 25 July 2018

¹¹⁹ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 30 July 2018

¹²⁰ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 27 July 2018

¹²¹ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 3 August 2018

¹²² The latter together with the flood plans referred to in point ii. above provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 July 2018

¹²³ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 July 2018

¹²⁴ All provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 July 2018

- iv. A photo montage of the proposed development of the site the subject of submission, viewed from the top of the Crown Range zigzag;
 - m. For Underdown Trust and Archibald, a revised version of Chapter 43 of the Proposed Plan showing the suggested amendments overlaid on an updated version of the underlying chapter provisions¹²⁵;
 - n. For Wakatipu Equities Limited, a plan of the area Mr Skelton considered could support rural living development at a 4 hectare minimum lot size together with an estimate of the likely capacity of this land¹²⁶.
13. A number of parties also supplied a copy of the relief sought at our request ¹²⁷ in digital form. The responses were collated and forwarded to us under cover of a memorandum of counsel for the Council dated 31 August 2018, noting in each case the compatibility (or otherwise) of the information supplied with the Council GIS system.

1.5 Procedural Steps

14. Prior to the hearing, the Chair issued directions in relation to the following matters affecting the submissions and further submissions we heard:
- a. By a Decision dated 13 March 2018, an application by GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain (Submission 535) and Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust (Submission 532) for a waiver of time to amend portions of the respective submissions was granted in part to enable the zoning sought in relation to the submitters' land to be amended to Waikato Basin Lifestyle Precinct, and to amend the minimum lot size and setback distance from State Highway 6 applying to the sites the subject of submission.
 - b. By a Decision dated 2 April 2018 a waiver of time was granted to enable us to consider the following:
 - i. McGuinness Pa Limited¹²⁸;
 - ii. C Dagg¹²⁹;
 - iii. Kim Fam¹³⁰;
 - iv. M & C Burgess¹³¹;
 - v. Heather Moore & Szigetvey Trustee Services¹³²;
 - vi. Wendy McGuinness¹³³;
 - vii. Turi Edmonds¹³⁴;
 - viii. Millbrook Country Club Limited¹³⁵;
 - ix. John Martin¹³⁶;
 - x. Goldcrest Farming Limited¹³⁷;

¹²⁵ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 July 2018

¹²⁶ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel from Mr Skelton dated 27 July 2018

¹²⁷ In a Minute dated 31 July 2018

¹²⁸ Submission 2447

¹²⁹ Submission 2586

¹³⁰ Submission 2589

¹³¹ Submission 2591

¹³² Submission 2596

¹³³ Submission 2603

¹³⁴ Submission 2604

¹³⁵ Submission 2605

¹³⁶ Submission 2606

¹³⁷ Submission 2607

- xi. Scott Carran¹³⁸;
 - xii. KT Dunlop & SA Green¹³⁹;
 - xiii. Simon Botherway¹⁴⁰.
- c. By a Decision dated 4 April 2008, a waiver of time was granted to the following submitters in relation to lodgement of replacement submissions for Stream 14 submissions lodged within time:
- i. Hogans Gully Farm Limited¹⁴¹;
 - ii. Waterfall Park Developments Limited¹⁴²;
 - iii. Ladies Mile Consortium¹⁴³.
- d. By a Decision dated 13 April 2018, a waiver was granted in order that the submission of Guenther Radler¹⁴⁴ might be considered;
- e. By a Decision dated 13 April, a waiver of the was granted in order that additional landscape material might form part of the submission of Trojan Helmet Limited¹⁴⁵.
15. In a Memorandum by Counsel for the Council dated 12 April 2018, our attention was drawn to a number of submissions that counsel considered were not “on” Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan. The Chair issued an initial Minute indicating that he proposed to strike out any submissions found not to be on the provisions notified and inviting the submitters to respond to the Council’s Memoranda.
16. By a Decision dated 17 May 2018, having considered the responses that had been filed by a number of submitters, the following submissions were struck out in whole or in part pursuant to Section 41D of the Act as not being “on” Stage 2 of the District Plan review and consequently disclosing no reasonable or relevant case:
- i. J & L Bagrie¹⁴⁶;
 - ii. R & J Kelly¹⁴⁷;
 - iii. D Stanhope & G Burdis¹⁴⁸;
 - iv. G Burdis¹⁴⁹;
 - v. D Stanhope¹⁵⁰;
 - vi. G Oudhoff & J Hennessey¹⁵¹;
 - vii. P Blakely and M Wallace¹⁵²;
 - viii. Vanderwood Trustees and Others¹⁵³;

138 Submission 2608
 139 Submission 2609
 140 Submission 2610
 141 Submission 2313
 142 Submission 2388
 143 Submission 2489
 144 Submission 2657
 145 Submission 2387
 146 Submission 2246
 147 Submission 2251
 148 Submission 2253
 149 Submission 2541
 150 Submission 2542
 151 Submission 2326
 152 Submission 2499.6
 153 Submission 2523.1

- ix. Second Kawerau Bridge Group¹⁵⁴;
 - x. Upper Clutha Environmental Society Inc¹⁵⁵;
 - xi. Glenpanel Developments Limited¹⁵⁶.
17. By a further Decision dated 2 June 2018, a waiver of time was granted to Tucker Beach Residents¹⁵⁷ to enable its further submission to be considered.
18. By a Minute dated 1 May 2018, the Chair issued timetable directions for both Stream 14 and 15. The Chair's Minute also provided guidance on a number of other aspects of the hearings. In relation to Stream 14, the relevant dates were:
- a. Section 42A Reports and other Council evidence – 28 May 2018;
 - b. Submitters' evidence – 11 June 2018;
 - c. Rebuttal evidence – 27 June 2018;
 - d. Council Reply – 10 August 2018.
19. The timetabling directions for the hearing were subsequently varied in the following respects:
- a. By a Minute dated 28 May 2018, the Chair granted an extension for the Council to lodge and distribute the Section 42A Reports on 30 May 2018.
 - b. By a Minute dated 4 June 2018:
 - i. The Council was given until 6 June 2018 to lodge replacement planning and landscape evidence in relation to Submission 2387;
 - ii. The date for submitter evidence (unless otherwise specified) was varied to 13 June 2018;
 - iii. The date for the evidence in respect of Submissions 2386, 2400 and 2513 was amended to 15 June 2018;
 - iv. The planning and landscape evidence in relation to Submission 2387 was amended to 19 June 2018;
 - v. The date for rebuttal evidence unless otherwise specified was amended to 27 June 2018;
 - vi. The date for rebuttal evidence in respect of Submissions 2386, 2400 and 2513 was amended to 29 June 2018;
 - vii. The date for rebuttal planning and landscape evidence in respect of Submission 2387 was amended to 4 July 2018;
 - c. By a Minute dated 10 June 2018, submitter 2387 was given leave to lodge additional architectural evidence by 19 June 2018.
20. Following the commencement of the Stream 14 hearing, the Chair made additional directions regarding submissions and further submissions allocated to Stream 14, as follows:
- a. By a Decision dated 2 August 2018, the following Stream 14 submissions were struck out under Section 41D of the Act in whole or in part:
 - i. Don Moffat and Brian Dodds¹⁵⁸ in respect of that part relating to the Shotover Country Special Zone;

¹⁵⁴ Submission 2568

¹⁵⁵ Submission 2016.2

¹⁵⁶ Submission 2548.1

¹⁵⁷ Further Submission 2802

¹⁵⁸ Submission 239

- ii. Sanderson Group Limited¹⁵⁹ in relation to that part relating to the Shotover Country Special Zone;
 - iii. Woodlot Properties Limited¹⁶⁰ in relation to that part relating to the Quail Rise Special Zone;
 - iv. Shotover Country Limited¹⁶¹ in relation to that part related to the Shotover Country Special Zone;
 - v. Sean Brennan¹⁶²;
 - vi. Kirstie Jean Brustad¹⁶³ in relation to that part seeking amendments to Chapter 21 of the Proposed District Plan;
- b. By a Decision dated 8 August 2018, further submission 2802 (Tucker Beach Residents) was struck out under Section 41D of the Act. Tucker Beach Residents Society Inc objected to that decision under section 357(2) of the Act. By decision of Commissioner Taylor acting for the Council dated 14 December 2018 that objection was upheld with the result that Further Submission 2802 was reinstated, and Tucker Beach Residents Society Inc confirmed as successor of Tucker Beach Residents;
 - c. By a Decision dated 31 August, further submission 2821 (Millbrook Owner- Members Committee) was struck out under Section 41D of the Act in so far as it sought relief in respect of Lot 3 DP 20693.
21. During the course of the hearing, the Chair made a number of procedural directions regarding the day to day management of the hearing. We note specifically the Chair's direction that a brief of evidence filed in the name of Ross John Healy in support of further submission 2802 (Tucker Beach Residents) not be presented by the witness by reason of its content and late submission. That decision was confirmed by a Minute dated 30 July 2018.

1.6 Residual Hearing Issues

22. During the course of the hearing, the Chair sought comment from Counsel for the Council regarding the fact that as originally notified (on 23 November 2017), Chapter 24 did not include Table 24.2 (Rules 24.4.25-24.4.29 inclusive). We were advised that this omission was corrected shortly thereafter in the electronic and hard copy versions of Chapter 24 available to the public. The content of Table 24.2 was the subject of submissions by a number of parties we heard from, but the concern we had was that those consulting the notified version of Chapter 24 immediately upon its release might have incorrectly concluded that it was of no relevance to them by reason of the omission, and not been alerted to the subsequent change. The Council addressed this potential problem by renotifying Table 24.2 as a separate variation on 9 August 2018.
23. One submission¹⁶⁴ was filed on the notified variation. By a decision of the Chair dated 30 September 2018, parts of that submission were struck out. The submitter objected to that decision under section 357(2) of the Act and by a decision of Commissioner Taylor for the Council dated 10 December 2018, the parts of the submission that had been struck out were

¹⁵⁹ Submission 404

¹⁶⁰ Submission 501

¹⁶¹ Submission 528

¹⁶² Submission 2353

¹⁶³ Submission 2577

¹⁶⁴ Submission 2663 (Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association of New Zealand Inc)

reinstated. By a memorandum dated 16 January 2019, the Chair directed that the submitter confirm whether or not it wished to be heard in relation to the reinstated parts of its submission and file any material it wished considered by the Panel by 28 January. As above, the submitter filed submissions by Mr Boyd attaching a bundle of relevant material, including commentary from an acoustic expert (Mr George van Hout), and advised it did not require to be heard. The additional material provided by the submitter has accordingly been considered on the papers, along with the evidence of Ms Edgley and Dr Chiles filed by the Council in accordance with the directions of the Chair, in response.

24. The same issues did not arise in relation to the other submitter who had lodged a successful objection (Tucker Beach Residents Society Inc) as its submission had been heard without prejudice to the objection that had been made to its standing and that was, at that point, yet to be determined.
25. In addition, as noted above, the Council identified that the Summary of Submissions notified by it had omitted one submission relevant to Stream 14 (that of Millbrook Country Club Limited¹⁶⁵). The omission was corrected by notification of an Addendum to the Summary of Submissions on 26 July 2018, with the result that two additional further submissions were received¹⁶⁶. One of those further submissions (that of Millbrook Owner/Members Committee) was subsequently struck out in part, as discussed in section 1.5 above.

1.7 Declaration of Interest by Commissioners

26. During the course of the hearing, commissioners made the following declarations:
- a. Commissioner Dimery recorded that her partner is a director of the environmental consultancy Boffa Miskell Ltd, two of whose senior employees (Mr Chris Ferguson and Ms Yvonne Pflüger) gave evidence before us;
 - b. Commissioner Robinson recorded that he was advising NZTA in respect of High Court appeals on two Auckland motorway projects;
 - c. Commissioner Smith recorded that he had been involved in his capacity as a Councillor in the Council decisions adopting a Lead Policy for the Ladies Mile area.
27. No party made objection to the continued participation of any of the Commissioners in the hearing following these declarations.

2. GENERAL ISSUES

2.1 General Approach to Stream 14 Submissions and Further Submissions

28. Section 1.6 of Report 1 on the Stage 1 provisions of the District Plan Review summarises in some detail the statutory requirements for consideration of submissions and further submissions on the Proposed District Plan derived generally from the Environment Court's decision in *Colonial Vineyard Limited v Marlborough District Council*¹⁶⁷, as supplemented by subsequent higher order decisions, including but not limited to the decision of the majority of the Supreme Court in *Environmental Defence Society v The New Zealand King Salmon Company Limited*¹⁶⁸.

¹⁶⁵ Submission 2295

¹⁶⁶ FS2821 (Millbrook Owner-Members Committee) and FS2822 (Skipp Williamson)

¹⁶⁷ [2014] NZ EnvC 55

¹⁶⁸ [2014] NZSC 38 ("*King Salmon*").

29. Both Report 1 and the cases it cited related to the Act as it stood prior to enactment of the Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017. We therefore inquired of counsel for the Council when she opened the Council's case, as to which version of the Act we should apply given the amendments to it in 2017. Her response, which we agree with, is that in relation to the submissions made on Stage 1 of the PDP we hear, we must refer to the Act as it was in 2015, when those provisions were publicly notified. However, in respect of the provisions notified in November 2017, the correct version of the Act is that applying as at 1 October 2017, that is to say, incorporating the amendments made to the Act by virtue of the Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017. Ms Scott identified the relevant changes as between these different versions of the Act to be:
- a. The incorporation of reference in Section 6(g) to *"the management of significant risks from natural hazards"* (which we are required to recognise and provide for);
 - b. The addition of a specific function for the District Council (in Section 31(1) related to *"the establishment, implementation and review of objectives, policies and methods to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in respective housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the district"*;
30. No other party drew any additional aspects of the 2017 amendments to our attention as requiring our consideration, and, having reviewed the content of 2017 Amendment Act ourselves, we did not identify any other material changes that we need to factor into our decision-making process.
31. We therefore find that subject to the potential relevance of those two additional matters that we need to bear in mind when considering the provisions notified in November 2017, the principles set out in Report 1 remain applicable to our consideration of submissions and further submissions.
32. When applying these principles, however, we need to take account of changes that have occurred in the interim to the higher-order provisions of relevance to our task.
33. Report 1 discussed the status of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement for the Otago Region as at the date that report was finalised (28 March 2018). Paragraph 46(e) recorded that large sections of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement were the subject of unresolved appeals to the Environment Court, lessening the weight that could be placed on it.
34. When Ms Scott opened the Council case, she advised us that that position had changed.
35. Ms Scott supplied us with copies of Environment Court consent orders relating to the following parts of the Proposed RPS:
- a. Chapter 1 (Resource Management in Otago is Integrated);
 - b. Chapter 2 (Kai Tahu);
 - c. Chapter 4.1 (Natural Hazards);
 - d. Chapter 4.2 (Climate Change);
 - e. Chapter 4.4 (Energy);
 - f. Chapter 4.5 (Urban Growth);
 - g. Chapter 4.6 (Hazardous Substances);
 - h. Chapter 5.1 (Public Access);
 - i. Chapter 5.2 (Historic Heritage);

- j. Policy 5.3.2 and related Method 3 (Land Use Change in Dry Catchments);
 - k. Policy 5.3.3 (Distribution of Commercial Activities);
 - l. Policy 5.3.4 (Industrial Land);
 - m. New Policy 5.3.6 (Tourism and Outdoor Recreation);
 - n. Chapter 5.3 (Infrastructure);
 - o. Chapter 5.4 (Offensive or Objectional Discharges, Precautionary Approach, Pest Plants and Animals, and Activities in the Coastal Marine Area).
36. As counsel for the Council observed, the effect of these orders of the Court was to amend the Proposed RPS with immediate effect. We also accept counsel for the Council's submission that these amended provisions did not have "*full legal weight*" so as to entirely replace the previously operative RPS¹⁶⁹. At least in theory, unless and until the Proposed RPS was made operative, the relevant legal obligation was for us to have regard to the Proposed RPS as amended by the Environment Court consent orders¹⁷⁰ and continue to give effect to the Operative RPS¹⁷¹, notwithstanding that in relation to those parts of the Proposed RPS the subject of consent orders, the document was effectively beyond challenge.
37. Ms Scott also provided us with draft consent order documentation relating to a further three aspects of the Proposed RPS being:
- a. A revised description of the Takata Whenua of the Otago Region;
 - b. Proposed amendments to Policy 5.3.1 (Rural Activities);
 - c. Proposed amendments to Chapter 3 of the Proposed RPS (Otago has High Quality Natural Resources and Ecosystems).
38. While, at the time of our hearing, the amendments proposed in these memoranda had no legal significance, the fact that they had been submitted to the Environment Court by consent meant that the likelihood was, in practice, that the Proposed RPS would be amended substantially in the manner set out in the draft consent documentation.
39. A number of parties made submissions on the implications of the amendments to the Proposed RPS noted above (including those of the subject of draft consent orders) and the Council witnesses included a commentary on the implications of the changes to the Proposed RPS in their reply evidence. Accordingly, while initially we felt it might be necessary to offer parties the opportunity to make submissions on the changed Proposed RPS, by the end of the hearing, we had concluded that this would not be necessary, unless the Environment Court issued orders directing further changes to the Proposed RPS materially at variance from the draft consent orders. We advised the parties of our conclusion in this regard by a Minute dated 31 July 2018.
40. Following completion of the hearing, we were supplied with two additional consent orders of the Environment Court dated 5 September 2018, making the amendments proposed in the consent memoranda related to Takata Whenua and Policy 5.3.1 (Rural Activities).

¹⁶⁹ As contended by Counsel for Boxer Hills Trust and Trojan Helmet Limited

¹⁷⁰ Pursuant to Section 74(2)(a)(i) of the Act

¹⁷¹ Pursuant to Section 75(3)(c) of the Act

41. On 7 January 2019, we received a Memorandum of Counsel from Ms Hockley advising us that the Regional Council had resolved to make the proposed RPS partially operative on 14 January 2019¹⁷². Attached to this memorandum was a copy of the 1998 RPS identifying those parts which would be revoked as a result of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 coming into effect. A copy of the partially operative RPS 2019 was also attached. As a result, at the date at which we make our recommendations to the Council, there is a Partially Operative RPS 1998, a Partially Operative RPS 2019, and consent order documentation relating to proposed amendments to Chapter 3 of the Proposed RPS (Otago has High Quality Natural Resources and Ecosystems). Our recommendations reflect the obligation on the Council to give effect to the Operative Regional Policy Statement, and have regard to the remaining portions of the Proposed RPS.
42. As noted in the Stage 1 Report 1, however, the fact that the Partially Operative RPS 1998 predates all of the National Policy Statements that we also have to give effect to means that the significance of that legal difference is somewhat lessened.
43. The Hearing Panel's Report 1 also considered¹⁷³ the potential relevance of Chapters 3-6 as recommended by the Hearing Panel in Stage 1. Those Chapters provide strategic direction for the balance of the Proposed District Plan. The conclusion reached by the Hearing Panel in Stage 1 was that while those chapters were not 'settled', they represented the recommendations of the relevant Hearing Panels as to what was required to meet the relevant legal obligations. Accordingly, in the words of that Report:

"While reference still needs to be made to the relevant higher order documents where relevant to ensure they are given effect, absent issues of scope which might have constrained the Hearing Panel (e.g. from recommending an amendment the Panel felt was required to give effect to a relevant higher order document or to make a provision consistent with Part 2 of the Act) or genuine exceptions not covered (or not fully covered) by the strategic chapters, reference back to Part 2 of the Act, and the higher order documents noted above, is effectively a cross-check in those circumstances, to ensure that this is the case¹⁷⁴"

44. Since that Report was released, the Council has confirmed the Hearing Panel's recommendations and appeals have been filed on the Strategic Chapters. Some parties argued that we should place little or no weight on the Decisions Version of the Strategic Chapters in light of the large number of appeals that have been filed. This issue came sharply into focus when we discussed with counsel for a number of a parties how we should approach submissions seeking rezoning of particular properties.
45. Counsel for the Ladies Mile Consortium, for instance, submitted to us that the number of appeals on those Strategic Chapters meant that they fell within the "uncertainty" caveat in *King Salmon*. We had difficulty understanding how this might be the case. The situation the Supreme Court was addressing in relation to uncertainty was where a Plan provision is

¹⁷² Memorandum of Counsel on Behalf of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Regarding the Otago Regional Policy Statement, dated 7 January 2019

¹⁷³ At paragraph 48

¹⁷⁴ Compare *Turners and Growers Horticulture v Far North District Council* [2017] NZHC 764 at [48]

uncertain in meaning¹⁷⁵. We do not see that the effect of multiple appeals on the Strategic Chapters is to make the wording of those provisions uncertain. Obviously, the wording of the provisions may change, but that does not make the wording of the Decisions Version uncertain in the sense the Supreme Court was referring to. The position might have been different if one of the parties had submitted to us that the wording of any actual provision was uncertain, but that was not the case.

46. Accordingly, we prefer the view put to us by Mr Todd, when appearing as counsel for Hogans Gully Farms Limited, who submitted that it was an issue of weight, with the weight given to the Stage 1 provisions existing in a continuum starting at the point when the Plan was notified at one end, to the point that it is operative at the other. Mr Todd described the position as one where as the process is worked through and the Plan provisions are tested, more weight is progressively placed on the Proposed Plan provisions.
47. Counsel for Trojan Helmet Ltd and Boxer Hills Trust, Ms Wolt, also identified it as an issue of weight, suggesting to us though that we could put “*little or no weight*” on the provisions in the strategic chapters given the number and nature of the appeals on them. We disagree with that position. Among other things, section 32 requires us to test plan provisions against the objectives of the PDP. It is clearly inappropriate for us to second-guess what views the Environment Court might have regarding the objectives in Chapter 3 (or any other provision the subject of appeal for that matter). As Ms Wolt accepted when we discussed it with her, we necessarily have to reference back to the Decisions Version of the PDP at this point.
48. The Council has produced an annotated version of the Stage 1 Decisions Version indicating which provisions are the subject of appeal. This indicates that Chapter 5 is not the subject of appeal. Accordingly, in our view, we can give it considerable weight to the extent that it is relevant to our recommendations. By contrast, virtually all of Chapters 3, 4 and 6 are the subject of appeal and must be approached somewhat more cautiously. Again, however, for the limited number of matters in those chapters that have not been challenged in the Environment Court, we think that we can give them considerable weight. Among others, our attention was drawn to the fact that while initially the subject of appeal, the definitions of “*urban development*” and “*resort*” are not now the subject of appeal¹⁷⁶.
49. We proceed on the basis that we should give those parts of the Decisions Version of the strategic chapters the subject of appeal more than “*little or no weight*” but, as Mr Todd submitted, not “*total*” weight. We agree that we have to be alive to the potential that the appeals will be successful, and therefore test any tentative conclusions based on the Strategic Chapters against both the higher order policy and plan provisions that we are required to implement, and to Part 2 of the Act. We remain of the view, however, that the Stage 1 Report 1 correctly described this process as a cross check.
50. Counsel for Ladies Mile Consortium also submitted that we are duty bound to consider every element of Part 2 in relation to every rezoning application (and by implication, every disputed provision of Chapter 24) because of the “*uncertainty*” of the strategic chapters. Counsel took issue in particular with a reference in Stage 1 Report 16 to the need to look beyond the

¹⁷⁵ See [2014] NZSC38 at [90]

¹⁷⁶ Email of Warwick Goldsmith dated 5 October 2018

strategic chapters in the PDP to the higher-level planning documents and Part 2 of the Act “*as appropriate*”.

51. While it might have been helpful if the Stream 12 Hearing Panel had given some examples of when such reference would be appropriate (and vice versa), we reject counsel’s submission in this regard.
52. Stating the obvious, Part 2 has many elements. Some elements are clearly irrelevant to any of the matters before us. Insofar as section 6(a) of the Act refers to preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (and its protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development), notwithstanding the statutory instruction that we recognise and provide for that matter, we think we are on safe ground putting it to one side in the situation of a land-locked District.
53. Similarly, section 6(b) of the Act, addressing the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, is only engaged in the small number of submissions deferred from Stage 1 dealing with areas categorised as ONFs and ONLs.
54. More generally, the Supreme Court’s decision in *King Salmon* tells us that if we are giving effect to a directory provision of the Operative RPS or of a National Policy Statement, it is not permissible to look to Part 2 for additional and potentially contradictory direction, absent any suggestion that the directory instrument is invalid, incomplete or uncertain in meaning.
55. In the same way, the need to refer to higher order documents depends on the context. We think we can safely assume that the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation is unlikely to provide useful guidance on a submission seeking rezoning of rural land in the Wakatipu Basin for rural living. Perhaps less obviously, the NPSUDC is only potentially relevant to those submissions seeking to facilitate urban development.
56. We also think that it is relevant that the Proposed District Plan needs to be internally consistent. We had discussed that point with counsel for the Ladies Mile Consortium who agreed that the Panel should be trying to produce a Plan that is internally consistent. We consider that that is an important consideration against the background of Section 31(1)(a) which makes integrated management a key District Council function. This means in our view that we need to take a ‘top-down’ approach, seeking first, consistency with the strategic chapters that provide high level guidance as to the outcomes the Proposed District Plan is seeking to achieve, and secondly with the balance of the Proposed District Plan.
57. In the case of Wakatipu Basin rezoning issues, the zoning we recommend also needs to fit within the framework of Chapter 24. Counsel for Trojan Helmet Ltd submitted that we ought to test (under section 32 of the Act) the provisions that submitter contended for against the objectives in the strategic chapters rather than those of Chapter 24. However, that was in the context of a submission seeking a special zone, with its own framework of objectives, policies and rules. In that specific context, we agree with the submission. In other rezoning matters, however, the objectives of Chapter 24 are relevant to the inquiry, and so it is important that we form a firm view on the submissions seeking changes to those objectives before going on to address the subsidiary provisions, including zoning provisions.

58. We discussed a related point with Ms Louise Taylor, giving planning evidence for X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust, who suggested that we needed to analyse the rezoning proposal that submitter advanced by reference to the purpose of the proposal (i.e. whether the proposed rezoning is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the proposal). This appeared somewhat circular to us, and Ms Taylor agreed that there was an initial critical step, determining whether the purpose of the proposal is itself appropriate. Ms Taylor’s view was that that question had to be tested against the direction provided in the strategic chapters. We agree that the latter are the primary reference point, but because the X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust proposal involved the use of both the Precinct sub-zone, and the Rural Amenity zone, the objectives we recommend for Chapter 24 are also relevant.
59. Looking more generally at the considerations identified in Stage 1 Report 1 as being relevant to our analysis of the submissions and further submissions we heard, we should note the submission made by counsel for Lake Hayes Investments Limited, Crosby Developments, L McFadgen and Slopehill Joint Venture drawing our attention to the Environment Court’s decision in *Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc v Whakatane District Council*¹⁷⁷, where the Court emphasised that the application of section 32 of the Act, where it directs an inquiry as to the “most appropriate” provisions, should be read as requiring an examination of the reasonably practicable options to identify the least restrictive regime that meets the purpose of the Act and the objectives of the Plan¹⁷⁸. Provided that guidance is kept in mind, we regard the summary set out in the Stage 1 Report 1 as still generally applicable, subject to the considerations discussed above, except for minor changes able to be made under Clause 16(2), and we have applied it on that basis.
60. Turning to the particular issue of rezoning that took up much of the hearing, this also was the subject of commentary in the Stage 1 Reports. In particular, Reports 16 and 17.1 contain a discussion of general principles which we regard as equally applicable to the rezoning submissions we heard¹⁷⁹.
61. As with those Reports, and for the same reasons, we have taken the view that where a submission seeking rezoning of land is unsupported by evidence (either of Council or the submitter), we have no basis on which to undertake the section 32AA evaluation required of us. Accordingly, such submissions must necessarily be rejected.
62. Report 17.1 also found it helpful to refer to and apply a set of zoning principles and other factors applied to the consideration of the most appropriate zoning for particular land. These were summarised at paragraph 132 of the Report as follows:
- “a. whether the change implements the purpose of the PDP Strategic chapters and in particular the Strategic Direction, Urban Development and Landscape Chapters;*
 - b. the overall impact the rezoning gives to the O[perative] RPS;*
 - c. whether the objectives and policies of the proposed zone can be implemented on the land;*

¹⁷⁷ [2017] NZEnvC 051

¹⁷⁸ See the discussion at [59]

¹⁷⁹ See in particular Report 16 at Section 2 and Report 17.01 at Section 2

- d. *economic costs and benefits are considered;*
- e. *changes to the zone boundaries are consistent with the maps in the PDP that indicate additional overlays or constraints (e.g. Airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces, SNAs, building restriction areas, ONLs/ONF);*
- f. *changes should take into account the location and environmental features of the site (e.g. the existing and consented development, existing buildings, significant features and infrastructure);*
- g. *zone changes are not inconsistent with long term planning for the provision of infrastructure and its capacity;*
- h. *zone changes take into account effects on the environment of providing infrastructure onsite;*
- i. *there is adequate separation between incompatible land uses;*
- j. *rezoning in lieu of resource consent approvals, where a portion of the site has capacity to absorb development does not necessarily mean another zone is more appropriate;*
- k. *zoning is not determined by existing use rights, but these will be taken into account.”*

63. The Report also identified as relevant local context factors:

- “a. the layout of streets and the location of public open space and community facilities;*
- b. land with physical challenges such as steep topography, poor ground conditions, instability or natural hazards;*
- c. accessibility to centres and the multiple benefits of providing for intensification in locations with easy access to centres; and*
- d. the ability of the environment to absorb development.”*

64. The submissions we heard from the parties did not directly challenge the zoning principles set out in Report 17.1. However, we should address at this point the legal submissions for Lake Hayes Investments Limited, Crosby Developments, L McFadgen and Slopehill Joint Venture that our analysis *“should be an effects-based decision, rather than based upon a desired outcome or directive planning purpose and should take into account the existing consented and developed environment on the ground rather than providing a zone which makes that existing environment and development incongruous within the Proposed DPR Zone¹⁸⁰”*.

65. Addressing first the extent to which zones must be effects-based rather than being based on a desired future outcome, counsel relied on the Environment Court’s decision in *Cerebos Greggs Limited v Dunedin City Council*¹⁸¹ as authority for this proposition. We think that the case is of limited relevance to us for a number of reasons. Firstly, the factual context is quite different. The respondent city council had sought to provide for the growth of three educational institutions with more favourable zone provisions for their activities. The Court found that there was no evidence that the three institutions needed access to the land in question (there was evidence that two of the institutions did not) and was clearly concerned

¹⁸⁰ Paragraph 4(d) of Counsel’s legal submissions

¹⁸¹ See 169/2001

that the zoning purported to provide for activities based on who was undertaking them, rather than what was being provided for.

66. While the Environment Court expressed a concern that the zoning mechanism being used was not based around adverse effects, but rather around a directive planning approach adopted by the Council¹⁸², that was in the context of the wording of section 32 of the Act prior to 2003 which focussed attention on whether objectives, policies, rules or other methods were “*necessary*” in achieving the purpose of the Act. The version of section 32 that we have to apply focusses on whether objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and whether other provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives, implying a broader frame of reference¹⁸³.
67. Last, but by certainly no means least, subsequent authority confirms that a directive planning approach may indeed be appropriate, where supported by appropriate evidence. We note, for instance, the emphasis given by the Supreme Court in *King Salmon* to the “*forward looking and management focus*” of the RMA¹⁸⁴ and the Supreme Court’s discussion of Policy 7 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement that provides for strategic planning of the coastal environment¹⁸⁵.
68. As regards to the second element of the passage from counsel’s submissions quoted above, we think the proposition put to us requires qualification. Counsel cited the Environment Court’s decision in *Milford Centre v Auckland Council*¹⁸⁶ as support for the proposition advanced. At the paragraph referred to us, the Environment Court stated that it saw no proper basis to draw a distinction between the environment for the purpose of resource consent and a Plan Change and accordingly adopted the approach of the Court of Appeal in the well-known decision of *Queenstown Lakes District Council v Hawthorn Estates Limited*¹⁸⁷.
69. However, we note that the Environment Court’s view in this respect is clearly contrary to the conclusion reached by the High Court in *Shotover Park Limited v Queenstown Lakes District Council*¹⁸⁸ which held that “*when deciding the content of a plan for the future, as distinct from the grant of a particular resource consent, the Court is not obliged to confine “environment” to the “existing environment”, as defined in [84] of Hawthorn*”¹⁸⁹.
70. In our view, the two points made by counsel are linked. Clearly, the environment one sees on the ground is relevant to the Plan provisions that are put in place, but the content of a plan is forward looking. It needs to reflect the environment sought to be achieved over the life of the Plan, not (or not just) the environment that already exists.

¹⁸² At paragraph [21] as noted in counsel’s submissions.

¹⁸³ Even given the fact that the word “*necessary*” in the version of s32 applying prior to 2003 had not been interpreted literally, as a synonym of “*essential*” for instance

¹⁸⁴ [2014] NZSC 38 at [21]

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid* at [53]-[54]

¹⁸⁶ [2014] NZ EnvC 23

¹⁸⁷ [2006] NZRMA 424

¹⁸⁸ [2013] NZHC 1712

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid* at [4]

71. This was brought into sharp focus by the number of submissions we heard seeking that areas previously zoned for Rural Residential density development should continue to have the benefits of that zoning (or equivalent) because of the expectations that had been built up among the land owners concerned. Some counsel suggested that land owners had a right to develop their land based on the zoning in previous plans. We do not accept that that is the case. As we will discuss in greater detail in the relevant reports, where past planning decisions have had unsatisfactory outcomes, we believe it is contrary to the purpose of the Act to perpetuate the status quo and facilitate further unsatisfactory outcomes unless there are cogent reasons to do so.
72. We might have had greater cause for pause had the evidence identified specific ways in which the ongoing operation of established activities would be materially impeded by a change in zoning – that was the situation the Environment Court found to exist in the *Cerebos* decision counsel referred to us, for instance. Evidence to that effect would clearly need to be considered carefully in the assessment of costs and benefits section 32 requires, but to the extent effects on existing activities were addressed in the submissions and evidence we heard, this tended to be expressed at a broad philosophical level, along the lines of the passage from counsel’s submissions quoted above. The focus of the submissions was clearly on the ability to undertake new development rather than the ability to continue existing land use activities. Restricting new development is not without cost (it has obvious opportunity costs that need to be considered under section 32), but such costs are in our view generally less pressing than restrictions on the ability to continue existing activities.
73. In summary, we believe that Report 17.1 pitched the position correctly; that zoning moving forward is not determined by existing use rights, but they are relevant to our deliberations.
74. We acknowledge that some of the principles and other factors identified in Report 17.1 reflected the scope of the Stream 13 hearing, which included submissions related to urban zonings. In addition, the particular context of the Wakatipu Basin introduces additional considerations to rezoning matters that we needed to take into account. We will discuss some of those issues shortly at a general level. In addition, our ability to apply some of the zoning principles is hampered by lack of evidence. The Council did not produce any evidence as to economic costs and benefits. When queried, Ms Scott told us that the Council’s position was that it was not practicable to do so. Only two submitters produced economic evidence, being Middleton Family Trust and Waterfall Park Developments Limited¹⁹⁰, and the evidence for Middleton Family Trust did not include any quantification of economic costs and benefits.
75. Accordingly, except where we had specific evidence as above, our consideration of this particular principle is both qualitative and somewhat generic in nature.
76. However, we consider that the zoning principles and other factors set out in Report 17.1 are of general assistance and we have looked to them in the consideration of particular submissions.
77. The key additional considerations that we regard as relevant to submissions seeking rezoning of land in the Wakatipu Basin relate to the cumulative effects of the development of the Basin

¹⁹⁰ That of Mr Michael Copeland and Mr Fraser Colegrave respectively.

that has occurred to date (mostly for rural living purposes) and the effects of future development; both the development that will result from utilisation of building platforms that are already registered on titles throughout the Basin, and future development that might be facilitated by the zoning provisions that we recommend.

78. Chapter 3 of the Proposed District Plan seeks to provide general guidance for rural living development in the District by means of the following policies:

“3.3.22 Provide for rural living opportunities in areas identified in the District Plan maps as appropriate for rural living developments.

3.3.23 Identify areas in District Plan Maps that are not within Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Outstanding Natural Features and that cannot absorb further change, and avoid residential development in those areas.

3.3.24 Ensure that cumulative effects of new subdivision and development for the purposes of rural living does not result in the alteration of the character of the rural environment to the point where the area is no longer rural in character.”

79. As we will discuss in greater detail shortly, although Chapter 24 and the related planning maps were publicly notified before release of the Hearing Panel recommendations on Chapter 3 (and the Council decisions accepting same), the approach taken in Chapter 24 of an Amenity zoning applying to the whole of the Basin (with strong policies and rules seeking to limit further residential development) and a Precinct sub-zone applying to defined parts of the Basin (where rural living development need pass a significantly lower regulatory hurdle before being approved), reflects the intent of the Chapter 3 policies quoted above¹⁹¹.

80. Ms Gilbert observed when she gave evidence before us that the balance between the amount of land within the Lifestyle Precinct Sub-Zone and that the subject of the more stringent Rural Amenity Zone provisions, is the key to its success. Ms Gilbert suggested that were we to recommend significant additional areas of Lifestyle Precinct land be zoned within the Wakatipu Basin, this would risk disturbing that balance and consequently, risk not achieving the intent of Policy 3.3.24.

81. A number of landscape experts appearing before us similarly suggested that the areas of Precinct in the Basin could be expanded at various locations without raising concerns regarding cumulative adverse effects.

82. The cumulative effect, if all of the submissions seeking up-zoning were granted, would clearly alter the pattern of zoning in the Wakatipu Basin substantially from the position notified. Our initial impression was that there would be very little Rural Amenity Zone land left, certainly on the floor of the Basin¹⁹². We asked Mr Barr whether our impression was correct and his pithy description of the area of Rural Amenity Zoned land that would be left was, “*not a lot*”. Subsequently, the Council supplied us with a map showing just the areas the subject of

¹⁹¹ Acknowledging that both Policy 3.3.23 and 3.3.24 are the subject of appeal to the Environment Court. From the Council’s annotated version of the PDP, it appears that Policy 3.3.22 is not the subject of appeal.

¹⁹² That is to say, excluding the Crown Terrace

evidence where up-zoning was sought. Substantial areas are involved, particularly in the eastern half (east of Lake Hayes) of the Basin.

83. None of the landscape witnesses we had before us, apart from Ms Gilbert, had undertaken an overall assessment of the Wakatipu Basin, which would have equipped them to provide us with an assessment of the cumulative effect of widespread up-zoning of the Rural Amenity Zone areas.
84. Many of those witnesses, however, have a longstanding familiarity with the Wakatipu Basin and we invited them to express an opinion on how much development of the Basin is too much.
85. Mr Stephen Skelton¹⁹³, for instance, expressed the view in response to our question that greater provision for rural living could be made provided the 'important' areas were protected. He emphasised that the floor of the Basin has a rural living character already. However, aside from some areas of the properties which were the subject of his evidence, Mr Skelton did not identify what other areas might be considered important.
86. We consider that there is a tipping point beyond which further rural living (and other) development will have significant adverse effects on the rural character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin¹⁹⁴. As always in relation to cumulative effects, the trick is to identify exactly where and when that tipping point is reached.
87. In our view, part of the answer is to recognise that there is both an overall tipping point for the Basin, and multiple tipping points within the Basin; that is to say discrete areas within the Basin that have already reached their absorptive capacity¹⁹⁵.
88. Viewed Basin-wide, we prefer the evidence of Ms Gilbert to the landscape witnesses who suggested that there is significant scope for additional rural living development. Ms Gilbert had the advantage of having undertaken an overall assessment of landscape capacity that identified significant Precinct areas facilitating further rural living development already¹⁹⁶. By contrast, the landscape witnesses we invited to comment on the cumulative effects of large-scale up-zoning, while endeavouring to assist us, were necessarily expressing an off the cuff view.
89. It follows that our consideration of the most appropriate zoning for individual properties or areas takes place against that background. That does not mean that submitters faced an insuperable obstacle. We have considered each submission carefully against the relevant statutory tests discussed earlier in this section, but the effect of site-specific zoning on the

¹⁹³ Giving expert landscape evidence for Wakatipu Equities Ltd and Slopehill Properties Ltd

¹⁹⁴ Compare *Lakes District Rural Landowners Society Inc v Queenstown Lakes District Council* C75/2001 where the Environment Court expressed that view (at [47])

¹⁹⁵ We note that the Council's decision on a subdivision consent (RM160571) dated 31 January 2017 provided to us by counsel for M Guthrie identified that proposal as reaching the tipping point in the area south of the State Highway and east of Morven Hill.

¹⁹⁶ Mr Barr estimated (in his rebuttal evidence at Appendix C) that the additional rural living development potentially able to be undertaken in the notified Precinct Areas as being 520 residential units, an increase of approximately 90% from existing consented residential capacity in those areas.

overall capacity of the Wakatipu Basin to absorb further development is an important factor for us to consider.

90. Lastly, we should record that we have taken the same approach to the implementation of section 32AA as in the Proposed District Plan Stage 1 recommendation reports¹⁹⁷. Our reasoning for recommending amended provisions is set out in the body of our reports, and incorporates the additional section 32 evaluation required, rather than that appearing in a tabulated form within or external to our reports.

2.2 Site-Specific Plan Provisions

91. The submissions we heard sought a variety of relief. While some submitters were content to seek rezoning of their land on the basis of the zone provisions applying generally across the Wakatipu Basin, a number sought relief that was tailored to the situation of their particular property. This varied from submissions that sought stand-alone zones¹⁹⁸ to site specific rules proposed to be inserted into the more general provisions. Most commonly, this involved a reduced density to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity from that the subject of the provisions of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) as notified.
92. The Hearing Panels considering rezoning matters in relation to the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) faced a similar position¹⁹⁹. We take the same view as those reports, namely that while no issue can be taken regarding the jurisdiction to insert site-specific plan provisions if a submission sought that relief, a proliferation of such site-specific provision, raises issues in terms of plan administration, potentially causing the plan to lose overall direction and coherence, and adversely affecting its usability.
93. More generally, having considered the submissions on Chapter 24 and made recommendations, as appropriate, to vary those provisions, we think that we ought to apply the zones as recommended unless there is good reason not to do so.
94. As we noted earlier in our Report, the provisions of Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) recognise that a Resort, as defined, is an activity to be distinguished from Urban Development. While we were advised that the objectives and policies applying to Resorts are the subject of appeal, our understanding is that the essential elements of a Resort, as captured by the definition of that term, is not now the subject of appeal.
95. There is no general Resort Zone. To the extent that the Proposed District Plan recognises Resorts, it is by way of, in each instance, a zone specific to that resort²⁰⁰.
96. Accordingly, this is one situation where, were we to be satisfied that there is a good case for the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) to recognise a new Resort, it would appear logical to do so by way of a discrete zone of its own
97. In other situations, we have, in each case, considered whether the proposed provisions give effect to and implement the strategic direction chapters, having appropriate regard to

¹⁹⁷ See Report 1 at Section 1.8

¹⁹⁸ E.g. Middleton Family Trust, Waterfall Park Developments, Trojan Helmet Limited, Hogans Gully Farms

¹⁹⁹ See Report 16 at Section 2.5 and Report 17.01 at Section 2.3

²⁰⁰ Millbrook Resort Zone, Chapter 43 and Waterfall Park Zone, Chapter 42

(implementing as required) the higher level directions contained in the various documents relevant to our recommendations (and Part 2 of the Act where applicable) together with the effect on the environment of applying the proposed zone. We have also considered whether the proposed provisions have been drafted in a manner consistent with the resource management approach of the Proposed District Plan.

2.3 Background to Chapter 24

98. The version of Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan notified in 2015 had both similarities and differences to the then Operative District Plan. Among other things, recognition of Visual Amenity Landscapes (VALs) and Other Rural Landscapes (ORLs) in the Operative District Plan was overtaken by identification of non-outstanding rural land as being within the Rural Landscape Classification²⁰¹ with a separate set of objectives policies and other provisions applying to it. Policy 6.3.1.2²⁰² stated that the Rural Landscape Classification related to landscapes zoned Rural in the district.
99. Like the Operative District Plan, the notified version of the Stage 1 Proposed District Plan retained a general Rural Zone covering much of the District, supplemented by zones intended to facilitate rural living at different densities (principally the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones).
100. As with the Operative District Plan, the Stage 1 Proposed District Plan did not specify a minimum density for subdivision and residential development within the general Rural Zone. Subject to specified exceptions, applications for subdivision and residential development were discretionary activities. Again paralleling the provisions in the Operative District Plan in this regard, provisions of the Stage 1 Proposed District Plan as notified sought to displace any inference that might have been taken from that activity classification, to the effect that subdivision and development was generally appropriate in the Rural Zone²⁰³.
101. During the course of its hearing of submissions on the chapters of the Proposed District Plan containing the rules implementing this general structure, the Stream 2 Hearing Panel formed the view that further work was required to evaluate the extent to which the Proposed District Plan (as notified), as it affected the floor of the Wakatipu Basin, was the most appropriate method to manage the natural and physical resources within that area. More specifically, in a Minute dated 1 July 2016, the Hearing Panel stated:

“In the course of the hearing, based on the evidence from the Council and submitters, we came to the preliminary conclusion that continuation of the fully discretionary development regime of the Rural General Zone of the ODP, as proposed by the PDP, was unlikely to achieve the Strategic Direction of the PDP in the Wakatipu Basin over the life of the PDP. We are concerned that, without careful assessment, further development within the Wakatipu Basin has the potential to cumulatively and irreversibly damage the character and amenity values which attracts residents and other activities to the area.”²⁰⁴

²⁰¹ Renamed Rural Character Landscape in the Decisions Version of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1)

²⁰² Renumbered 6.3.1 in the Decisions Version

²⁰³ See notified Policy 6.3.1.4 of the Stage 1 Proposed District Plan as notified and compare section 1.5.3(iii) of the Operative District Plan

²⁰⁴ At paragraph 8

102. The Hearing Panel recommended to the Council that a detailed study of the floor of the Wakatipu Basin was required, among other things, to:
- “Determine whether, given the residual [sic] development already consented, there is any capacity for further development in the Wakatipu Basin floor and, if there is, where it should be located and what form it should take.”*
103. The Council accepted that recommendation with the result that submissions relevant to subdivision and development of the Wakatipu Basin were deferred and were not the subject of recommendation or decision as part of the Stage 1 Proposed District Plan, pending the results of the study that the Council commissioned.
104. The resulting Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study²⁰⁵ concurred with the Hearing Panel’s preliminary conclusion quoted above. Having undertaken a comprehensive analysis of the Wakatipu Basin, the report writers identified 25 landscape character units (LCUs) with varying capacity to absorb additional development; ranging from very low to high. The Report recommended a rating of moderate-high as an appropriate threshold for upzoning and expressed the opinion that up-zoning units with lower ratings ran the risk of *“...detracting from the high amenity values of the study area; undermining the impression of informal nodes of rural residential development interspersed with swathes of more open, rural areas; and/or detracting from the neighbouring ONFL [Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape] context.”*²⁰⁶
105. This Report (which we will refer to hereafter as the WB Landscape Study) provided the methodological basis for Chapter 24 and the accompanying planning maps, the subject of the submissions we heard. Specifically, the WB Landscape Study provided the basis for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (“Rural Amenity Zone”) with a specified minimum lot size of 80 hectares and buildings requiring consent as a restricted discretionary activity, but subject to the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (“Precinct”) being embedded within the broader Rural Amenity Zone with a significantly smaller lot size and its own additional objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria (replacing the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones previously applying to discrete areas within the Wakatipu Basin). The descriptions in the WB Landscape Study of each LCU, including their respective absorptive capacities, are annexed to Chapter 24 and cross referenced in the text of the chapter.
106. The WB Landscape Study is an impressive piece of work and we were assisted by being able to discuss the landscape considerations underpinning it with one of its principal authors, Ms Gilbert. She provided evidence explaining some of the differences between recommendations in the WB Landscape Study and the notified Stage 2 Proposed District Plan provisions.
107. Among other things, Ms Gilbert explained to us the further analysis that led to the recommendation that the minimum lot size in the Precinct should be 6000m² rather than 4000m².

²⁰⁵ Final Report dated March 2017, Authors Barry Kaye, Kelvin Norgrove and Bridget Gilbert

²⁰⁶ WB Landscape Study at 1.18

108. The WB Landscape Study recommendations were not accepted by Council in two notable respects:
- a. The Study recommended a Ladies Mile Gateway Precinct providing for a density of development at the same levels as the Low or Medium Density Residential Zones in the Proposed District Plan, subject to a 75 metre building setback control from the State Highway. The concept recommended by the Study was of an urban parkland type development character with amenity, landscape and infrastructure issues required to be addressed through a Structure Plan process. The Council determined instead that the eastern end of the Ladies Mile area be zoned Rural Amenity, and that the balance of Ladies Mile should be left zoned Rural, as per the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) as notified, pending further investigation.
 - b. The study recommended a separate Arrowtown Precinct be identified for the areas west of McDonnell Road not forming part of the Hills Golf Course property, together with the area east of McDonnell Road and south of the current Urban Growth Boundary of Arrowtown, with provision for density of development at the same levels as the Low or Medium Density Residential Zones. As with Ladies Mile, the Landscape Study suggested an urban parkland approach was appropriate for this area with a structure plan process to address amenity, landscape and infrastructure issues. The Council determined that aside from the land the subject of the Arrowtown South Special Zone, which was left unchanged, the balance of the area the Landscape Study had proposed make up the Arrowtown Precinct be rezoned Rural Amenity.
109. Understandably, a number of submitters with interests in the land the WB Landscape Study had recommended form one or other of these two precincts sought to rely on the reasoning of the WB Landscape Study in key respects. We discuss those submissions in much greater detail in the relevant reports.
110. More generally, the evidence we heard from submitters largely accepted the methodology the WB Landscape Study had employed although it was suggested to us that the study was too broad brush and needed to have provided more finely grained recommendations as to the particular areas deserving greater protection²⁰⁷.
111. We record specifically that the criticisms of the WB Landscape Study in the submission of the Darby Partners LP²⁰⁸, among other things, that suggested it was so flawed that Chapter 24 should be withdrawn, were not backed up by expert evidence, or pursued when the submitter appeared. We compare the expert evidence of Ms Yvonne Pflüger²⁰⁹, who advised us that in her opinion, the WB Landscape Study was well done, and she supported its conclusions.
112. Clearly, the WB Landscape Study was not accepted on all points. A number of other aspects of the WP Landscape Study were the subject of evidence challenging specific aspects of the study. The competing expert evidence we heard, however, tended to focus on the specific areas the subject of submission and its immediate environs, rather than putting the landscape issues in the broader context of the entire Basin. While we accept that a compartmentalised

²⁰⁷ See e.g. the landscape evidence of Mr Stephen Skelton for Burgess Duke Trust and Ashford Trust

²⁰⁸ Submission 2376

²⁰⁹ For Trojan Helmet Ltd and Boxer Hills Trust

analysis of landscape issues is useful, and in some cases might be determinative, the absence of a broadscape review, showing how the more detailed analysis fitted into the bigger picture, rather lessened the weight we felt we could give to that evidence in many cases where it conflicted with Ms Gilbert’s more comprehensive analysis of the issues. The exception in this regard was Ms Rebecca Hadley who, although not able to present her views as those of an *independent* expert, did give us an alternative overall concept (to that of Ms Gilbert) to ponder in respect of the central area of the Basin.

113. Our discussion of the more specific issues that we had to determine should be read in the light of these more general comments.

2.4 General Challenges to Chapter 24

114. Mr Barr identified a number of general provisions opposing Chapter 24 noting specifically:
- a. The submission of Jane Shearer²¹⁰ also sought that the variation ceases and a full review of the zoning in rural areas is undertaken;
 - b. The submission of Bruce McLeod²¹¹ who opposed the variation creating Chapter 24 and critiquing the research analysis underlying it. Mr McLeod also made a number of requests for specific changes to Chapter 24 that we will discuss in that context;
 - c. The submission of Phillip Blakely and Mary Blakely-Wallace²¹² who sought that the subdivision rules proposed in Chapter 24 are more similar to the Rural Zone rules with no minimum lot size and subdivision being a discretionary activity, and that the merging of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones into the Precinct is reconsidered;
 - d. The submission of Anna-Marie Chin²¹³ who opposed Chapter 24 to the extent that it puts more restrictions on being able to build than the “*present zone*”;
 - e. The submission of David Shepherd²¹⁴ who sought that the Precinct be abandoned, and the existing minimum lot sizes remain;
 - f. The submission of Kaye Eden²¹⁵ who opposed both the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct and sought that subdivisions be considered on their merits, that the minimum lot size in the Rural Amenity Zone be significantly reduced and that the minimum lot size in the lifestyle area be increased (to 2 hectares);
 - g. The submission of Roger Monk²¹⁶ who sought that the Rural Amenity Zone be rejected, and the status quo of no minimum lot area and a discretionary activity status be substituted;
 - h. The submission of John Martin²¹⁷ who sought that the variation be withdrawn, and asserted both that the Landscape Study findings are flawed and that there is no resource management rationale for the 80 hectare minimum lot size in the Rural Amenity Zone.

²¹⁰ Submission 2055

²¹¹ Submission 2231: Supported by FS 2734, FS2744, FS2750, FS2770, FS2741, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2784, FS2741 and FS2783

²¹² Submission 2499

²¹³ Submission 2241

²¹⁴ Submission 2135: Opposed by FS2797

²¹⁵ Submission 2360

²¹⁶ Submission 2281: Supported by FS2716, FS2769, FS2795 and FS2796. Mr Barr noted a number of other submissions to similar effect, seeking retention of the Operative District Plan zoning regime

²¹⁷ Submission 2606

115. Mr Barr noted a group of submissions filed by resource management firm Southern Planning Group that opposed the entirety of Chapter 24, but also sought specific changes to provisions that are addressed later in this Report²¹⁸.
116. Mr Barr also identified a large group of submissions filed by Anderson Lloyd Solicitors in identical terms which sought a similar regime to the Operative District Plan with no minimum lot size or specified density requirement in the Amenity Zone Area²¹⁹. Mr Barr referred us to the submissions of DJ Robertson²²⁰, Timothy Roberts²²¹, C Dagg²²² and Kim Fam²²³ to similar effect.
117. Most of the submitters generally opposing Chapter 24 did not appear in support of their submission. In addition, to the extent that their position rested on criticism of the WB Landscape Study, as already noted, this was not generally supported by the expert landscape witnesses that we heard from.
118. For his part, Mr Barr gave evidence firmly supporting the general approach of Chapter 24 including the 80 hectare minimum density standard for the Rural Amenity Zone, and non-complying status for applications not meeting that standard. He relied on the WB Landscape Study and the section 32 analysis supporting Chapter 24 and recommended that the submissions generally opposing Chapter 24, or key elements such as the Rural Amenity Zone density standard and activity status, be rejected.
119. The evidence of Mr Ben Farrell for Wakatipu Equities Limited and Slopehill Properties Limited, and Mr Jeff Brown for Lake Hayes Investments Limited, Stoneridge Estate Limited, D Duncan, R Daymon, Crosby Developments, L McFadgen, Slopehill Joint Venture, R & M Donaldson, United States Ranch Limited, M McGuinness, DJ Robertson, Trojan Helmet Limited, Hogans Gully Farm Limited, Burdon & Wills, Boxer Hill Trust and P Chittock advanced contrary positions.
120. Mr Brown noted that he had been involved in the Environment Court case in which the operative regime for rural subdivision and development had originated and advised that he continued to support a discretionary regime distinguishing between Section 6 and Section 7 landscapes, with no minimum lot size. He considered that in the nearly 20 years of its operation the regime had been successful and that no problems had been identified justifying the change to the non-complying/80 hectare regime in Chapter 24.
121. Mr Brown recommended, therefore, that it should be replaced by a fully discretionary regime, as per the Rural Zone of Stage 1 of the PDP, comprising suitable objectives, policies and assessment matters that promote appropriate subdivision and development and the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the Wakatipu Basin.
122. In his view:

²¹⁸ See for instance the submission of Speargrass Trust: Submission 2410

²¹⁹ See e.g. the submission of Morven Ferry Limited: Submission 2449

²²⁰ Submission 2321

²²¹ Submission 2477

²²² Submission 2586

²²³ Submission 2589

“Even taking into account the ONL/ONF areas, the Basin has the potential to absorb some additional development at a scale and form that is compatible with the existing character of the landscape and in a way that would not contribute to any perceived adverse, actual or cumulative effect on landscape values and rural character. Across the Basin and in many individual properties there is a variety of locational attributes, topographies, and degrees of potential visibility. This variety justifies a regulatory approach to subdivision and development that does not impose a blanket “one size fits all” control.”

123. For his part, Mr Farrell noted that Chapter 24 addressed a key issue he had raised in his evidence in relation to the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) by provision of a separate policy framework for the Wakatipu Basin. However, he was of the view that the benefits of rural living were not satisfactorily recognised and provided for through the objectives, which inappropriately sought to protect significant amenity landscape values rather than maintain or enhance them.
124. Mr Farrell supported the proposed policy framework in Chapter 24 insofar as it introduces a description of the respective land units but in his view, the landscape descriptions and associated policy framework do not adequately identify the landscape qualities and characteristics which should be maintained or enhanced. He supported the discretionary regime for subdivision and development, subject to an exception for development within identified sensitive landscape areas where, in his view, it was more appropriate to manage subdivision and land use as a non-complying activity. Mr Farrell relied on the landscape evidence of Mr Skelton for the identification of the areas where this exception should apply.
125. Hogans Gully Farms suggested a variation of the approach supported by Mr Farrell as alternative relief in its submission. This would involve a discretionary activity status for subdivision and development in the Landscape Character Units identified as having a “moderate” absorption capacity in the WB Landscape Study²²⁴.
126. We also had legal submissions from a number of parties in relation to the issues canvassed in Messrs Brown and Farrell’s evidence. We refer in particular to the legal submissions for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, Bunn, Green and Morven Ferry Limited that analysed the provisions of Chapter 24 relative to the revised provisions of the Proposed RPS (including those the subject of draft consent orders, but at that point not confirmed by the Environment Court), and concluded that Chapter 24 goes beyond what is now required by the Proposed RPS. Counsel emphasised also the decision in *Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc v Whakatane District Council*²²⁵ already referred to insofar as it confirmed that where the purpose of the Act and the objectives of the Plan can be met by a less restrictive regime, then that regime should be adopted.
127. In his evidence in reply, Mr Barr analysed the revised RPS provisions relied on by counsel for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and others and expressed the view that Chapter 24:

²²⁴ The WB Landscape Study identified LCU’s 15 (Hogans Gully Farm), 22 (The Hills) and 23 (Millbrook) as being in this category

²²⁵ [2017] NZ EnvC 051

- a. Accords with and assists with the strategic directions of the PDP to give effect to Objective 1.1 and Policies 1.1.1 to 1.1.2 and Objective 1.2 and Policy 1.2.1 (as revised)²²⁶; and
 - b. Gives effect to Proposed Revised RPS Policy 3.2.6(a) by the provision of a relatively strict policy and rule framework expressly providing for rural living in locations where the landscape has been identified as having capacity for additional rural living development in areas identified as Lifestyle Precinct²²⁷.
128. In her Reply submissions, counsel for the Council drew attention to the language used by counsel for submitters, emphasising that they did not go so far as to say Chapter 24 does not give effect to the Proposed RPS, but rather used language such as that quoted above – provide very little support for, goes beyond what is required, etc.
129. The starting point for analysis of these competing positions is the reasoning of the Environment Court putting in place the discretionary activity regime Council now seeks to depart from. The key decision is that the Environment Court in *Wakatipu Environmental Society Inc v Queenstown Lakes District Council*²²⁸. The Court there recorded the pros and cons of a minimum lot size coupled with non-complying status for exceedances versus a discretionary regime with no minimum lot size. Many of the points summarised in the Court’s decision were the same as those have been put to us. The Court concluded on balance that it agreed with those (including Mr Brown) supporting the latter. It noted as a key factor the fact that the policies of the Rural General Zone expressly contemplated that there would be locations in which development may be appropriate, because the landscape in question could absorb change. Accordingly, the question for the Court was whether such development was better guided by broad brush District-wide policies (as on non-complying activities) or by finer grained criteria (on a discretionary regime). It came down on the side of the latter but noted that *“we remain alert to the considerable problems with controlling subdivision and rural residential development as discretionary activities and hope to deal with those in what follows.”*²²⁹
130. What followed was a discussion of the fact that discretionary activities were used in the then Proposed Plan in a specialised way. The Court commented:
- “The “Special Discretionary Activity” should be defined so as to make it clear that there is a presumption that resource consent will be difficult to obtain because in the Rural General Zone the activity being considered is more likely to be inappropriate than appropriate. The revised Plan (and the Transitional Plan) have not worked satisfactorily in our view to control cumulative effects, and particular care needs to be taken over this issue now”.*²³⁰
131. In a subsequent decision, having reflected on it further, the Court decided that a definition of discretionary activity was not required so long as the reasons for classifying activities as discretion included a statement that activities had been classified as such where they were not suitable in most locations in a zone or part of a zone, but might be suitable in a few locations²³¹.

²²⁶ Barr Reply at 3.9

²²⁷ Barr Reply at 3.41

²²⁸ C186/2000

²²⁹ Ibid at [21]

²³⁰ Ibid at [23]

²³¹ See *Lakes District Rural Landowners Society Inc v Queenstown Lakes District Council* C75/2001 at [44]

132. The second key control that the Court put in place was a series of assessment criteria focussing on the extent of development within a defined radius of an application site. This went through various iterations in the Court decisions. As the Court noted in the later decision already referred to²³²:

“One of the most difficult issues to determine is how to prevent residential development in the VAL and/or ORL becoming gradually so dense that the Wakatipu Basin loses its rural character.”

133. In a later decision again²³³, the Court described the final form of the so called “radius” criterion as being “one of a unseverable set that we regard as the minimum which might just, possibly, achieve the purpose of the Act”²³⁴.
134. Considering the extent to which the Environment Court’s reasoning remains valid, we think it is fair to say that both the policy regime in Chapter 24 and the evidence of the Council (particularly that of Ms Gilbert) would support the view that there is scope to absorb some development within the Rural Amenity Zone. As was the case in 2000-2001, the issue is how the Rural Amenity Zone is best managed to identify those areas with further development potential and to exclude development in areas where that is inappropriate.
135. In terms of the success or otherwise of the operative regime in managing cumulative effects, Mr Vivian offered us the view, when presenting his evidence for a group of submitters including Skipp Williamson, Wakatipu Investments Limited, Broomfield and Woodlot, that the radius criterion had not been successful. Certainly, it has not been retained in the assessment criteria in Chapter 21 of the Decisions Version (governing the Rural Zone).
136. Considering Mr Brown’s view that the existing regime has nevertheless worked well and should be retained, we note that the Stream 1B Panel did not agree that subdivision, use and development should be the subject of case by case merits assessment, and considered that it was past time for the Proposed District Plan to pick up on the Environment Court’s 1999 finding that there were areas of the Wakatipu Basin that required careful management, because they were already and/or very close to the limit at which over domestication would occur²³⁵. Strategic Policies 3.3.22-24 reflect that view.
137. We have already quoted from the Minute of the Stream 2 Hearing Panel dated 1 July 2016 indicating its preliminary view that the continuation of the existing regime governing the Rural General Zone was unlikely to achieve the strategic direction of the Proposed District Plan.
138. The WB Landscape Study came to the same view.
139. Trying to rationalise the differences of opinion, we wonder whether Mr Brown (and others who expressed a like view regarding the relative success of the existing regime) have fully taken into account the extent of latent development in the Wakatipu Basin authorised by

²³² C75/2001 at [47]

²³³ *Lakes District Rural Landowners Society Inc v Queenstown Lakes District Council* C162/2001

²³⁴ *Ibid* at [60]

²³⁵ See Report 3 at Section 2.11

building platforms registered on Computer Freehold Registers that have not yet been actioned. In its 2004 decision, *Hawthorn Estate Limited v Queenstown Lakes District Council*²³⁶, the Environment Court accepted as a fact “that it is practically certain that approved building sites in the Wakatipu basin will be built on”²³⁷. Absent a change in the planning framework governing construction within approved building platforms (about which we will have more to say later in this Report), we have no reason to doubt that that remains the case. Accordingly, assessments of the success or otherwise of the existing regime governing development in the Basin, as the WB Landscape Study has done, need to take account, not just the extent of development visible on the ground, but that which is in reality in train.

140. We also note that the minimum lot size proposed in the Rural Amenity Zone of 80 hectares is quite a different beast to that which was under consideration in the Environment Court’s 2000 decision. There, the proposed minimum lot size in the Rural General Zone was 4 hectares, and the arbitrary nature of that limit, together with the potential for it to encourage people to subdivide down to the minimum level in an inefficient manner, were identified as potential reasons not to pursue that as an option.
141. An 80 hectare minimum lot size does not have those same implications. Mr Barr’s evidence was that there are in practice only three or four properties in the Basin with lot sizes greater than 160 hectares that could take advantage of such a minimum lot size. Indeed, that was one of the criticisms made of the approach in Chapter 24 by submitters. Mr Barr identified the 80 hectare minimum lot size as effectively limiting subdivision potential to boundary adjustments.
142. We think that such a large minimum lot size sends a clear message that for those properties not zoned within the Precinct, applications for subdivision and development will need to be particularly well thought out and justified to stand any prospect of success.
143. Ultimately, we think that that was the message the Environment Court was trying to send with its “special” discretionary activity status.
144. We also note that Mr Farrell did not oppose the approach taken in Chapter 24 in principle. His issue, as we understood it, was that the Zone was too large and the area where subdivision and development was to be considered as a non-complying activity consequently also too large. We regard that as turning on the view one takes of the landscape evidence rather than a difference in planning principle.
145. Turning to the arguments put to us based on what is now the Partially Operative RPS 2019 put to us by counsel for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and others, counsel emphasised the new chapter of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 which she described as “seeking to specifically recognise the enabling aspects of Part 2 without qualification of protective provisions”. Working through those new provisions, Objective 1.1 reads:

“Otago’s resources are used sustainably to promote economic, social and cultural wellbeing for its people and communities.”

²³⁶ C83/2004

²³⁷ Ibid at [21]

146. Policy 1.1.1 reads:

“Provide for the economic wellbeing of Otago’s people and communities by enabling the resilient and sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources”.

147. We do not accept counsel’s submission that these provisions offer unqualified support to use and development. In both cases, reference to sustainable use qualifies the provisions. In an RMA context, in the absence of a clear intention to the contrary, any reference to sustainability imports reference to section 5 of the Act. As the Supreme Court noted in *King Salmon*, section 5 focuses on the use, development **and protection** of natural and physical resources.

148. In *King Salmon*, the Supreme Court also identified that the obligation to give effect to higher order policy documents has varying force in practice depending on what it must be given effect to. The Supreme Court’s point was that the obligation to give effect to policies might be highly prescriptive if a policy is framed in a specific and unqualified way, but much less prescriptive if the policy is worded at a higher level of abstraction²³⁸. In our view, an objective and policy framed around the concept of sustainable use and development is at the less prescriptive end of the spectrum.

149. Policy 1.1.2 of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 is also framed in the language of sustainable management, providing for the social and cultural wellbeing and health and safety of Otago’s people and communities when undertaking the subdivision, use, development and protection of natural and physical resources by a range of steps. It is not framed in a way suggesting that the listed steps are the only ways in which social and cultural wellbeing and health and safety are provided for.

150. Counsel referred us also to the provisions of Chapter 3 which, at that point, was the subject of a draft consent order lodged with the Environment Court, but not signed off, and in particular to Policy 3.2.6²³⁹. That Policy needs to be read in the context of Objective 3.2 as suggested to be revised the draft consent order to read:

“Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced where degraded.”

151. The evidence for the Council that the rural areas of the Wakatipu Basin are amenity landscapes and highly valued was not, we think, the subject of any challenge and so this objective is directly applicable to it. The policies of Section 3.2 of the Proposed RPS distinguish between Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes (addressed under Policy 3.2.4) and highly valued Natural Features and Landscapes (addressed under Policy 3.2.6). As put to the Court, Policy 3.2.6 indicates an intention to maintain or enhance highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascape by all of the following:

- a. Avoiding significant adverse effects on those values that contribute to the higher value of the natural feature, landscape or seascape;*
- b. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects;*

²³⁸ See [2014] NZSC 38 at [80]

²³⁹ That remains the position as at the date of finalisation of this report

c. *Encourage enhancement of those values that contribute to the high value of the natural feature, landscape, or seascape.”*

152. We agree with Mr Barr’s evidence in reply²⁴⁰ that the land within the Rural Amenity Zone not identified as Precinct has a generally low threshold for additional adverse cumulative effects from residential subdivision and land use, although varying from area to area; some areas are more sensitive than others. The WB Landscape Study, and Ms Gilbert’s evidence supports the view that unless managed particularly carefully, those cumulative effects will be significant and in terms of the revised Policy, need to be avoided.
153. Even if this were not the case, we would still be of the view that Chapter 24 gives effect to the revised Policy 3.2.6 because the instruction to avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects in Policy 3.2.6(b) gives the Council a wide discretion as to how exactly such effects are managed. We suspect that this is why counsel’s submissions did not assert that Chapter 24 does not give effect to the Proposed RPS in this regard but rather *“goes beyond what is required by the RPS”*.
154. We find that, considered at a high level, Chapter 24 is consistent with the Proposed RPS and gives effect to the Partially Operative RPS 2019.
155. In summary, we were not persuaded by the merits of the submissions and evidence opposing Chapter 24 generally, and/or seeking a reversion to the current regime governing subdivision and development in the Rural Zone (either under the Operative District Plan or the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1)). Given the comprehensive and convincing analysis contained in the WB Landscape Study, at this general level, we prefer the submissions and evidence for Council supporting the notified Chapter 24.
156. We have considered potential compromise positions such as that supported by Mr Farrell, or the alternative relief in the Hogans Gully Farm submission. The difficulty with Mr Farrell’s option is that Mr Skelton had focussed only on the land of Wakatipu Equities and Slopehill Properties. His evidence did not purport to be a complete review of the Basin to identify the sensitive areas within it. Nor did Mr Farrell provide us with a complete set of Plan provisions that would implement the split regime (part Discretionary, part Non-Complying) that he supported. The Hogans Gully alternative would overcome the limitation in geographical scope, because it utilises the analysis in the WB Landscape Study. However, it was unsupported by planning evidence that would have both fleshed out the Plan provisions required to implement it and provided the basis of an analysis under section 32.
157. In summary, neither compromise option is a viable alternative that we might seriously consider for the reasons set out above.
158. Our conclusion is therefore that the Rural Amenity Zone should be retained, supported by non-complying status for exceedances of the specified minimum lot density, leaves open the question of what the specified minimum lot density is. We will discuss submissions on that point when we come to the detailed provisions of Chapter 24, although our conclusions as to the appropriate role of the Rural Amenity Zone mean that a significant reduction in the

²⁴⁰ At 3.40

minimum lot density (e.g. to 4ha) would be inconsistent with that role (as well as introducing one of the deficiencies identified by the Environment Court in 2000 that was relevant to its decision to adopt the regime in the Operative District Plan). It also leaves open the question of whether the Precinct continues to have the role of a sub-zone enabling greater opportunities for rural living within the Rural Amenity Zone, in substitution for the separate Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones previously applying to rural land in the Wakatipu Basin in the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1).

159. We have already noted some of the general submissions on this point that Mr Barr drew to our attention. The Precinct was the subject of a number of other submissions that opposed it in principle and sought retention of the status quo. In some cases, this was clearly motivated by opposition to the effective up-zoning of parts of the Wakatipu Basin²⁴¹. Insofar as the motivation for these submissions was to oppose Precinct Zoning of particular properties, we will deal with that in the appropriate report. Similarly, to the extent that the motivation for this submission lay in the minimum lot density specified within the Precinct areas, we will address that in the context of our discussion of the particular provisions of Chapter 24. The submitters did not, however, present a case in support of their more general opposition to the Precinct that would provide us with the basis to take a different view from the evidence presented for the Council.
160. The submission of Wakatipu Investments Limited²⁴² took a different stance, seeking that the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct each be subzones of an overarching Wakatipu Basin Zone with distinct visions. The submission did not suggest what those visions should be and when Mr Carey Vivian presented planning evidence for the submitter, it appeared to us that his concern was more with the potential inconsistency of the objectives and policies applying to the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct respectively. This submission, if accepted, would require a radical restructuring of Chapter 24. In the absence of a clearly stated outline as to how such a restructuring should be undertaken, and with what end result, it is not possible to undertake a section 32 analysis of the relief sought. It would be inappropriate to recommend it be taken further.
161. Our recommendation is therefore that the essential structure of Chapter 24 be retained. This means that we necessarily accept Mr Barr's recommendation²⁴³ that the submissions lodged as part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) and deferred to the Stream 14 hearing relating to the application of the Rural, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones in the Wakatipu Basin have effectively been overtaken by Chapter 24, except in those few areas of Rural Zone land (principally on Ladies Mile) that were not included within the notified Proposed District Plan (Stage 2).
162. Save in the case of submissions addressing those areas, those submissions do not require further consideration.

²⁴¹ See e.g. Submissions 2084, 2122, 2192, 2193, 2206, 2209, 2530 and 2656

²⁴² Submission 2275; Opposed by FS2732. See also submissions 2272 and 2276 to like effect.

²⁴³ See Section 7 of his Section 42A Report

163. There were also a number of general submissions focussing on the procedural underpinning for Chapter 24. A number of submissions sought, for instance that further assessments be undertaken prior to the hearings for Chapter 24²⁴⁴ or that the section 32 analysis be revised²⁴⁵.

164. Such submissions do not relate to matters within our jurisdiction and must necessarily be rejected.

2.5 Amendments to Chapters 3 and 6

165. We have already discussed the significance of the 'Strategic Chapters' of the Proposed District Plan²⁴⁶ in Section 2.1. In summary, those chapters provide higher level direction for the more detailed chapters of the Proposed District Plan that follow.

166. Apart from two sections of Chapter 6, the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) did not include any additions or amendments to the strategic chapters.

167. We note that those two amendments were not listed for hearing as part of Stream 14, but they were the subject of evidence in Mr Barr's Section 42A Report.

168. Having initially submitted we should make no recommendation on those changes, because they were not properly before us, Ms Scott for the Council noted that most but not all of the submitters on the two Chapter 6 changes were parties to Stream 14. She therefore suggested that we might provide comments on those suggested changes for the benefit of the Stream 15 Hearing Panel. We understand that the Stream 15 Hearing Panel did not receive any additional evidence from submitters on this subject and so it may be helpful if we set out our views, as Ms Scott suggested. We will do after dealing with the submissions on other aspects of Chapters 3 and 6.

169. A number of submitters sought changes to both Chapter 3 and Chapter 6 that were not the subject of variation by the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2). Such submissions give rise to an initial legal issue, as to whether they are "on" the provisions notified so that we might consider their merits. Case law is clear that where the subject matter of a Plan Change or Variation is limited, submissions cannot provide jurisdiction to expand the scope of the Plan Change/Variation²⁴⁷.

170. In this particular case, there is the additional consideration that the appeals on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) put practically all of Chapters 3 and 6 in issue, so that the wording of provisions in those chapters is a matter for the Environment Court, and not for us.

²⁴⁴ See e.g. Submissions 2246, 2251 and 2332: Supported by FS2765 and FS2766; Opposed by FS2714 that sought that a housing and business development capacity assessment be completed and released, prior to the hearings

²⁴⁵ See Submission 2332; Opposed by FS2714

²⁴⁶ Chapters 3-6 inclusive

²⁴⁷ See e.g. *Clearwater Resort Limited v Christchurch City Council* High Court AP34/02; *Palmerston North City Council v Motor Machinists Limited* [2013] NZHC 1290. Compare *Albany North Landowners and others v Auckland Council* [2016] NZHC 138 per Whata J at [129]-[131] emphasising the difference when submissions are made on a full district plan review (in that case the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan).

171. Ms Scott for the Council submitted to us that submissions might properly seek amendments to the strategic chapters by way of addition, provided those additions are specific to the areas of the Wakatipu Basin the subject of Chapter 24 and do not impact on the application of the existing provisions in those chapters to the balance of the District.
172. Ms Scott specifically took issue with amendments to the strategic chapters suggested by Mr Farrell in his evidence for Wakatipu Equities Limited and Slopehill Properties Limited on the basis that they would not satisfy that test.
173. Applying the approach suggested by Ms Scott, Mr Barr's Section 42A Report concluded that it was desirable to add a series of additional policies to Chapter 6 to ensure Chapter 24 implements Chapter 6 and achieves Chapter 3²⁴⁸.
174. We will discuss Mr Barr's recommendations shortly. First though we need to address the extent of our jurisdiction, because Counsel for Boxer Hills Trust and Trojan Helmet Limited, Ms Wolt, took issue with Ms Scott's submissions for Council. She argued that there was no scope to add additional provisions to Chapter 6 of the Proposed District Plan because, with the exceptions we have noted above, the higher order chapters were not addressed by the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), and it would cause significant prejudice to submitters, including Trojan Helmet Limited if the Proposed Plan were amended by a "side wind". Counsel also recorded that it had been obvious to Trojan Helmet Limited that there was no clear connection between Chapter 24 and the higher order strategic chapters, but the submitter considered there was no jurisdiction to make a submission on these chapters.
175. We found that submission somewhat curious given that Boxer Hills Trust, which we understood to be a related entity to Trojan Helmet Limited and for whom counsel was also making legal submissions, was one of a number of submitters whose submission sought as relief that Chapters 3 and 6 be amended so that the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct "are integrated with and have higher order authority from those chapters". The submission noted specifically that that would include new objectives and policies within those chapters. Counsel did not explain how she was able to reconcile the conflicting positions between the parties for whom she was appearing²⁴⁹.
176. We agree with Ms Scott's submissions on the extent of our jurisdiction. Clearly, we have no ability to recommend amendments to provisions that are now before the Environment Court. To the extent that Mr Farrell sought to persuade us of the merits of different objectives and policies in the strategic chapters, we think that evidence was misconceived. It follows also that Submission 2244, which opposed Chapters 3 and 6, along with the Morven Ferry et al submissions that proposed amendments to a number of provisions in Chapters 3, 6 and 21 that were not the subject of variation, must necessarily be rejected as being out of scope²⁵⁰.
177. By the same token, however, we do not think that the fact that new provisions are located within Chapter 6 (or Chapter 3 for that matter) is decisive.

²⁴⁸ Refer paragraphs 38.19-38.21

²⁴⁹ The position adopted for Trojan Helmet Ltd is also difficult to reconcile with its support in FS2796 for Submission 2505 which sought specified amendments to Chapter 3.

²⁵⁰ See also the submission of Queenstown Trails Trust (#2575) repeating submissions made on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) that is out of scope for the same reason.

178. Ms Wolt accepted that we might have scope to put higher level provisions in Chapter 24 (depending on their wording). If additional provisions properly relate to the subject matter of Chapter 24, it does not seem to us that it should matter that those new provisions are located in other parts of the Proposed District Plan, if that better fits with the structure of the PDP.
179. Beyond that, however, to advance our consideration of Mr Barr’s recommendations, we need to review the other submissions that might give jurisdiction for those additional policies.
180. There were a large number of submissions on this aspect of the PDP, but they fell into quite discrete groups.
181. The first group of submissions were either in exactly the same or substantially the same form as the Boxer Hills Trust submission quoted above and sought non-specific amendments to Chapters 3 and 6 so as to provide higher order policy support for Chapter 24, and in many cases also, integration of the Chapter 24 zones with Chapters 3 and 6²⁵¹.
182. A separate group of submissions²⁵² sought amendments to the provisions of Chapters 3 and Chapter 6:

“To provide appropriate objective and policy support for the zone [referring to the Rural Amenity Zone], to:

- *Recognise that the Wakatipu Basin has landscape qualities distinct from the Rural Landscape Classification;*
- *Identify the characteristics and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin through a proper and comprehensive mapping of the landscape character areas within it;*
- *Provide for areas of rural living within the Wakatipu Basin through identification of the lifestyle precinct;*
- *Recognise and provide for areas of commercial activities within the basin and provide for them through a new commercial precinct (“Lakes Hayes Cellar Precinct”);*
- *Provide an appropriate policy structure in support of the proposed areas of landscape character and guidelines underpinning Chapter 24;*
- *Ensure that the landscape categories within Chapter 6 do not apply within the Lifestyle and Commercial Precincts.”*

183. Submissions 2377 and 2378 particularised that relief; they sought new policies in Chapter 3 reading as follows:

“Recognise the Wakatipu Basin as having landscape qualities distinct from the Rural Landscape Classification of the District;

²⁵¹ See Submissions 2291, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320 and 2389: supported by FS2708, FS2709, FS2725, FS2748, FS2750, FS2765, FS2766, FS2781, FS2783, FS2784, FS2787 and FS2792; opposed by FS 2794.

²⁵² Submissions 2376, 2377 and 2788: supported by FS2782, FS2783 and FS2784

Identify the characteristics and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin through the mapping of areas of landscape character and the formulation of associated landscape guidelines.

Provide areas for rural living within the Wakatipu Basin through identification of a lifestyle precinct located within those parts of the landscape having higher capacity to absorb change.

Opportunities for low density housing are enabled within a rural setting to provide greater access to open space recreation, nature conservation and rural amenity values.”

184. Submission 2307 sought the particularised relief quoted above, but not the more general relief.

185. A further group of submissions²⁵³ sought variously:

a. An amendment to notified Objective 3.2.5.5 so that it would read:

“The character of the district’s landscapes is maintained by ongoing agricultural land use and land management where landscape character is derived from predominantly agricultural use.”

b. A new policy in Chapter 3 worded as follows:

“Recognise and provide for the amenity, social, cultural and economic benefits of rural living development.”

c. Amendment to the Policy originally notified as 6.3.1.3 to delete any reference to the Wakatipu Basin.

d. Amendment to the Policy originally notified at 6.3.1.6 to read:

“Encourage rural living subdivision and development where this occurs in areas where the landscape can accommodate change.”

e. Insertion of a new Policy in Chapter 6 reading:

“Recognise the distinctive character of the Wakatipu Basin and the amenity benefits of rural living development in this area.”

186. In his Section 42A Report, Mr Barr considered that no changes to Chapter 3 were necessary. In his view, the notified provisions of Chapter 24 achieve the Chapter 3 strategic directions²⁵⁴.

²⁵³ Submissions 2449, 2475, 2479, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2500, 2501, 2505, 2509, 2525, 2526, 2529, 2550, 2553, 2562, 2577: supported by FS2708, FS2709, FS2711, FS2712, FS2721, FS2722, FS2734, FS2740, FS2743, FS2747, FS2749, FS2765, FS2770, FS2781, FS2782, FS2783, FS2784, FS2792, FS2795 and FS2796; opposed by FS 2715

²⁵⁴ Refer paragraph 38.18

He recommended, however, a new policy to be inserted in Chapter 6 after Policy 6.3.3 (numbered 6.3.XA), worded as follows:

“Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this chapter related to those categories do not apply.” (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.1.8, 3.3.20-24, 3.3.32)

187. The numbering at the end of Mr Barr’s suggested policy follows the structure of the Decisions Version of the Chapter 6 policies, cross referencing the relevant provisions in Chapter 3.
188. Mr Barr recommended a new section be inserted in Chapter 6 to follow Policy 6.3.33, reading²⁵⁵ as follows:

“Managing Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.

- 6.3.34 *Avoid urban development and subdivision to urban densities.*
- 6.3.35 *Enable continuation of the contribution low-intensity pastoral farming on large landholdings makes to the District’s landscape character.*
- 6.3.36 *Avoid indigenous vegetation clearance where it would significantly degrade the visual character and qualities of the District’s distinctive landscapes.*
- 6.3.37 *Encourage subdivision and development proposals to promote indigenous biodiversity protection and regeneration where the landscape and nature conservation values would be maintained or enhanced, particularly where the subdivision or development constitutes a change in the intensity of the land use or the retirement of productive farm land.*
- 6.3.38 *Ensure that subdivision and development adjacent to Outstanding Natural Features does not have more than minor adverse effects on the landscape quality, character and visual amenity of the relevant Outstanding Natural Feature(s).*
- 6.3.39 *Encourage any landscaping to be ecologically viable and consistent with the established character of the area.*
- 6.3.40 *Require the proposals for subdivision or development for rural living take into account existing and consented subdivisional development in assessing the potential for adverse cumulative effects.*
- 6.3.41 *Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.*

²⁵⁵ The cross references to Chapter 3 provisions recommended by Mr Barr are omitted for convenience.

- 6.3.42 *Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade landscape quality or character, or important views as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed developments such as screen planting, mounding and earthworks.*
- 6.3.43 *Locate, design, operate and maintain regionally significant infrastructure so as to seek to avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, while acknowledging that location constraints and/or the nature of the infrastructure may mean that this is not possible in all cases.*
- 6.3.44 *In cases where it is demonstrated that regionally significant infrastructure cannot avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, such adverse effects shall be minimised.*
- 6.3.45 *Avoid adverse effects on visual amenity from subdivision, use and development that:*
- a. *Is highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); or*
 - b. *forms the foreground for an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature when viewed from public roads.*
- 6.3.46 *Avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries that would degrade openness where openness is an important part of its landscape quality or character.*
- 6.3.37 *Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure and to locate within parts of the site where it will minimise disruption to natural land forms and to rural character”.*
189. As Mr Barr made clear, the origins of these 14 suggested new policies lay firmly in the Decisions Version of Chapter 6. Most of the suggested policies are identical to existing policies in that chapter and apply to Rural Character Landscape land. Where policies have been amended, this was only to delete inapplicable elements.
190. The rationale for reproducing all of these policies arises from the fact that Policy 6.3.1 states that the classification of Rural Character Landscape land occurs in “*Rural Zoned*” landscapes in the District. While the amendments to Chapter 6 forming part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) deleted other provisions in the notified Chapter 6 reinforcing that the landscape classifications shown on the planning maps applied only in the Rural Zone, the Hearing Panel observed in Section 8.4 of its Stream 1B Report that Policy 6.3.1 (notified Policy 6.3.1.2) was not the subject of variation and has that end result in any event.
191. The effect of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) is to rezone almost all of the non-outstanding parts of the Wakatipu Basin as Rural Amenity. Accordingly, to the extent that the provisions of Chapters 3 and 6 provide guidance as to the management of activities occurring on Rural Character Landscape land, those provisions largely do not apply in the Wakatipu Basin.
192. It was that position that Mr Barr sought to address with his recommended additional policies. Mr Barr made it clear that his preference would have been to amend Chapter 6 to provide that the policies relevant to the Rural Character Landscape areas also applied within the Wakatipu

Basin, but given the inability to do so in this process, he suggested a new section effectively mirroring those existing policies.

193. In the case presented to us for the Council, two lines of argument were advanced to support our ability to accept Mr Barr's recommendations. The first, from Mr Barr, referenced the submissions on the point that we have summarised above and suggested that if not expressly sought, the relief recommended by Mr Barr addressed the substance of the submissions.
194. The second line of argument was that the policies that Mr Barr recommended already applied to the Wakatipu Basin at notification of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), by virtue of the variations to Chapter 6 contained therein, but that the Hearing Panel's Stage 1 decisions altered that position. Accordingly, it was suggested that Mr Barr's recommendations merely take the Proposed District Plan back to the position it was in at the time the variation of Parts 6.2 and 6.4 were notified.
195. We do not accept the second point. The reasoning of the Hearing Panel considering submissions on the strategic chapters (Stream 1B) was that the limitation on the application of the (renamed) Rural Character Landscape to Rural Zoned land was contained in notified Policy 6.3.1.2. That policy was not the subject of variation as part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) and no submissions sought that it be amended to have the result apparently sought by Council. It remained in Chapter 6, renumbered as Policy 6.3.1. From an answer Mr Barr gave to our questions, we rather understood that the Council deliberately chose not to amend Policy 6.3.1.2 by way of variation because of the difficulty that would have placed the Stream 1B Hearing Panel in seeking to arrive at recommendations in relation to the balance of Chapter 6. Be that as it may, the renumbered Policy 6.3.1 states when the landscape categories apply in terms that, as above, mean that the policies governing Rural Character Landscape land largely do not apply in the Wakatipu Basin. In our view, moving from that position is a substantive change that could only be achieved by way of a submission clearly seeking that relief.
196. Having said that, we agree with Mr Barr's view, and the submissions from a number of parties, that the end result is a disconnect between the higher-level provisions in the Strategic Chapters and the general approach taken in Chapter 24.
197. We disagree with the submissions (and the evidence of Mr Chris Ferguson) that that disconnect extends to Chapter 3. Policies 3.3.22-3.3.24 inclusive are framed in a way that is not specific to Rural Character Landscape land and provides policy direction that in our view, Chapter 24 sits neatly within. The disconnect arises rather with Chapter 6.
198. We find that Mr Barr's suggested Policy 6.3.XA would resolve the problem and fits fairly within the submissions seeking integration of the Chapter 24 Zones with Chapters 3 and 6 noted above. It sets Chapter 24 up as providing a standalone set of provisions, in much the same way as the Gibbston Character Zone.
199. We note that Mr Ferguson also supported that recommendation as providing necessary integration into Chapter 6. The position is not nearly so clear, however, as regards the other policies recommended by Mr Barr.

200. The suggested policies cover a range of issues. However, because they mirror the policies applying to Rural Character Landscape land, they clearly do not respond to Submissions 2377, 2378 and 2703, that sought to emphasise the differences between the Wakatipu Basin and land classified as Rural Character Landscape. Likewise, it difficult to reconcile the recommended relief with the relief sought by the group of submitters including Submission 2449 quoted above, for the same reason.
201. Nor do we think it would be appropriate to rely on the submissions such as 2291 seeking higher level policy guideline and/or integration. The suggested policies are not “*higher-level*”, because they are not framed at a higher level of abstraction than the objectives and policies in Chapter 24. Rather, they provide more detailed policy guidance on a range of points, some of which overlap with objectives and policies in Chapter 24, and some covering discrete issues. Nor are they obviously required to integrate Chapters 6 and 24 in the way that is suggested by Policy 6.3.XA .
202. There is a second problem relying on these policies as a jurisdictional basis for extensive changes to Chapter 6. The relief sought is expressed very generally. While we do not accept the legal argument put to us by Trojan Helmet Limited that no amendments to Chapter 6 could be made based on submissions on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), we do agree that if amendments are to be made, they need to be made on the basis of submissions that are more specific as to the relief sought than such general relief. We do not think that an interested party reading a submission seeking higher level policy direction would contemplate that that might provide a basis for some 14 quite specific new policies overlaying Chapter 24. In summary, while we agree that Mr Barr’s recommendation has merit, we do not consider that we have the scope to accept it.
203. Turning to the balance of the specific relief sought by submitters that is summarised above, we do not think that a policy inserted into Chapter 3 indicating that the Wakatipu Basin has landscape qualities distinct from Rural Character Landscape land adds much to Mr Barr’s suggested Policy 6.3.XA. It would also introduce an inconsistency because other areas with ‘special’ provisions like Gibbston Valley are not the subject of policies in Chapter 3.
204. Of the three other policies suggested by Submissions 2307, 2377 and 2378, we do not consider that they are necessary having regard to the policy we have recommended already providing that the Rural Amenity Zone has a standalone regulatory regime. We consider also that the third policy referring to opportunities for low density housing is expressed too generally. To be within jurisdiction, it needs to be specific to the Wakatipu Basin. If it were made more specific, we do not think a policy stating that opportunities for Low Density Housing are enabled adds anything to notified Objective 24.2.5.
205. Looking at the more general relief sought by Submissions 2376, 2377 and 2378, specific reference to one new Commercial Precinct is the opposite of higher-level policy guidance. If recognition of such a new Commercial Precinct has merit (which we discuss further later in this Report) it can be done through specific policies in Chapter 24.
206. Turning then to the relief sought by the group of submissions including Submission 2449 quoted above, the suggested amendments to Chapter 3 supported by Mr Farrell are outside the scope of the hearing for the reasons discussed above. The same point could be made about the suggested amendment to notified Policy 6.3.1.3, but in any event, the submission

- has been overtaken by the Stage 1 decisions on Chapter 6. The relevant policy (renumbered 6.3.12) does not refer to the Wakatipu Basin.
207. The suggested amendment to notified Policy 6.3.1.6 is expressed too generally to be within scope. We do not think it would add anything to Chapter 24 if made specific to the Wakatipu Basin.
208. Turning to the amendments to Chapter 6 forming part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), three provisions were the subject of amendment.
209. The first amendment was to delete a paragraph formerly part of Part 6.2. When the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) was notified, that paragraph read:
- "Landscapes have been characterised into three classifications within the Rural Zone. These are Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF), where their use, development and protection are a matter of national importance under Section 6 of the RMA. The Rural Landscapes Classification (RLC) makes up the remaining Rural Zoned land and has varying types of landscape character and amenity values. Specific policy and assessment matters are provided to manage the potential effects of subdivision of development in these locations."*
210. The second amendment was to delete the first sentence of a rule (Notified Rule 6.4.1.2) which read:
- "The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone. The Landscape Character and Strategic Direction Chapter's objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at issue."*
211. The third suggested amendment was to Notified Rule 6.4.1.3.
212. As notified, that rule read:
- "The landscape categories do not apply to the following within the Rural Zones:*
- a. Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones.*
 - b. The area of the Frankton Arm located to the east of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line as shown on the District Plan maps.*
 - c. The Gibbston Character Zone;*
 - d. The Rural Lifestyle Zone;*
 - e. The Rural Residential Zone."*
213. The amendments to this Rule were to substitute "assessment matters" for "categories" in the first line, deletion of the "s" at the end of the first line so the rule refers to "Rural Zone", and deletion of c, d, and e.
214. These changes were the subject of a large number of submissions.
215. Addressing first the deletion of the paragraph quoted above from Part 6.2, Crown Investments et al sought that the paragraph be retained. Morven Ferry et al sought that it be retained but with reference inserted to make it clear that the Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle, Rural

Amenity Zones, together with the Precinct, are excluded from the Rural Landscape Classification. We also note submission 805 that Transpower lodged as part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1), seeking that this particular paragraph include recognition of the national grid.

216. The submissions on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) are relevant by virtue of clause 16B(1) of the Act.
217. Crown Investments et al sought also that Rule 6.4.1.2 be returned to the position as notified save that reference be added to objectives and policies related to the landscape classifications applying only in the Rural Zone. We also note a number of submissions filed as part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) process seeking clarification that the landscape classification objectives and policies do not apply to the Rural Lifestyle, Rural Residential and Millbrook Resort Zones²⁵⁶. The submission of Arcadian Triangle²⁵⁷ is also worthy of note; that submission suggested that reference to Chapter 3 (i.e. the Strategic Direction Chapter) might be deleted because its application across the district was, in the view of the submitter, obvious.
218. A number of submissions also sought that Rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 be combined. Specifically, the Morven Ferry et al submissions sought that a combined rule be restated to focus on the landscape categories, providing that those categories do not apply in the five listed zones, together with the Precinct.
219. Many of the Donaldson et al submissions sought that Rule 6.4.1.3 be amended to similar effect, but the way that the relief in the submission is formulated leaves it unclear as to whether it is suggested that it should relate to the landscape categories or to assessment matters, or both.
220. Crown Investments et al sought that Rule 6.4.1.3 focus on the landscape classifications together with the objectives, policies and assessment matters relevant to those classifications, specify the Gibbston Character Zone as a Rural Zone for this purpose and state, for the avoidance of doubt, that the Rural Zone does not include the Rural Amenity Zone, the Precinct, the Rural Lifestyle Zone or the Rural Residential Zone.
221. The submission of BSTGT Limited²⁵⁸ appears to have sought²⁵⁹ that Rule 6.4.1.3 include reference to the Rural Amenity Zone in the list of zones to which the Rule does not apply. The submission of Slopehill Properties Limited²⁶⁰ was to similar effect. Stage 1 submissions specifically related to Rule 6.4.1.3 included those of Contact Energy Limited²⁶¹ and Queenstown Trails Trust²⁶² seeking that the Hydro Generation Zone and any trail (respectively) be added to the list of specific exclusions.

²⁵⁶ See Submissions 669, 694, 696 and 712

²⁵⁷ Submission 836

²⁵⁸ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

²⁵⁹ The actual relief refers to Rule 6.4.5.1, which does not exist, either in the notified or the Decisions Version of Chapter 6

²⁶⁰ Submission 2484

²⁶¹ Submission 580

²⁶² Submission 671

222. Mount Cardrona Station Limited²⁶³ and Arcadian Triangle Limited²⁶⁴ also sought that the exclusion in Rule 6.4.1.3(a) not be limited to Ski Area Activities.
223. In his Section 42A Report²⁶⁵, Mr Barr explained the rationale of the Chapter 6 variations as relating in part to the fact that the Proposed Open Space and Recreation Zone forming part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) had been identified both on land classified as ONLs and ONFs in terms of Section 6 and on land classified as visual amenity in terms of Section 7, and in part because reference to rural assessment criteria not applying to the Gibbston Character Zone, the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Rural Residential Zone was unnecessary; the assessment matters are contained in Chapter 21, which relates only to the Rural Zone. By contrast, Mr Barr advised that the varied provisions sought to make it clear that the landscape assessment criteria would apply to activities not classified as Ski Area Activities if undertaken within the Ski Area Sub-Zones (i.e. the opposite of the position sought by submissions 407 and 836).
224. Mr Barr, however, noted that the initial intention underlying the variations in this latter regard had been overtaken by the Stage 1 decisions which²⁶⁶ provide that the landscape categories, and the policies of Chapter 6 related to those categories, do not apply within the Ski Area Sub-Zones.
225. Having reviewed other aspects of the Decisions Version of Chapter 6, Mr Barr concluded²⁶⁷ that the variation text has been entirely overtaken. In his view, given that all of the relevant policies in the Decisions Version are the subject of appeal, there was no merit in discussing the text as varied further. Accordingly, the Chapter 6 text Mr Barr recommended was that as notified, together with the suggested additional policies discussed above.
226. Our reading of Decisions Version Policies 6.3.1-6.3.3 is that:
- a. The landscape categories (and consequently the policies related to those categories) apply only in the Rural Zone;
 - b. Within the Rural Zone, the Ski Area Sub-Zone and the area of Frankton Arm identified in Policy 6.3.2 are not the subject of landscape classification and the policies of Chapter 6 do not apply to them, insofar as they relate to those categories;
 - c. The Gibbston Character Zone, the Rural Residential Zone, the Rural Lifestyle Zone and the various Special Zones are not subject to the landscape categories or to the policies of Chapter 6 related to those categories unless otherwise stated.
227. To those provisions should be added our recommended additional policy stating that the Rural Amenity Zone (including the Precinct) are in the same category as the zones listed in (c) above.
228. It follows, in our view, that the text proposed to be deleted in Part 6.2 is unnecessary. Were it to be retained, then consistently with the new policy we have recommended as above, then reference would need to be added to the Rural Amenity Zone. But we think the position is perfectly clear, as it is.

²⁶³ Submission 407

²⁶⁴ Submission 836

²⁶⁵ At Section 37

²⁶⁶ In Policy 6.3.2

²⁶⁷ At 37.20

229. The only reason one would retain that text would be if it were felt necessary to make the addition requested by Transpower, so that the text refers to the National Grid. However, we do not believe that that is necessary either. The context of Part 6.2 is one of a general introduction. If any provisions specifically related to the National Grid are required, they need to be addressed in the substantive provisions of the Chapter.
230. Mr Barr inferred from the Hearing Panel’s report on Chapter 6 that that Hearing Panel would have deleted Rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 if they had not been the subject of variation. We think that is a fair inference.
231. We likewise consider that given the Decisions Version policies as they stand, together with the additional policy we propose, Rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 are unnecessary. The only additional element they provide is the statement that Chapter 3’s objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones. We agree with the Stage 1 submission of Arcadian Triangle that that is obvious on the face of the Plan and does not need to be stated. If it were to be stated, then we think that the existing text would need to be revised because Chapter 3 contains many provisions that are not related to landscape values.
232. In summary, we recommend to the Stream 15 Hearing Panel that:
- a. The text of Part 6.2 the subject of variation be deleted as proposed;
 - b. Rules 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3 (renumbered 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 in the Decisions Version) might be deleted.
233. Obviously, with the vast bulk of Chapter 6, including Policies 6.3.1-6.3.3 inclusive, the subject of appeal, the position we have described and on which we have based our recommendation might change. However, in our view, it is preferable to take that position as the starting point, and make the provisions affected by Stage 2 consistent with it, in order that the Environment Court might have a complete package of provisions to review and amend, as appropriate.
234. Summarising our conclusion on the matters that are within our jurisdiction under this heading, we recommend the addition of a new policy to follow 6.3.3, numbered 6.3.3A, and worded as follows:
- “Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this chapter related to those categories do not apply.”*
(3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.1.8, 3.2.5.2, 3.3.20-24, 3.3.32)
235. We believe that this additional policy is the most appropriate way to integrate Chapter 24 into the balance of the Proposed District Plan and thereby to achieve the objectives of the Proposed District Plan.

2.6 Scope Issues

236. One side effect of the staged Proposed District Plan process is that we had a number of submissions before us deferred from the Stage 1 process related to the location of ONL or ONF boundaries variously at Arthurs Point, Slope Hill, Crown Terrace and Morven Hill and which, if accepted, would leave areas of Rural Zoned land the subject of a Rural Character Landscape notation in the Proposed District Plan. This in turn raises the legal issue as to whether we have

scope in that instance to rezone that land Rural Amenity, in order that the land in question not sit as small islands on the Wakatipu Basin planning maps.

237. Ms Scott addressed the point in her submissions in reply. She referred us to the recent High Court decision in *Albany North Landowners v Auckland Council*²⁶⁸ for the tests of when an amendment to a plan is in scope. The key question is whether a change can fairly be said to be the foreseeable consequence of any changes directly proposed by a submitter.
238. As counsel observed, rezoning land Rural Amenity Zone could not have been a foreseeable consequence at the time the relevant submissions were lodged, because that zone did not exist until notification of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2).
239. The answer to the question therefore turns on whether the Rural Amenity Zone is sufficiently similar to the Proposed District Plan Rural Zone (when subject to a Rural Character Landscape notation) to make rezoning a minor change within Clause 16(2).
240. We posed that question to Mr Barr and his answer, having reflected on it, was that the provisions governing the Rural Zone/Rural Character Landscape are less restrictive of subdivision and development than the Rural Amenity Zone. Mr Barr's opinion reflected his recommendations regarding the final form of the Rural Amenity Zone provisions, which include non-complying activity status for subdivision and development of sites less than 80 ha against a background of restrictive objectives and policies. As discussed in Section 2.4 of our report above, we believe that the essential elements of the Rural Amenity Zone should be retained. On that basis, we concur with Mr Barr's view, and therefore with the submissions of counsel for the Council that rezoning land excluded from an ONL or an ONF by reason of our recommendations on submissions would not be within scope.
241. We should address at this point one variation to the scope question we have posed above, that Ms Scott also canvassed in her submissions in reply.
242. This relates to whether changes could be made to the boundaries of Landscape Character Units in Schedule 24.8 along with changes to the text of that Schedule explaining each LCU.
243. Ms Scott's submission was that these changes, when made in conjunction with an associated change from a submission, are consequential alterations to the Proposed District Plan that properly fall within clause 10(2)(a) of the First Schedule to the Act. We agree with that submission although we need to qualify its potential application. It seems to us that the submission in question must validly seek rezoning of land as either Rural Amenity Zone or Precinct. While Schedule 24.8 extends to some land not the subject of either the Rural Amenity Zone or Precinct, the role of that Schedule under the Objectives and Policies of Chapter 24 is to guide consideration of activities within the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct and so we think it is only when a submission validly seeks rezoning to either of them that amendments to Schedule 24.8 might be seen as a foreseeable consequence of the changes sought by a submitter.

2.7 Protect and/or Maintain and/or Enhance?

244. Notified Objective 24.2.1 read:

²⁶⁸ [2016] NZHC 138

“Landscape and visual amenity values are protected, maintained and enhanced.”

245. A number of policies in Chapter 24 also refer to protection, maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values.
246. This aspect of Chapter 24 was the subject of consistent criticism by submitters, both as part of the general opposition to Chapter 24 noted above, and in the specific contexts where it arose. The thrust of the submissions and evidence we heard was that protection is appropriate for ONLs and ONFs (in line with the language of Section 6), but not for “amenity” landscapes such as the balance of the Wakatipu Basin, whose values should be maintained and enhanced (in line with language of Section 7).
247. As we pointed out to counsel for the Council, that reasoning could draw support from the reasoning of the report of the Stream 1B Hearing Panel, if not from the actual words of the Strategic Chapters²⁶⁹.
248. The submissions of counsel for the Council in Reply sought to persuade us that the Stream 1B Hearing Panel had accepted a submission (for Trojan Helmet Limited) that presented a flawed view of the authority relied upon (the Environment Court decision in *Calveley v Kaipara District Council*²⁷⁰). Counsel also pointed out that the introduction to both Sections 6 and 7 of the Act refers to management of the “*use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources*”. Counsel’s submission was that protection is an option in determining how to best maintain the amenity value of a landscape.
249. In his reply evidence, Mr Barr drew our attention to provisions in the recently finalised Christchurch District Plan that utilised avoidance policies in some cases in order to maintain rural amenity landscapes and to a paragraph in the reasons for an objective in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement that suggested that both protection (of views) and the maintenance (of a particular aspect of amenity) might be employed in the implementation of a more general objective.
250. Neither counsel for the Council nor Mr Barr, however, explained to us clearly what the difference is between an objective or policy directing protection of some aspect of the environment, as opposed to its maintenance (or enhancement).
251. Counsel for Barnhill Corporate Trustee & Ors referred us to a helpful passage from the key Environment Court decision underlying the Operative District Plan²⁷¹:

“An important point in respect of Section 7 landscapes is that that Act does not necessarily protect the status quo. There is no automatic preference to introduced grasses over pine forest. Nor should it be assumed (on landscape grounds) that existing rural uses are preferable in sustainable management terms to subdivision for lifestyle blocks which could include restoration of indigenous bush, grasses or wetlands, especially where predator controls are

²⁶⁹ Refer Report 3 at [340]

²⁷⁰ [2014] NZEnvC 182

²⁷¹ *Wakatipu Environmental Society Inc v Queenstown Lakes District Council* C180/99 at [91]

introduced. Just to show how careful one has to be not to be inflexible about these issues we raised the question whether it is possible that a degree of subdivision into lifestyle blocks might significantly increase the overall naturalness of a landscape... Logically there is a limit: the law of diminishing returns where too much subdivision leads to over-domestication of the landscape”.

252. Counsel for Wakatipu Equities Limited referred us also to litigation in the early years of the act on the correct interpretation of Section 7(c). Counsel cited *Shell New Zealand Limited v Auckland City Council*²⁷² as stating:

“If the adverse effects are minor they can be treated as inconsequential and so, broadly speaking, the environment is “maintained””.

253. Neither the Court of Appeal nor Temm J, whose High Court judgment the Court of Appeal was quoting from in the cited report, actually made that statement²⁷³. Temm J was addressing the proposition that every resource consent application must demonstrate that the activity in question will maintain and enhance amenity values. The Judge rejected that proposition, holding that the Act contemplated applications for consent *“that not only do not enhance an amenity but also do not even maintain it”*. Explaining the apparent inconsistency, Temm J said:

“Perhaps the Legislature intended to convey that if the adverse effects are minor they can be treated as inconsequential and so, broadly speaking, the environment is “maintained” in the sense that a minor incursion about it is not significant.”

254. It seems to us that Temm J was just suggesting this as a possible explanation for the then framework of the Act rather than making a positive holding to that effect²⁷⁴.
255. Be that as it may, the Supreme Court’s decision in *King Salmon* is clearly authority for the proposition that irrespective of the openness of the language of Part 2, its provisions can take on a more prescriptive meaning if incorporated in policy statements and plans.
256. Even accepting that *“maintenance”* admits of minor adverse effects though, we do not think that takes matters much further. The Stream 1B Hearing Panel found that the appropriate test for Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features should provide for minor adverse effects²⁷⁵.
257. Counsel for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and others also sought to press on us authority confirming the subjective nature of amenity values. We accept the point made, but again, if it is correct to describe amenity values as *“subjective”* it is clear that ONLs and ONFs likewise have subjective elements by reason of reference in the classic *Pigeon Bay* criteria to anthropocentric considerations.

²⁷² [1996] NZRMA 189 (CA)

²⁷³ Noting that counsel also provided us with a quotation from the Court of Appeal judgment correctly setting out what was said in the High Court’s decision.

²⁷⁴ The Court of Appeal’s decision does not materially assist. Although the Court of Appeal quoted from the High Court decision it found that the issue before was moot as no party sought to support the then Planning Tribunal’s position on the sole point of appeal

²⁷⁵ See Report 3 at Section 2.11

258. We sought the assistance of a number of the counsel who appeared before us, and the expert planning witnesses who gave evidence, as to whether there is indeed a difference between “*protection*” and “*maintenance*”, and if so, exactly what it is.
259. It is fair to say, we think, that although many counsel and planning witnesses²⁷⁶ started with the feeling that there was a difference, and “*protection*” connoted a greater level of restriction than does “*maintenance*”, all struggled to identify what the difference is. Mr Ferguson, giving planning evidence for Darby Planning LP and others, suggested for instance that when the terms are used in Sections 6 and 7, the difference is not so much between those terms, but how the statute qualifies them – in Section 6(c) by referring to appropriate subdivision, use and development and in Section 7(c), by reference to amenity values. Counsel for Trojan Helmet Limited and Boxer Hill Trust, Ms Wolt, suggested it was probably more perception than any substantive difference between the two terms, although like Mr Ferguson, she noted there was a difference in how Part 2 requires the different matters be addressed.
260. On the issue as to whether there is a difference between “*protect*” and “*maintain*”, the decision of the Environment Court in *Housing New Zealand Corporation v Auckland Council*²⁷⁷ released after our hearing implied that there was a difference²⁷⁸ in the context of provisions related to special character areas in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. The Court did not, however, explain what the difference is.
261. Helpfully, the difference between these various terms was canvassed in the Environment Court in *Port Otago Limited v Dunedin City Council*²⁷⁹. There, the Court adopted the meaning of “*protect*” as “*keep safe from harm or injury*”. It did not view that concept as carrying with it maintenance of the continuing original or existing state in perpetuity. The Court cited dictionary meanings of “*maintain*” that suggested it should be read as “*keep it the same level or rate*”, “*keep in existence*”, “*keep in proper or good condition*”.
262. The Environment Court therefore held that the word “*maintain*” includes the meaning of “*protect*”. The Court also held specifically that protection is a method by which a Plan can have regard to amenity values under Section 7(c) of the Act²⁸⁰.
263. It follows that we accept the submissions and evidence we had from the Council that it is permissible to provide for the protection of amenity landscapes if that is the option that best meets the requirements of section 32 of the Act, and the other statutory matters canvassed above feeding into our recommendations. Equally, because of the overlap in meaning of these different terms, we do not think it is helpful to use them in a combined phrase (protect, maintain and enhance). We note in this regard that the Environment Court described addition of an objective seeking “*protection*” (of historic heritage) to one already seeking maintenance and enhancement (of character and amenity values) as creating the potential for confusion in the *Housing New Zealand* decision noted above²⁸¹. We also consider that the decision as to

²⁷⁶ Including Mr Barr, giving evidence for the Council

²⁷⁷ [2018] NZ EnvC 186

²⁷⁸ See paragraphs [60] and [250]

²⁷⁹ C4/2002

²⁸⁰ Ibid at [41]-[42]

²⁸¹ Paragraph [214]

which term is appropriate depends on what it is that is sought to be protected and/or maintained.

264. In this regard, we agree with counsel for Darby Planning LP and others who suggested to us that it does not really make sense to talk about protecting amenity values from harm. Maintaining makes much more sense in that context. Similarly, when talking about something physical (like a landscape or an ecosystem) it makes more sense to refer to protecting that landscape from harm than it does to talk about maintaining it. We acknowledge though that, other than as a matter of grammatical “*fit*”, finding reasons for either position is elusive.
265. The other reason why it is important to be clear about what it is that has to be protected and/or maintained is because if not used carefully, both might connote preservation in the sense of unchanged retention. We take on board the Environment Court’s observation from its 1999 decision on the Operative District Plan quoted above, that, at least in the context of amenity values, change may be beneficial.
266. We also consider that it is unhelpful to use the combined phrase “*maintain and enhance*” in an objective or policy. Reading those terms literally, an action which enhances amenity values (for instance) does not keep those amenity values at the same level or rate. In other words, depending on the context, if the two terms are used conjunctively, the resulting direction is internally contradictory.
267. The same contradictions do not arise in the context of Section 7(c) because these are matters to which we must have particular regard. As noted as long ago as Temm J’s judgment in the *Shell* case already quoted, read in that context, it may be permissible to not maintain, let alone enhance amenity values in a particular situation.
268. Read in a Plan context, however, we think it is desirable in principle to use these instructions in the alternative: maintain **or** enhance.

2.8 Lake Hayes Water Quality Issues

269. In his Section 42A Report, Mr Barr noted three submissions that sought varying relief by reason of the impact intensification of land uses would have on the water quality of Lake Hayes. The Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc²⁸² sought that the District Plan restrict any further residential or commercial subdivision and building in the Lake Hayes Catchment until suitable reticulated sewerage infrastructure is installed to prevent increased inputs of nutrients and contaminants to the lake. Peter Goulston²⁸³ sought that there be an immediate halt on rezoning and further development of the area around Lake Hayes and Mill Stream, until among other things a full and independent environmental impact assessment can be carried out on the impact on those water bodies and the surrounding water catchment area. Catherine Dumarchand²⁸⁴ opposed the Precinct Zone as a whole, by reason of effects on the Lake Hayes Catchment.
270. Mr Barr drew our attention to provisions in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago related to Lake Hayes water quality issues. The rules of that Plan require on-site wastewater treatment systems within the catchment of Lake Hayes to obtain a resource consent that is assessed as

²⁸² Submission 2140

²⁸³ Submission 2095; supported by FS2727

²⁸⁴ Submission 2150

a full discretionary activity. Mr Barr also referred us to the evidence of Ms Jarvis for the Council, who expressed confidence that on-site wastewater servicing can be achieved on properties with a minimum allotment size of 6000m².

271. While we were initially somewhat sceptical as to whether the regional rules are being observed in this regard, Ms Jarvis advised us that her experience was that people were indeed making applications to the Regional Council; she had acted for a number of applicants herself. She also observed that in practice, the Regional Council requires secondary treatment, or more advanced treatment still, for wastewater discharges in the Lake Hayes Catchment.
272. The evidence of Dr Ruth Goldsmith for Waterfall Park Developments Limited included a lengthy technical paper authored by Dr Marc Schallenberg and Ms Lena Schallenberg discussing water quality in the Lake Hayes Catchment (*"The Schallenberg Report"*). The Schallenberg Report recorded that Lake Hayes is a highly-valued lake that has suffered from algal blooms for many decades, that those blooms worsened since 2006 with lake health and fishing deteriorating markedly. The report sought to analyse the link between worsening of algal blooms over the period from 2006 and the decrease which had occurred over the same period in external and internal nutrient loads. It concluded that the lake might be approaching a tipping point where, with appropriate restoration measures, stable improvements in summer water clarity, reduction in algal biomass and reoxygenation of the bottom waters of the lake might be achieved. Accordingly, the Schallenberg Report recommended a focus on land use activities in the catchment *"to further reduce nutrient and sediment losses from land to water"*.
273. Dr Goldsmith summarised the Schallenberg Report for us as well as providing her findings on the water of Mill Creek, concluding that the latter's existing water quality is generally good but groundwater inputs elevate nitrogen concentrations and faecal bacteria concentrations at times. She attributed that to the primary catchment land use of beef and sheep grazing on exotic pasture and golf course management.
274. The evidence of Mr Davis for the Council was consistent with the position described in greater detail in the Schallenberg Report, and by Dr Goldsmith. Mr Davis reported, importantly, that State of the Environment water quality monitoring for Lake Hayes and Mill Creek reports consistent exceedances of nutrient related water quality limits in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.
275. Mr Davis also confirmed that agricultural activities would not be the sole source of nutrients and that nitrates, in particular, would be coming from Rural Residential properties in the catchment.
276. We also heard from the Friends of Lake Hayes Inc in support of its submission. Helpfully, the Chair of the Society (Mr Hanff) was accompanied by Dr Schallenberg and we were able to clarify aspects of the Schallenberg Report with the lead author. Dr Schallenberg's evidence was that we could not assume that conversion of pastoral sheep farming to rural living or urban living would necessarily have a positive effect on nutrient inputs to the catchment and he firmly supported a requirement that new development be linked to existing reticulated wastewater systems. In Dr Schallenberg's view this was always preferable to onsite disposal of wastewater, irrespective of the level of treatment.

277. To assist our understanding of these issues, we requested that the Council supply us with information on the extent of the Lake Hayes Catchment, the extent of existing reticulated wastewater services, and the location of onsite wastewater disposal facilities consented by Otago Regional Council.
278. After an initial false start, this information was sourced from Otago Regional Council and supplied to us under cover of a memorandum dated 29 August 2018.
279. In his reply evidence, Mr Langman noted advice from the Regional Council that approximately six consents had been granted by Otago Regional Council for wastewater discharge in the Lake Hayes catchment. Mr Langman described that number, somewhat euphemistically, as “*surprising*”, given that there are no existing use rights for discharges with the Regional Plan: Water for Otago having been operative for a number of years²⁸⁵. While the information subsequently supplied to us on 29 August suggests that the number of wastewater discharge consents issued by Otago Regional Council with the Lake Hayes Catchment may be greater than that advised to Mr Langman, it is apparent to us that there are a number of rural residential and rural lifestyle properties within the Lake Hayes catchment that do not have access to reticulated wastewater schemes and that have not obtained a discharge permit as required by the Regional Plan. Against that background, it is difficult to conclude that the Regional Plan is operating as intended, or to have confidence that the contribution wastewater discharges make to the degraded water quality of the Lake Hayes Catchment is being properly managed.
280. We discussed both with counsel for the Council and with Mr Barr the potential relevance of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 (NPSFM) to our deliberations. Both agreed that it was relevant. Mr Barr’s view was that this was the case irrespective of whether wastewater discharges required resource consents from the Regional Council. He thought that was particularly the case at the plan formulation stage.
281. Ms Scott returned to the issue in her submissions in reply confirming her initial response that although the policies in the NPSFM direct Regional Council actions, the objectives are worded broadly in a manner that is not specific to Regional Councils. She noted specifically Objective C1 of the NPSFM:
- “To improve integrated management of freshwater and the use and development of land in whole catchments, including the interactions between freshwater, land, associated ecosystems, and the coastal environment”.*
282. Ms Scott also drew our attention to the guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment on implementation of the NPSFM which suggests that this objective is relevant to territorial authorities, both in the context of resource consent applications for land use and subdivision and in the context of District Plan reviews “*to exercise their function for integrated management under section 31(1)*”.

²⁸⁵ Langman Reply at 3.9

283. Given Mr Davis’s evidence, which indicates that the Lake Hayes catchment is over-allocated²⁸⁶, we consider that Objective A2(c) is also relevant to our deliberations. That objective seeks that the overall quality of freshwater within a freshwater management unit is maintained or improved while *“improving the quality of freshwater in water bodies that have been degraded by human activities to the point of being over-allocated”*.
284. In his evidence in reply, Mr Langman also drew our attention to the provisions of Objective 3.1 and Policy 3.1.1 of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement. These were among the provisions that were the subject of consent memoranda submitted to, but not yet approved by the Court as at the date of Mr Langman’s evidence. That remains the position and they reinforce the NPSFM focus on enhancing degraded water quality.
285. The control of discharges of contaminants into or onto land or water and the control of the use of land for the purpose of maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies are Regional Council functions²⁸⁷.
286. Territorial authorities, however, have the function of establishing, implementing and reviewing objectives policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the District²⁸⁸.
287. Where subdivision and development has the potential to impact on water quality, there is an overlap between the regional and territorial functions. Particularly in a case such as this where the Regional Council has already put regulation in place purporting to manage the relevant activities, we need to be confident that an additional layer of regulation in the District Plan would meet the section 32 tests focussing on the efficiency of those provisions.
288. In his evidence in reply, Mr Barr recommended to us that we might insert an advice note into Chapter 24, pointing out to people the need to obtain a resource consent from Otago Regional Council for onsite wastewater treatment systems within the Lake Hayes catchment, but considered that that was as far as the text of Chapter 24 could go because the control of contaminant discharges is a Regional Council function.
289. We agree with Mr Barr’s view. We do not believe that it would be permissible to control wastewater discharges directly through the mechanism of District Plan Rules.
290. In his reply evidence, Mr Langman discussed the relevance of this issue to the extent of Precinct Zoning within the Lake Hayes Catchment. As he observed, the WB Landscape Study, on which the notified zoning was based, did not consider the consequential effects of subdivision and development on water quality²⁸⁹.

²⁸⁶ Defined in the NPSFM to include allocation to users beyond a water quality limit

²⁸⁷ Under section 30 of the Act

²⁸⁸ Section 31(1)(a) of the Act

²⁸⁹ Although Friends of Lake Hayes sought that the Landscape Study be broadened in this respect, we have no ability to direct amendments to it. We can and should, however, take account of its limitations, which was Mr Langman’s point.

291. In addition to the nutrient effects that we have already discussed, Mr Langman also commented on evidence provided by the Friends of Lake Hayes as to the adverse effects of sediment on lake water quality. He referred in particular to significant land disturbance activities at Waterfall Park and commented that the degree of earthworks on that site would likely result in sediment being transported into Mill Creek during heavy rainfall events.
292. Ultimately Mr Langman put it to us in the following terms:
- “If the Panel is satisfied that the impacts of earthworks can be managed through the Earthworks Chapter of this Plan, and onsite wastewater disposal can be adequately managed through the discretionary regional consenting process for wastewater, then it is my view that the areas identified for Precinct in the Lake Hayes Catchment are appropriate.”*
293. He regarded the answer to that question as uncertain and therefore falling within the ambit of Policy 5.4.3 of the now Partially Operative RPS 2019 directing that a precautionary approach be applied.
294. We consider that there is evidence that the earthworks provisions of the Operative District Plan are not working effectively to control earthworks effects on water quality in the Lake Hayes Catchment. We observed the extent of earthworks on the Waterfall Park site that were the subject of Mr Langman’s evidence and have no reason to take a different view from him regarding the efficacy of sediment control measures on that site. Whether it is possible to put a more effective regime in place will be a matter for the Stream 15 Hearing Panel considering submissions and further submissions on the Earthworks Chapter of the Proposed District Plan, and so we should not assume the current situation will continue.
295. As regards nutrients, however, we think that if anything, Mr Langman understated the position. The evidence we have discussed already clearly indicates to us that whatever the position in theory, the Regional Plan is not currently being enforced in a manner that gives us any confidence that the objectives we have quoted from the NPSFM will be achieved, as they relate to Lake Hayes.
296. Even if it were being enforced, Ms Jarvis told us that the Regional Plan has no hard and fast limits and the level of treatment required is much less than for sensitive catchments in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty Regions (Lake Taupo and Rotorua Lakes respectively). We asked Mr John McCartney, giving evidence for Spruce Grove Trust, about the efficacy of advanced on-site wastewater treatment. He told us that modern systems would minimise nutrients reaching groundwater, but he could not give us an absolute assurance that no additional nutrients would flow into Mill Creek (reflecting the location of the site the subject of his evidence) and thence to Lake Hayes.
297. We also note the view expressed to us by Mr Davis that intensification within in the Lake Hayes Catchment needs to be considered particularly carefully because of the condition and sensitivity of the Lake.
298. We consider that the appropriate course is to alter the notified Precinct Zoning to rezone land within the Lake Hayes catchment Rural Amenity Zone except where it is served by a reticulated wastewater treatment scheme.

299. That exclusion differs slightly from that recommended by Mr Langman²⁹⁰. Mr Langman suggested that an appropriate exclusion would be for areas either served by existing community wastewater schemes or within areas that are developed to approximately rural residential developed levels of density (below 2ha).
300. The information supplied to us by Council identified both community and private sewer schemes. While the areas the subject of private scheme were not before us, we think that in principle, the issue is the efficacy of a scheme in removing nutrients from the Lake Hayes Catchment rather than the governance arrangements for it.
301. Mr Langman did not explain the rationale for his second exception and on the basis that further degradation of Lake Hayes as a result of subdivision and development is, in our view, to be avoided, we do not think it is appropriate.
302. We concur with Mr Langman's view that the time to consider up-zoning these areas to Precinct is when it can be demonstrated that such a zoning would not result in any further degradation of water quality feeding into Lake Hayes, and that this approach gives effect both to the NPSFM and to the Partially Operative RPS 2019 provisions noted above.
303. We note that we have relied on the delineation of the Lake Hayes Catchment provided to us under cover of the Council's 29 August 2018 Memorandum. The area identified appears to follow the surface water catchment of Lake Hayes, which is influenced by the Arrow Irrigation Scheme water race. This gives rise to some concerns because, when seeking to control nutrient inputs in a catchment, one also has to consider the ambit of the groundwater catchment, which may not coincide with the surface water catchment. The lay evidence of Mr Rohan Hill suggested that the Regional Council map of the catchment may not accurately reflect the extent to which groundwater on the south side of Mooney Road flows ultimately into Lake Hayes. We also note that the Schallenberg Report defined a broader area as representing the catchment. However, Dr Schallenberg made it clear that his expertise was in water quality rather than groundwater hydrology, and so we were unable to explore with him the basis for his map of the catchment. We suspect, therefore, that the catchment map we have relied upon may be conservative, but with due respect to Mr Hill, it is the best information available to us at this time.

2.9 Transport Network Capacity

304. The expert evidence of David Smith for the Council was that the State Highway bridge over the Shotover River is approaching capacity and any increase in density of development in the Wakatipu Basin will exacerbate congestion at the bridge. While he accepted that many of the submissions we heard related to relatively small increases in activity which on their own would have no noticeable effect on the performance of the transport network, he opposed all submissions seeking to increase residential density beyond that provided for in the notified Chapter 24 by reason of their cumulative adverse effect.
305. For similar reasons, Mr Smith did not oppose submissions²⁹¹ seeking to downzone Mooney Road. Mr Smith also drew to our attention the difficulty assessing when improvements to Mooney Road and its intersection with Hunter Road are required in a resource consent context

²⁹⁰ In his Reply Evidence at paragraph 3.17

²⁹¹ Submissions 2129 and 2171

and to justify recovery of the costs thereof, if utilisation of the proposed Precinct sub-zone proceeds incrementally.

306. Mr Smith's evidence was generally supported by the evidence and legal submissions for NZTA. NZTA's evidence was that if anything, Mr Smith's assessment was conservative and that more recent data than he had relied on indicated that Mr Smith's modelling (predicting that the Shotover bridge would reach capacity between 2023 and 2035 depending on the extent of additional development beyond that provided for in the Proposed District Plan that occurred on Ladies Mile) was conservative, because it underestimated both baseline traffic and the level of growth that had occurred in the interim. It was noted that there were some time periods where the bridge was already at capacity. NZTA's position was that further land use intensification should only occur as part of an integrated process addressing transport network capacity.
307. A number of submitters called expert traffic evidence that disputed Mr Smith's conclusions as to the level of impact the proposed development would have on the transport network generally, and the Shotover Bridge in particular. In some cases, Mr Smith accepted in his rebuttal evidence that the evidence for submitters had merit, but he remained of the view that any intensification would have an adverse effect on capacity at the Shotover Bridge and should not be permitted except through an integrated planning process.
308. The expert evidence for submitters also suggested to us that our permitting further development in the Wakatipu Basin would assist NZTA to justify enhancement of the network, including an improved crossing over the Shotover River²⁹². The legal submissions for submitters similarly took issue with Mr Smith's recommended approach, emphasising that his modelling did not suggest an insuperable problem within the ten year life of the Proposed District Plan and arguing that the Council would in fact be assisted by knowing what zonings are in place, so that a case might be made to bring forward transport network enhancements that will inevitably be required in any event²⁹³.
309. For its part, NZTA firmly rejected the idea that it might be assisted by additional development putting greater pressure on the road transport network.
310. The submissions relying on the predicted timing of over-capacity problems were also undercut to a degree by the subsequent evidence we received from NZTA indicating that capacity problems at the Shotover Bridge are likely understated by Mr Smith's modelling and the congestion problems he was concerned about would occur within the life of the Proposed District Plan.
311. Curiously, given Mr Smith's evidence, the position taken for Council, both in its legal submissions and planning evidence²⁹⁴, was not to advance arguments that no further development can be permitted by reason of the capacity of the roading network. Ms Scott described Mr Smith's evidence as raising a wider issue that cannot be solved in this hearing.

²⁹² See e.g. the evidence of Mr Jason Bartlett for Hogans Gully Farm Limited

²⁹³ See e.g. the legal submissions of Counsel for Ladies Mile Consortium

²⁹⁴ See Vanstone EIC at 15.13

312. As regards the legal position, Ms Scott referred us to submissions she had made in the Stage 1 Stream 12 hearing on the interrelationship between zoning and infrastructure capacity. Those submissions are addressed at Section 2.8 of Report 16. That report notes the leading decision of *Foreworld Developments Limited v Napier City Council*²⁹⁵, where the Court held that it is contrary to the purpose of the Act to zone land for an activity when the necessary infrastructure to allow that activity to occur without adverse environmental effects does not exist and there is no commitment to providing it.
313. Report 16 suggested that a distinction might be drawn between infrastructure capacity as it relates to the three waters (potable water, wastewater and stormwater) and transport infrastructure because the latter does not have the same binary characteristics as the three waters. Ms Scott was inclined to accept that point as a general proposition, but she pointed out to us that there is some commentary about road capacity in the *Foreworld* Decision.
314. This is correct. While the Court’s focus was clearly on sewage infrastructure, it noted that Transit (NZTA’s predecessor) had expressed concern about the potential for unintegrated development placing the State Highway “*under capacity and access pressure*”. The Court’s comment is limited to a single sentence agreeing that that was a valid concern for the same reasons as those in relation to sewerage infrastructure. There is no commentary in the Environment Court’s decision as to the extent of the transport issues that might have been created or whether they might have been determinative in the absence of other infrastructure capacity issues.
315. We discussed with counsel for some of the parties whether the then recently revised Proposed RPS might assist in this context given that renumbered Policy 4.5.2 directs that the design and development of infrastructure be co-ordinated with land use change “*in growth and redevelopment planning*”. Counsel for Philip Smith suggested to us that this policy might be of general application. Mr Langman, in his reply evidence for Council²⁹⁶, was likewise of the opinion that this policy applies to all development. However, it is located in a section of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 related to urban growth development. That is the focus of Objective 4.5 and while Policy 4.5.2 is generally expressed, if read more widely than applying to urban development, it would not be a course of action designed to achieve the objective in that regard. It does not seem likely to us that that outcome would be intended.
316. Irrespective of the correct interpretation of the Partially Operative RPS 2019, we take on board the desirability emphasised both by Mr Smith and the witnesses for NZTA of an integrated approach to development and transport infrastructure planning. We were left unclear, however, why the District Plan review process could not be the vehicle for such integrated planning, given that integrated management is a key District Council function under the Act.
317. We also tend to agree with counsel for Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, Bunn, Green and Morven Ferry Limited that a requirement for co-ordination does not preclude development in advance of infrastructure provision. We understand from NZTA’s evidence that planning of transport infrastructure upgrades is a complicated process, and we should not rely on upgrades occurring in any particular timeframe where they are not already the subject of firm

²⁹⁵ Environment Court Decision W8/2005

²⁹⁶ At 2.9

commitments (clearly the case for the Shotover River crossing). Similarly, while we were informed that it was not practicable to modify the existing bridge due to engineering considerations, we were also told that it should not be assumed an upgrade would necessarily take the form of a new bridge. NZTA would look at all options seeking “*modal neutrality*”. Importantly, NZTA did not tell us that there was no prospect of an upgrade of the Shotover River crossing, which its counsel, Ms McIndoe, accepted was the relevant legal test.

318. While, as already noted, the representatives of NZTA strenuously resisted any suggestion that intensification of development would assist the Agency to make a case for enhancement to the Shotover State Highway Bridge, it did appear to us from their description of the transport network planning process that it responds to demand. Mr Sizemore told us, for instance, that the Kawarau River crossing was only upgraded when the existing historic one-way bridge became inadequate for the level of traffic demand crossing the river. He said it would similarly be traffic demand that would necessitate an upgrade to the Shotover River bridge, albeit that because the investment at the Shotover crossing would be greater than had been required for the Kawarau River, the traffic situation would have to be significantly worse than it had been in relation to the Kawarau upgrade before an investment would be triggered.
319. Ultimately, this appeared to us to be a classic “*chicken and egg*” position. While we take on board the concerns expressed in the evidence of Mr Smith for Council and Messrs MacColl and Gattenby for NZTA, counsel for NZTA told us that the Agency was not trying to provide a complete snooker to further development. That was also the position put to us by counsel for the Council. Accordingly, we take the view that while transport infrastructure issues, including but not limited to the capacity of the Shotover River Bridge, might perhaps be a consideration were we to conclude that large-scale intensification might occur across the Wakatipu Basin, it ought not to prevent incremental development of parts of the Wakatipu Basin, if that is appropriate for other reasons.
320. We did not find the traffic issues Mr Smith identified specific to particular submissions as being critical to the recommendations we have made, with one exception. This was in the case of Mooney Road. As discussed in greater detail in Report 18.5, the additional information supplied by Council following the 24 October hearing indicated that the existing road reserve is insufficient to meet the requirements of the Council’s Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice. While Mr Langman suggested to us in his verbal reply on 24 October that road upgrading issues could be addressed within a resource consent context (given the Restricted Discretionary Activity Status for new development in the Precinct sub-zone), Mr Smith did not support leaving resolution of the need for roading improvements to the consent process in his evidence in chief²⁹⁷. For our part, we do not regard it as satisfactory to facilitate a relatively large-scale intensification of an area serviced by a narrow country lane with limited scope for upgrading unless either the landowners who have opposed the Precinct sub-zone agree to contribute land from their respective frontages to permit widening of the legal road (on the face of the matter, an unlikely proposition) or the Council compulsorily acquires that land. In the absence of clear expert evidence suggesting that the end result of utilisation of the existing legal road width would be satisfactory, we consider further rural living development should be discouraged.

²⁹⁷ Section 14

2.10 Queenstown Airport Reverse Sensitivity Issues

321. The Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) identifies noise boundaries around Queenstown Airport and provides for restrictions on development within those boundaries. Those boundaries roll over the outcome of Plan Change 35. A sliding scale is applied, with decreasing constraints on development, depending on whether development is within the Air Noise Boundary shown on the planning maps or within the Outer Control Boundary shown on those maps. None of the land the subject of submission before us is within the Air Noise Boundary. A small corner of one property the subject of submission by R & R Jones²⁹⁸ is within the Outer Control Boundary.
322. QAC filed further submissions in opposition to a number of submissions seeking rezoning of land in the Wakatipu Basin. By the time its planning witness, Mr Kyle appeared before us, its opposition was restricted to three submissions only, those of Shotover Country Limited²⁹⁹, Scott Crawford³⁰⁰ and R and R Jones³⁰¹.
323. Mr Kyle advised us that the existing Air Noise and Outer Control Boundaries were based on modelling predicting the operation of the airport at 2035, but that recent rapid growth in airport traffic meant that the modelled noise contours would likely be reached within another 3 to 4 years i.e. more than ten years earlier than predicted. He emphasised to us the recognition given to the airport in the Proposed Regional Policy Statement; it is identified as regionally significant infrastructure and revised Policy 4.3.5 of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement directs that regionally significant infrastructure be protected by:
- a. Restricting the establishment of activities that may result in reverse sensitivity effects;*
 - b. Avoiding significant adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure;*
 - c. Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure...*
324. Mr Kyle's evidence was that reverse sensitivity effects do not stop at the currently identified noise boundaries and that QAC was seeking to anticipate the rapid growth in airport traffic with revised noise boundaries. Mr Kyle provided us with material identifying those revised noise boundaries that as at the date of our hearing, were the subject of consultation with a view to having revised provisions publicly notified by the end of 2018.
325. On that basis, Mr Kyle supported QAC's opposition to each of the three submissions noted as above.
326. The evidence of Ms Vanstone for the Council addressing the submissions QAC opposed noted that QAC had advanced a similar position in the context of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) and that the Stream 13 Hearing Panel had formed the view that it was neither appropriate nor necessary for the Proposed District Plan to go beyond the limitations rolled over from the Plan Change 35 process. She supported that view and accordingly, while recommending that each of the three submissions the subject of QAC's further submissions be rejected, explicitly

²⁹⁸ Submission 850

²⁹⁹ Submission 528

³⁰⁰ Submission 842

³⁰¹ Submission 850

recorded that she did not do so by reason of reverse sensitivity effects on Queenstown Airport³⁰².

327. The Stream 13 Hearing Panel's Report recorded³⁰³ that the noise boundaries shown on the planning maps are also limitations on the amount of noise that aircraft operations at Queenstown Airport can create, because they are conditions on QAC's designation. It followed, in the Hearing Panel's view, that a new hearing process would be required before those conditions could be amended. As the Hearing Panel observed, there could be no certainty that the community would accept increased noise at the airport.
328. This point was the subject of a discussion we had with Mr Kyle. He accepted that it was not inevitable that the existing noise contours would be breached and that there was an alternative scenario in which the number of aircraft flights might be capped, to ensure that noise levels remain within the designation conditions.
329. We agree with the stance of the Stream 13 Hearing Panel. While that Panel was focussing on the requirements of land for urban development, which introduces additional considerations³⁰⁴, we likewise take the view that it is not sound resource management practice to limit development potential in the face of the uncertainties around the future operation of Queenstown Airport. We think that the existing restrictions implement Partially Operative RPS 2019 Policy 4.3.5 given the constraints on aircraft operations already imposed by the designation conditions. We also consider that it would be inappropriate to anticipate the outcome of a future First Schedule process that has not been the subject of section 32 analysis.
330. This view was reinforced after the hearing by our observing media reports that QAC had put its proposed expansion plans on hold following the feedback received during its consultation process that was reported to be overwhelmingly negative. While little weight can of course be placed on media reports, and it was clear from the quoted comments of QAC's Chief Executive that it was pausing rather than abandoning its proposed changes to Airport noise boundaries, these reports emphasised to us the uncertainties that lay at the heart of the recommendations of the Stream 13 Hearing Panel.
331. Accordingly, we put no weight on the concerns expressed by QAC in its evidence before us, other than as regards the portion of the Jones property within the Outer Control Boundary³⁰⁵. We heard no evidence in support of the Jones submission so do not discuss this matter any further.

3. TEXT OF CHAPTER 24

3.1 General Approach to Discussion of Submissions

332. In his Section 42A Report, Mr Barr identified that a number of submissions had sought identical, or very similar relief, for identical or very similar reasons. Mr Barr adopted the drafting technique, in his Section 42A Report, of referring to these groupings collectively. To

³⁰² Refer Vanstone EIC at 19.15, 23.20 and 24.23

³⁰³ Report 17.1 at Section 5.3

³⁰⁴ Among other things the NPSUDC comes into play.

³⁰⁵ Submission 850, opposed by FS1071, FS1340

avoid lengthening our report unnecessarily, we propose to do the same where we refer to the relief sought by submitters.

333. The groupings are as follows:
- a. The submissions of Chorus New Zealand Limited³⁰⁶, Spark Trading Limited³⁰⁷ and Vodafone New Zealand Limited³⁰⁸ are referred to as “*the Telco submissions*”.
 - b. A group of submissions lodged by resource management firm Southern Planning Group comprising Alexander Morcom, Jaqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited³⁰⁹, Robert Fisk & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited³¹⁰, A K Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co Limited & RB Robins³¹¹, Speargrass Trust³¹², B Hamilton & L Hayden³¹³, Bendall Family Land Trust³¹⁴, Shotover Trust³¹⁵, AEM Property (2017) Limited³¹⁶, are collectively referred to as “*Morcom et al.*”
 - c. A group of submissions lodged by Boffa Miskell Limited comprising Crown Investments Trust³¹⁷, Darby Planning LP³¹⁸, Lake Hayes Limited³¹⁹ and Lake Hayes Cellar Limited³²⁰ are collectively referred to as “*Crown Investments et al.*”
 - d. A group of submissions lodged by Anderson Lloyd Solicitors including Morven Ferry Limited³²¹, Peter Hale³²², Ray Ferner³²³, Slopehill Joint Venture³²⁴, Wakatipu Equities Limited³²⁵, Julie QT Limited³²⁶, Morven Residents Association Inc³²⁷, Philip Smith³²⁸, Phillippa Archibald³²⁹, Arrowtown Village Joint Venture³³⁰, Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green³³¹, Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited³³², Crosby

306	Submission 2194
307	Submission 2195
308	Submission 2478
309	Submission 2334
310	Submission 2338
311	Submission 2398
312	Submission 2410
313	Submission 2422
314	Submission 2424
315	Submission 2437
316	Submission 2496
317	Submission 2307
318	Submission 2376
319	Submission 2377
320	Submission 2378
321	Submission 2449
322	Submission 2458
323	Submission 2464
324	Submission 2475
325	Submission 2479
326	Submission 2488
327	Submission 2490
328	Submission 2500
329	Submission 2501
330	Submission 2505
331	Submission 2509
332	Submission 2525

Developments Limited³³³, Len McFadgen³³⁴, Goldcrest Farming Limited³³⁵, GW Walker Family Trust³³⁶, Kirstie Jean Brustad³³⁷ and John Edward Griffin³³⁸ are collectively referred to as "*Morven Ferry et al*";

- e. The group of submissions lodged by Brown and Company Planning Group including those of R & M Donaldson³³⁹, Lake Hayes Investments Limited³⁴⁰, Stoneridge Estate Limited³⁴¹, RG Dayman³⁴², Tui Trustees (2015) Limited³⁴³, Mandeville Trust/S Leck³⁴⁴, C Batchelor³⁴⁵, BD and J Duncan³⁴⁶, G Wills and T Burdon³⁴⁷, Waterfall Park Developments Limited³⁴⁸, are collectively referred to as "*Donaldson et al*";
- f. The group of submissions lodged by Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Limited, surveyors including the submissions of J & L Bagrie³⁴⁹, E, J, R & S Dennison³⁵⁰, D Gallagher³⁵¹, M K Greenslade³⁵², Anna Hutchinson³⁵³, R & J Kelly³⁵⁴, Sarah Lawrence³⁵⁵, DM Stanhope and G Burdis³⁵⁶, L M Topp³⁵⁷, Antony, Sarah and Samuel Strain³⁵⁸, Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey³⁵⁹, L McFadgen³⁶⁰, P & J McLeod³⁶¹, R and S McLeod³⁶², NT McDonald³⁶³ and Middleton Family Trust³⁶⁴ are collectively referred to as "*Bagrie et al*";

333	Submission 2527
334	Submission 2529
335	Submissions 2550 and 2551
336	Submission 2553
337	Submission 2577
338	Submission 2580
339	Submission 2229
340	Submission 2291
341	Submission 2314
342	Submission 2315
343	Submission 2316
344	Submission 2317
345	Submission 2318
346	Submission 2319
347	Submission 2320
348	Submission 2389
349	Submission 2246
350	Submission 2247
351	Submission 2248
352	Submission 2249
353	Submission 2250
354	Submission 2251
355	Submission 2252
356	Submission 2253
357	Submission 2254
358	Submission 2255
359	Submission 2256
360	Submission 2296
361	Submission 2298
362	Submission 2300
363	Submission 2303
364	Submission 2332

- g. The submissions lodged by Resource Management firm Vivian + Espie Limited for Skipp Williamson³⁶⁵, Wakatipu Investment Limited³⁶⁶ and D Bromfield and Woodlot Properties Limited³⁶⁷ are collectively referred to as "*Williamson et al*".

3.2 Part 24.1: Purpose

334. Chapter 24 commences with a lengthy outline of the contents of the Chapter under the heading "*Purpose*". This introductory discussion is the subject of numerous submissions.
335. Morven Ferry et al provided a complete rewrite of the section so that it would align with the relief they sought on the balance of the Chapter. Key points of emphasis that we identified were:
- a. Clarification that the Precinct is part of the Rural Amenity Zone;
 - b. Removal of reference to protection of the values of the Wakatipu Basin;
 - c. Emphasising that productive farming is not a dominant activity in the Basin;
 - d. Introduction of reference to the Landscape Classification Units;
 - e. Removal of reference to the Basin being a rural landscape;
 - f. Softening the description of potential adverse effects from development in the Precinct;
 - g. Emphasising the enabling aspects of the Precinct;
 - h. Deletion of reference to setbacks from identified landscape features;
 - i. Deletion of discussion of how effects of development near ONLs and ONFs are managed;
 - j. Deletion of reference to specific minimum densities in the Precinct, substituting discussion of a range of densities reflecting different factors applicable within the Precinct areas.
336. Many of these points overlapped with the relief sought in other submissions. So, for instance, amendment so the text that describes the Precinct as providing for a range of lot sizes was sought in the Donaldson et al submissions, many (but not all) of which also sought generally that the Zone purpose better provide for rural living. Crown Investments et al similarly sought removal of reference to protection of landscapes and deletion of the description of development in the Precinct as being "*limited*".
337. Debbie MacColl³⁶⁸, Phillip Bunn³⁶⁹ and Steven Bunn³⁷⁰ sought deletion of reference to an 80 hectare minimum lot size in the Rural Amenity Zone. Boxer Hills Trust³⁷¹ and Trojan Helmet Limited³⁷² sought deletion of reference to both minimum and average lot sizes. Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant³⁷³ sought better explanation of the differences between the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct. Williamson et al sought related relief, suggesting there be a distinct vision for the Rural Amenity Zone in the Precinct.

³⁶⁵ Submission 2271

³⁶⁶ Submission 2275

³⁶⁷ Submission 2296

³⁶⁸ Submission 2350

³⁶⁹ Submission 2355

³⁷⁰ Submission 2356

³⁷¹ Submissions 2385: Supported by FS2743, FS2749, FS2769 and FS2784and 2386;

³⁷² Submissions 2387: Supported by FS2701, FS2733 and FS2769

³⁷³ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

338. Raising a different point, Tonnie and Erna Spijkerbosch³⁷⁴ sought removal of what they described as “*monotone colour requirements*” on the grounds that it is creating a boring landscape.
339. The Telco submissions sought reference to utilities as an activity contemplated in the District.
340. Queenstown Trails Trust³⁷⁵ sought reference be made to the public trail network and to encouragement of expansion of same.
341. Slopehill Properties Limited³⁷⁶ sought that the zone purpose be made shorter, reference the benefits of rural living and signal that significant landscape character has been or need to be identified before it can be protected, maintained or enhanced.
342. Mr Barr accepted that the purpose statement is relatively long compared to some other chapters of the Proposed District Plan, but he pointed to the comparable section in Chapter 21 as being of similar length. He considered that the detail provided was of value, albeit that there was potential to prune unnecessary text.
343. Mr Barr recommended changes to Part 24.1 both in response to submissions and to our discussion of aspects of the section with him, including:
- a. Clarification that the Precinct is a sub-zone of the Rural Amenity Zone;
 - b. Inclusion of reference to an opportunity to reduce the prescribed minimum lot size (consistent with a recommendation he made in relation to that provision);
 - c. Amendment to the reference to landscape features to retitle them “*Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features*”;
 - d. Introduction of the Landscape Character Units as a means to define relevant values and assist effects assessment;
 - e. Deletion of the notified paragraph describing management of subdivision related issues as being unnecessary duplication;
 - f. Deletion of the statutory advice as to rules with immediate legal effect on the basis that it will be unnecessary once decisions on submissions are issued.
344. Before embarking on a discussion of the submissions in relation to Part 24.1, we think it is valuable to set out our understanding as to the role of this kind of introductory statement.
345. First we do not see it as a summary of the content of the Chapter, other than at the very high level. To attempt to do otherwise is to invite submissions like those of the Telcos querying why the matter of particular interest to them in the Chapter has not been mentioned (the “*what about me*” syndrome).
346. We also think that it is important that the zone purpose not be expressed in a way that leaves room for doubt as to whether it provides some sort of over-riding objective, noting a recent comment from the Environment Court regarding the lack of clarity as to the role of the zone purpose in Chapter 21 of the Proposed District Plan³⁷⁷.

³⁷⁴ Submission 2133

³⁷⁵ Submission 2575

³⁷⁶ Submission 2584

³⁷⁷ See *Ballantyne Barker Holdings Limited v QLDC* [2018] NZ EnvC 181 at [164]

347. We see the zone purpose rather as a very high level outline of the content of the Chapter that serves to assist interpretation of the elements of the chapter with regulatory force; the objectives, policies and rules.
348. It follows that we rather tend to agree with Mr Carey Vivian, giving planning evidence for Williamson et al, that even with clarification of the interrelationship between the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct recommended by Mr Barr (which Mr Vivian supported):
- “The zone purpose... is still confusing and cumbersome to read through. In my opinion, the zone purpose should be focussed on the overall purpose of the zone. There is no need to repeat the rules (i.e. minimum lot sizes), or matters contained in other district wide sections of the Plan (i.e. natural hazards). Simply put, the zone purpose is an introduction to the objectives, policies and rules which follow.”³⁷⁸*
349. Mr Vivian recommended that subject to there being jurisdiction to do so, this section could be simplified into three paragraphs only:
- a. Stating what the chapter applies to;
 - b. Stating the overall purpose of the zone;
 - c. Explaining the role of the Precinct and its interrelationship with the Rural Amenity Zone.
350. Comparing the Slopehill Properties submission, which clearly did seek a material shortening of the zone purpose section, the three paragraphs suggested in that submission were:
- a. A statement of the purpose of the zone (as being to provide rural living opportunities);
 - b. Describing the other activities anticipated in the zone;
 - c. Referring to the need to manage the risks of natural hazards.
351. Interestingly, if one were looking for candidates for deletion in order that Part 24.1 might more succinctly state the purpose of the zone, the single sentence in the notified version noting that the district is subject to natural hazards that have to be managed is an obvious target. Aside from being a statement of the blindingly obvious, natural hazards are managed under Chapter 28. The single sentence relating to natural hazards in Part 24.1 says nothing that is not in Chapter 28 and reference to this topic raises obvious questions as to why other matters like tangata whenua issues (managed under Chapter 5) and heritage issues (managed under Chapter 26) are not similarly referenced.
352. Mr Barr did not identify any submissions specifically on the paragraph related to natural hazards. Presumably this is because it is so anodyne that in a process where almost everything else is the subject of submission, no submitter felt the need to make any comment about it. For the same reason, we think it can and should be deleted as a minor change in terms of Clause 16(2).
353. Looking at what a cut down version of Part 24.1 might say, the starting point is to describe what the chapter applies to. Because it applies to the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct, we agree with the submissions seeking that the relationship between the two needs to be made clear.

³⁷⁸ Vivian EIC at 2.10

354. We do not agree with Slopehill Properties that the purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone (as distinct from the Precinct) is to provide rural living opportunities. That may be a consequence of implementation of the zone provisions, but non-complying activity status for virtually all subdivision and development (which we support) indicates that it is not its purpose.
355. Consistent with the discussion in Section 2.7 of this Report, we accept the submissions seeking deletion of specific reference to “*protection*” in the combined phrase “*protect, maintain and enhance*” character and amenity. While we would prefer that maintenance and enhancement be stated as alternatives for the reasons discussed in Section 2.7, as far as we can identify, none of the submissions on Part 24.1 seek that amendment.
356. We believe that the purpose of the zone is therefore to maintain (and enhance) the character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin. Rather than attempt to describe those values, we agree with the submissions (and Mr Barr’s recommendation) that reference should be made to Schedule 24.8 that has a detailed breakdown of the landscape character and amenity values sought to be maintained and enhanced.
357. Although currently directed at the Precinct, the existing text on the use of controls on the location, nature and visual effects of buildings might usefully be introduced as an adjunct to implementation of Schedule 24.8.
358. Discussing the Precinct, we agree with submissions suggesting deletion of reference to specific controls on development in the Rules. We also accept that it is not helpful to describe opportunities for development in the Precinct as being “*limited*”. We disagree however, with submissions such as Morven Ferry et al that seek to emphasise the enabling elements of the Precinct and to de-emphasise the landscape character and amenity outcomes that must be achieved. The evidence of Mr Brown, for instance, was that reference to limited opportunities should be deleted “*because the primary purpose of the WBLP is Rural Residential living, and therefore the opportunity for subdivision for this purpose should be encouraged and enabled*”³⁷⁹.
359. When we discussed it with him, Mr Brown amplified on this position, suggesting to us that if the objective is to enable development, then that needs to be clear. He also clarified his evidence as starting from the proposition that the Precinct applies to areas with levels of absorption capacity that means that effects are able to be managed. This is an important point. When we discussed the rationale for the Precinct areas with Ms Gilbert, she told us that not every potential site within the recommended Precinct areas would be able to be developed consistently with the objectives and policies of the Plan, and if this was not clear, the policies might need to be tweaked to make it clear that a development outcome is not a given in every situation. Mr Brown frankly admitted that he had not put his mind to the potential position where sites were not able to be subdivided.
360. It seems to us, therefore, that it is important to characterise the Precinct as being more enabling of development than the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, but not “*open slather*”.

³⁷⁹ Brown EIC for Lake Hayes Investments Ltd and Others at 2.3(a)

361. Continuing the comparison of the Precinct with the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, while we consider it unhelpful to seek to describe the range of activities anticipated in the Rural Amenity Zone (as above, it invites complaints from those whose activities are omitted), we think at this general introductory level, it is helpful to be clear that there are a range of activities anticipated. The objectives, policies and rules provide guidance as to what is and is not anticipated within that range.
362. The other aspect of Part 24.1 that we consider worth retaining is the discussion of development near ONLs or ONFs given the statutory instruction to recognise and provide for their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. We also think it is important to mention the landscape feature lines shown on the planning maps outside ONLs and ONFs since we heard from at least one submitter (Mr Bloomfield appearing for his family³⁸⁰) who had misunderstood reference to those lines as relating to ONF or ONL lines. While we agree with Mr Barr's suggestion that they might more accurately be described as Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features, we think it is valuable that Part 24.1 describe them in a way that makes the difference clear.
363. Lastly, we think that the title to this section should be amended so that it is consistent with the other chapters of the Proposed District Plan and read "*Zone Purpose*", and that the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone should be shortened to Rural Amenity Zone. Referring to "*the Zone*" invites confusion when sites on the margin of other zones are the subject of application. Our recommendations on the balance of Chapter 24 adopt that non-substantive change without further comment.
364. In summary, therefore, we recommend that Part 24.1 be amended to read:

"Zone Purpose

This Chapter applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Rural Amenity Zone) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (Precinct). The purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone is to maintain and enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin. The Wakatipu Basin has been subdivided in Schedule 24.8 into Landscape Character Units to assist identification of the particular landscape character and amenity values sought to be maintained and enhanced. Controls on the location, nature and visual effects of buildings are used to provide a flexible and design led response to those values.

The purpose of defining the Precinct is to identify areas within the broader Rural Amenity Zone that have the potential to absorb rural living and other development, while still achieving the overall purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone. The balance of the Rural Amenity Zone is less enabling of development, while still providing for a range of activities suitable for a rural environment.

While the Rural Amenity Zone does not contain Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes, it is a distinctive and high amenity value landscape located adjacent to, or nearby to, Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. There are no specific setback rules for development adjacent to Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes. However, all buildings except small farm buildings and subdivision require resource consent to ensure that

³⁸⁰ Submission 2423

inappropriate buildings and/or subdivision does not occur adjacent to those features and landscapes. Buildings and development are also required to be set back from the Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps.”

3.3 Part 24: Relationship Between Objectives

365. There are five objectives in the notified version of Part 24.2. An Introductory statement records that the first four objectives (24.2.1-4 inclusive) apply both to the Rural Amenity Zone and to the Precinct. Objective 24.2.5 and its related policies are stated to apply to the Precinct only.
366. Williamson et al sought that this Introductory statement be deleted. Giving evidence for the submitters, Mr Vivian explained that his concern was that differences in wording as between some of the provisions in Part 24.2.5 (purportedly applying to the Precinct only) and those in the balance of Part 24.2 (purportedly applying to the Rural Amenity Zone as a whole) introduced confusion as to which objectives and policies should be given weight in the consideration of a resource consent application. Mr Vivian suggested, as a solution, adding a statement to the Introductory description of the inter relationship between the objectives and policies that in the event of conflict between them, Objective 24.2.5 takes precedent.
367. Initially, Mr Barr recommended rejection of the Williamson et al submission. In his rebuttal evidence, he analysed the areas of inconsistency Mr Vivian had suggested and sought to reconcile the different provisions.
368. We think that it is fair to observe that the apparent inconsistency Mr Vivian had identified was reduced by amendments Mr Barr recommended to a number of objectives and policies. Nevertheless, by his reply evidence, Mr Barr had come round to the view that a clarification statement along the lines of that suggested by Mr Vivian might assist. We agree. As Mr Barr observed in his rebuttal evidence³⁸¹, it is a basic principle of Plan interpretation that a specific provision should prevail over a general provision where they differ. A statement to that effect on the face of the Proposed District Plan can only assist its proper implementation.
369. Mr Barr recommended a slightly reframed statement from that suggested by Mr Vivian but essentially with the same effect, located immediately following Objective 24.2.5. Mr Barr’s wording is simpler and clearer than that suggested by Mr Vivian. We also agree that this clarification is better located with Objective 24.2.5. We therefore recommend that that Objective be followed by the statement:

“Objective 24.2.5 and Policies 24.2.5.1 to 24.2.5.6 apply to the Precinct only. In the event of a conflict between Objective 24.2.5 and Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4, Objective 24.2.5 prevails.”

370. We do think, however, that consistent with the submissions that sought clarity as to the relationship between the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct discussed in Section 3.2, some rewording of the initial statement at the commencement of Section 24.2 is required. At present, the statement refers to *“the Zone and Precinct”*. While that is how they are shown on the planning maps, it does not capture the concept of a sub-zone embedded within the broader Rural Amenity Zone. We recommend that the first sentence be reworded to read as follows:

³⁸¹ At 5.11

“Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4 and related policies apply to the Precinct and to the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone.”

3.4 General Approach to Submissions on Objectives and Policies

371. There were many submissions on the objectives and policies of Chapter 24. Our view on some of those submissions has already been set out in the preceding discussion of more general issues, either explicitly or implicitly. There were many requests for additional objectives and policies. The way we intend to approach our task is to consider first the submissions on the notified objectives of Chapter 24. Having completed that task, we will consider submissions that sought additional objectives, making recommendations as appropriate.

372. Having finalised a set of objectives for Part 24 in our minds, we will then consider the appropriate policies to achieve those objectives, starting with the policies in the notified chapter, and then considering submissions suggesting new policies.

3.5 Objectives

373. As notified, Objective 24.2.1 read:

“Objective - Landscape and amenity values are protected, maintained and enhanced.”

374. We note first a general submission by Walrus Jack Trustee Limited³⁸² that sought to ensure that the benefits of Rural Living are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to good design. This was a theme of many other submissions, most of which, however, sought to achieve the same end result through new provisions that we will discuss in due course. Submission 2480, however, is generally framed and needs to be borne in mind in our review of each provision.

375. More specific submissions included:

- a. Support for the objective as it stands from the Telcos;
- b. A request from Williamson et al that the objective be amended to be specific to the Rural Amenity Zone and refer to landscape *“character”*
- c. A request from Crown Investments et al that reference to *“protection”* be deleted. Slopehill Properties³⁸³ also sought to delete reference to protection;
- d. Federated Farmers³⁸⁴ sought that the objective refer to values being *“maintained or enhanced”*;

376. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of the Williamson et al submission that sought reference be to landscape *“character”*, noting that in the policies supporting the objective, that is the focus. Otherwise, Mr Barr did not recommend any change.

377. For our part, for the reasons set out in Section 2.7, we recommend that a submission seeking deletion of the reference to protection be accepted and that maintenance and enhancement be referred to as alternatives, as sought by Federated Farmers. We emphasise that we do not

³⁸² Submission 2480, opposed in part by FS2720, FS2723 and FS2724

³⁸³ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

³⁸⁴ Submission 2540

imply by recommending deletion of reference to “*protection*” any intention to soften or water-down the outcome sought to be achieved.

378. We agree with Mr Barr that it would not be appropriate to limit the objective to apply only in that part of the Rural Amenity Zone that is not Precinct. Equally, however, we think that there is value in being clear where it applies; not, for instance, within ONLs or ONFs or within special zones like Millbrook.

379. Accordingly, we recommend that Objective 24.2.1 be amended to read:

“Landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone are maintained or enhanced.”

380. We consider that this form of objective is the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the Act in the Wakatipu Basin areas not identified as outstanding or zoned for some other purpose. For the reasons set out in Section 2.7 of our Report above, we also consider that this formulation gives effect to the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.

381. As notified, Objective 24.2.2 read:

“Objective - Non-residential activities are compatible with infrastructure, and maintain and enhance landscape character and amenity values.”

382. The Telcos, Otago Fish and Game Council³⁸⁵ and NZTA³⁸⁶ supported the objective.

383. There appear to be no submissions that sought the objective be amended.

384. We discussed with Mr Barr what the reference to activities being “*compatible with infrastructure*” meant. He accepted that it was potentially ambiguous given that it might relate to the ability to service activities or to the effects on infrastructure. Mr Barr accepted, however, that the policies of the section offered little assistance other than notified policy 24.2.2.4, which relates to effects on road safety or efficiency.

385. Having reflected on our comments, Mr Barr recommended that the objective be amended to refer to compatibility with infrastructure “constraints”. He suggested to us that NZTA’s submission provided scope for that change.

386. We regard the notified objective as unsatisfactory; both because of the ambiguity in its meaning that we discussed with Mr Barr and because it is not at all apparent to us why compatibility with infrastructure should be a specific target in relation to non-residential activities, but not (implicitly) in relation to residential activities. While we appreciate that Mr Barr was seeking to address the first at least through his suggested amendment, we disagree that the NZTA submission provides scope for the suggested change. NZTA sought that the objective be retained as proposed. That does not seem to leave much room for amendment to us.

³⁸⁵ Submission 2455

³⁸⁶ Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by FS2765 and FS2766

387. Given the submissions we have to work with, we consider that the only permissible change to the objective is if the requirements of Clause 16(2) can be met. As a result of the recommended amendments to Objective 24.2.1, that objective already provides for maintenance or enhancement of landscape character. Therefore, reference to landscape character can be deleted from Objective 24.2.2 as a minor change. The same is not the case for amenity values. Objective 24.2.1 relates to visual amenity values which are a subset of the broader concept of amenity values. While it is not obvious to us why non-residential activities should have a focus on the full range of amenity values while residential activities have a narrower focus, the difference between the two is material and in our view cannot be altered under Clause 16(2).
388. For the reasons set out in section 2.7, we would prefer that maintenance and enhancement were stated as alternatives, but given the limited scope for amendment, we do not consider we can recommend that change.
389. Similarly, if *“compatibility with infrastructure”* is read as related to the efficient provision of infrastructure, which the sole policy relevant to infrastructure in Part 24.2.2 would suggest, there is an obvious overlap with Objective 24.2.4 that already seeks that efficient provision of infrastructure be ensured. We consider that the best approach is to delete reference to compatibility with infrastructure from this objective and shift Policy 24.2.2.4 into Part 24.2.4. We consider that because of the duplication between provisions, these are minor changes.
390. In summary, therefore, we recommend that Objective 24.2.2. be amended to read:
- “Non-residential activities maintain and enhance amenity values.”*
391. We consider that given the limited options open to us, this is the formulation that is the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the Act.
392. Turning to Objective 24.2.3, as notified, it read:
- “Objective - Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated where rural living opportunities, visitor and tourism activities, community and recreation activities occur.”*
393. Aside from the submission of Otago Fish & Game Council³⁸⁷ that supported the objective, the only other submission we need to note is that of Federated Farmers³⁸⁸ that sought the word *“occur”* at the end of the objective be deleted and substituted by the phrase *“conflict with pre-existing activities”*.
394. Mr Barr did not disagree with the thinking underlying the Federated Farmers submission but considered that the suggested amendment was unnecessary, because it is inherent in the concept of reverse sensitivity that the objective is addressing the effects new activities might have on pre-existing activities. He therefore recommended that the objective remain as notified.

³⁸⁷ Submission 2455

³⁸⁸ Submission 2540

395. We note that Mr Cooper’s tabled evidence for Federated Farmers did not address the Society’s submission on this particular objective, which we read as acceptance of Mr Barr’s reasoning³⁸⁹. We agree with Mr Barr’s recommendation. We think that it is implicit in a reference to reverse sensitivity effects that this relates to new activities having an effect on pre-existing activities.
396. Accordingly, we recommend that the objective remain as notified on the basis that this is the most appropriate way to achieve the Act, having regard to the alternatives open to us.
397. Objective 24.2.4, as notified, read as follows:
- “Objective - Subdivision and land use development maintains and enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure.”*
398. The Department of Conservation³⁹⁰, Otago Fish and Game Council³⁹¹ and NZTA³⁹² all supported the objective.
399. Submissions we noted that sought substantive change to the objective included:
- a. Transpower New Zealand Limited³⁹³ that sought the objective be amended to include reference to the protection of the National Grid.
 - b. Morven Ferry et al that sought the objective be amended to remove reference to *“land use”*.
 - c. Federated Farmers³⁹⁴ that sought maintenance and enhancement be expressed as alternatives.
 - d. Slopehill Properties Limited³⁹⁵ that sought the objective be deleted.
400. Mr Barr did not consider it was necessary that specific reference be made to protection of the National Grid. He noted that the National Grid is not located on land the subject of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), but acknowledged that further upgrades might alter that position. While we accept Mr Barr’s evidence that the National Grid is not actually on land that has been rezoned may well be correct (we had no evidence to the contrary), it appears to us that the existing National Grid Line comes very close to the margins of the Rural Amenity Zone east of Morven Hill. More substantively, Mr Barr considered that the National Grid fell within notified Policy 24.2.4.6, it being an item of regionally significant infrastructure, as well as being provided for in Chapter 30 of the Proposed District Plan. He did not support the requested addition.
401. Mr Barr initially supported the Morven Ferry et al submission on the basis that *“subdivision and development”* is a defined term. However, having discussed it with us, he recommended

³⁸⁹ Consistent with paragraph 31 of Mr Cooper’s evidence

³⁹⁰ Submission 2242

³⁹¹ Submission 2455

³⁹² Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by FS2765 and FS2766

³⁹³ Submission 2442; Opposed by FS2746

³⁹⁴ Submission 2540

³⁹⁵ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

that specific reference was still required to land uses in addition to subdivision and development³⁹⁶ .

402. We agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning on the latter point. If all reference to land use were omitted, there would be no indication of the desired outcome when land uses have the potential to affect water quality. This would not give effect to the NPSFM provisions discussed in Section 2.8 of this Report that relate to District Council functions or to the strategic direction in Part 3.2.4.

403. Mr Barr did not discuss the Federated Farmers submission, but we agree that, for the reasons set out in Section 2.7 above, maintenance and enhancement should be alternatives.

404. We also agree that no specific reference is required to the National Grid in this context either to implement the NPSET or otherwise. We put little weight on Mr Barr’s point regarding Policy 24.2.4.6 since that relates to the establishment and operation of regionally significant infrastructure so as to achieve appropriate landscape and amenity outcomes, rather than its protection from the activities of third parties. We think the better answer is that the provisions of Chapter 27 and 30 already provide protection for the National Grid. Objective 24.2.3 also addresses reverse sensitivity effects and efficient provision of infrastructure in terms of Objective 24.2.4 clearly includes its ability to operate free from direct adverse effects. We consider further references to protection of infrastructure unnecessary.

405. In summary, therefore, we recommend that this objective be revised to read:

“Objective 24.2.4

Subdivision and development, and use of land, maintains or enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure.”

406. We consider that of the options available to us, this formulation is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

407. Objective 24.2.5 as notified read as follows:

“The landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct are maintained and enhanced in conjunction with enabling rural residential living opportunities.”

408. Otago Fish and Game Council³⁹⁷ supported the objective in its existing form.

409. We noted the following submissions that sought substantive amendments to it:

- a. Williamson et al sought that the objective be amended to acknowledge the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct will change over time.
- b. Donaldson et al sought that the objective be amended to read:

“Enable Rural Residential Living opportunities while managing the effects of subdivision and development on the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct.”

³⁹⁶ See Barr Reply at 11.21

³⁹⁷ Submission 2455

- c. Slopehill Properties Limited³⁹⁸ sought that the objective be deleted.
410. Mr Barr addressed the submissions on this objective at Section 25 of his Section 42A Report. Summarising his response to the Williamson et al and Donaldson et al submissions, it is that the objective already contemplates landscape change while setting a high bar to ensure that the development is the most appropriate.
411. Giving evidence for Williamson et al, Mr Vivian agreed with Mr Barr's reasoning. Mr Brown, however, presenting evidence for the Donaldson et al group, suggested a reformulation of the objective from that sought in the submissions, worded as follows:
- "Rural residential living opportunities are enabled while effects of subdivision and development on the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct are managed."*
412. Mr Brown's reasoning³⁹⁹ was that while expansion of existing rural residential development might fairly be required to maintain and if possible enhance the established character, greenfield areas where the established character and visual amenity values are not based on rural residential development would pose difficulties, because a change to rural residential development would change the existing character and visual amenity substantially.
413. He supported amended wording, because it stated up front what the Precinct is intended to enable and *"it seeks to manage (i.e. avoid, remedy, or mitigate) effects on the landscape character and visual amenities of the Precinct."*
414. In his rebuttal evidence⁴⁰⁰, Mr Barr expressed the view that if the objective is reduced to *"manage"* only, this does not provide sufficient guidance as to the desired end-state of the environment, leading to the likelihood that the Precinct will be managed, but in a way that produces sub-optimal outcomes.
415. We discussed Mr Barr's reasoning with Mr Brown, seeking to tease out the environmental outcome the latter was trying to achieve. His response was that in some respects, it was that setbacks be achieved and that buildings be constructed that are sympathetic with colours and amenities of the natural environment and associated buildings. He mooted the potential to add reference to building design, appearance and setbacks as a result. He remained of the view however, that the objective needed to be qualified, because maintenance or enhancement of amenity values would not be achieved in a zone anticipating change.
416. We share Mr Barr's concern that an objective identifying effects to be *"managed"* is an invitation for unsatisfactory outcomes in an area under intense development pressure. Substituting the phrase *"avoid, remedy or mitigate"*, which Mr Brown regarded as synonymous with *"managed"*, would be no better.

³⁹⁸ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

³⁹⁹ Refer Section 3 of his Evidence in Chief for Lake Hayes Investments Ltd and others

⁴⁰⁰ At 8.5-8.8

417. Likewise, expressing the objective conditionally using qualifiers like “*if possible*” or “*wherever practicable*” (that we also discussed as possibilities with Mr Brown) would leave too much leeway to applicants and create too great a potential for unsatisfactory outcomes.
418. Ultimately, we come back to the rationale underlying identification of the Precinct areas which, as explained to us by Ms Gilbert, is that those areas have greater capacity to absorb subdivision and development than does the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone. We asked Ms Gilbert if there was a relationship between absorption and the maintenance of visual amenity values, and in particular whether, if an area could absorb development, that meant that visual amenity values could be maintained in that area, and vice versa; i.e. that absorption and maintenance of visual amenity values are two sides of the same coin. She confirmed that was her view.
419. As discussed already, when we put that proposition to him, Mr Brown accepted that he had not considered the potential that sites would not be able to be developed within the Precinct area because development on them could not actually be absorbed.
420. As we have already discussed in the context of the zone purpose, this is a key theme underlying Chapter 24 that we will return to in the discussion of subsequent provisions. For present purposes, however, we think that the objective needs to specify as a minimum that landscape character and visual amenity values be maintained. It follows that our response to Mr Brown’s rhetorical question (whether we are anticipating change or not) is that if those values cannot be maintained, then development should not occur.
421. For the reasons set out in section 2.7 of this Report, the prospect that those values might be enhanced should be an alternative (maintained or enhanced).
422. We have no difficulty with reversing the order of the objective, as Mr Brown suggested, so long as it is clear that opportunities are enabled if and only if landscape character and visual amenity values are at minimum maintained.
423. Mr Barr suggested in the reply version of his objective that reference be made to rural living opportunities rather than “*rural residential living opportunities*”. Although his reply evidence does not mention it specifically, we infer that this suggested change is designed to avoid any confusion with the Rural Residential Zone, and the minimum development density therein (a point we discussed with Mr Barr in other contexts).
424. Mr Barr suggested that this might be considered a minor grammatical amendment. Given the relief sought by Slopehill Properties (seeking deletion of the objective), we think that it can be fairly attributed to that submission.
425. It follows from the discussion above, however, that we do not support deletion of this objective. We do not consider that would be consistent either with section 7(c) of the Act or with the strategic direction of the Proposed District Plan. The Slopehill Properties suggested relief of deletion of the objective was, however, premised on an alternative objective which would state:

“The benefits of rural living in the Wakatipu Basin are recognised and promoted”.

426. Mr Ben Farrell gave evidence for Slopehill Properties Limited. He sought to put the issue in a broader context of the evidence he had previously given on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1). While he supported a new objective along the lines sought in the Slopehill Properties submission, other aspects of his evidence suggested to us that he recognised the need, at an objective level, to balance enablement of development opportunities with an appropriate environmental outcome required to be achieved.
427. Mr Farrell told us, for instance, that he had supported an objective in Chapter 22 worded:
- “The District’s landscape, quality, character, and visual amenity values are maintained and enhanced while rural living opportunities in areas that can absorb development within those landscapes are enabled.”*
428. That is certainly our view. We do not support an objective focussing solely on the benefits of rural living without reference to the environmental standards that must be achieved in conjunction with that development.
429. In summary, we believe that the appropriate objective for the Precinct should be worded as follows:
- “Rural living opportunities are enabled in the Precinct, provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.”*
430. We believe that this formulation gives effect to the Proposed RPS provisions summarised in Section 2.4 of this Report seeking sustainable land use outcomes and is consistent with the strategy direction established in Chapter 3, including but not limited to Policy 3.3.24. We also believe that it is the most appropriate of the options open to us to achieve the purpose of the Act.
431. Slopehill Properties was one of a number of submissions that in various ways sought greater recognition of rural living developments through a new objective. This varied from very general requests such as those of WK and FL Allen⁴⁰¹ who sought *“a new objective and policies which specifically recognise and provide for the benefits of rural living in the Wakatipu Basin”* to the more detailed relief sought by Morven Ferry et al; a new objective worded as follows:
- “Existing development rights and additional rural living opportunities are recognised and provided for.”*
432. Donaldson et al sought a similarly worded objective framed as follows:
- “The benefits arising from rural living activities, and existing property rights, are recognised and provided for.”*
433. The Morven Ferry et al submission stated that the intention of the suggested new objective (and the policies that were intended to go with it) is to provide for the positive and enabling elements of Part 2 that following the Supreme Court’s decision in *King Salmon* might not

⁴⁰¹ Submission 2482: Supported by FS2717

otherwise be able to be considered. The Donaldson et al submissions referred to the extent of investment by landowners in their properties, suggesting that changes of zoning from the former Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle zoning to the Rural Amenity Zone has the potential to undermine that investment and introduce considerable uncertainty for owners “*particularly those who have not exercised the rights afforded by the existing zonings, including the construction of a dwelling, or subdivision*”.

434. Mr Barr addressed these submissions at Section 21 of his Section 42A Report. Having analysed the additional policies suggested in the Morven Ferry et al submission, Mr Barr found that all of the matters canvassed are recognised and provided for in the framework of Chapter 24 already, which in his view, creates development rights that were not afforded in the Operative District Plan Rural General Zone. He likewise did not consider similar relief sought by Donaldson et al as providing any great benefit, noting that he had addressed the concern apparently underlying these submissions through a recommendation that residential activities within building platforms could be facilitated.
435. As far as we could identify, the new objectives sought by these submissions were not the subject of supportive planning evidence, other than in the general way in which Mr Farrell addressed these issues (discussed above). We did, however, receive legal submissions from a number of submitters emphasising to us the importance of recognising existing property rights.
436. We asked Ms Hill, who appeared before us as counsel for a number of different submitter groups, exactly what established rights she was referring to in her submissions and she identified the removal (in the notified version of Chapter 24) of the ability to develop existing building platforms as controlled activities. As we will discuss in context of submissions on the rules in Chapter 24, this particular aspect of Chapter 24 is problematic, and we will recommend how it might best be addressed later in this report.
437. We do not believe that the appropriate course is to recommend a very general reference in an objective to “*existing development rights*” or “*existing property rights*”.
438. There is an inherent tension between the operation of the Act in relation to land uses and common law property rights. The latter would permit a landowner to do virtually anything they wished on their land, provided it does not give rise to a common law “*nuisance*”. At least since the enactment of the Town and Country Planning Act 1953, the exercise of common law “*rights*” of landowners has been the subject of greater scrutiny and control.
439. The Act seeks to recognise landowners “*rights*” in two principal ways. First, Section 9 of the Act generally⁴⁰² only restricts the use of land where that contravenes a District Rule, a Regional Rule or a National Environmental Standard. Second, section 32 of the Act requires an evaluation of Plan provisions against the criteria in that section. As already noted in this report, case law indicates that where a Plan contains restrictions, the correct interpretation of section 32 requires adoption of the least restrictive alternative meeting the purpose of the Act and the objectives of the relevant Plan.

⁴⁰² Land the subject of designations or heritage orders, or where the processes to obtain same have been formally commenced is the subject of additional controls

440. While landowners may have placed some reliance on more favourable zoning of their land under the Operative District Plan and/or the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) we do not regard such zoning as creating development or property “rights” if the landowner has not made application for a resource consent under the relevant rules (so as to bring section 88A of the Act into play). At most, it can only be an expectation. That expectation must, however, be considered against the background that it is inherent in the process of review of District Plans that, subject to the requirements of section 32 being met, the end result may be a greater level of restriction on land uses than had formerly been the case under the previous District Plan. Looked at broadly, this may arise in a range of circumstances; most obviously, this might arise, where past development under the existing provisions has had unsatisfactory consequences or where cumulative effects of past development are approaching a threshold beyond which development either should not proceed, (or should only proceed if the subject of a greater level of scrutiny).
441. Based on the WB Landscape Study and the evidence that we have heard, principally but not solely from Ms Gilbert, we believe that both of those is the case in the Wakatipu Basin.
442. To an extent, this issue overlaps with our discussion in Section 2.4 of this Report. For much the same reasons, we do not recommend an objective recognising existing development rights and/or existing property rights.
443. As regards the potential for an objective recognising “additional rural living opportunities” and/or “the benefits arising from rural living activities”, our response is largely the same as for the parallel relief suggested by Slopehill Properties. It would not be appropriate to provide such recognition without indicating what environmental standard has to be achieved in conjunction with additional rural living.
444. Stepping back, Chapter 24 already recognises the benefits of rural living through identification of the enhanced rights of development for that purpose in the Precinct, which in turn has been identified by reason of its ability to absorb that development, principally from a landscape perspective, but taking into account (in our recommendations, to the extent we are able to do so based on the evidence we have heard and the scope provided by submissions) other environmental constraints.
445. In the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, rural living development is deliberately made more difficult. That is part of the structure of the chapter that we have already recommended be retained. It does not, however, make it impossible. The WB Landscape Study identifies a sliding scale of absorption capacity across the Basin. While applications will need to meet the high bar posed by a non-complying activity status, that may well still be possible on an appropriate site with a carefully designed development proposal.
446. We also note that the point made in the Morven Ferry et al submission regarding the application of the Supreme Court’s decision in *King Salmon* now needs to be read in the light of the subsequent decision of the Court of Appeal in *RJ Davidson Family Trust v Marlborough District Council*⁴⁰³ indicating that there is greater scope to refer back to Part 2 of the Act on a

⁴⁰³ [2018] NZCA 316

resource consent application than in the plan setting that was the subject of the Supreme Court's decision.

447. In summary, we recommend that the submissions seeking greater recognition for rural living and/or existing development/property rights through a new objective not be accepted.
448. There are two other submissions seeking new objectives that we need to address at this point. The first is that of a number of the runanga of Kai Tahu with manawhenua status in the District⁴⁰⁴ who suggested the need for objectives, policies and rules to recognise and address the effects of landfills, cemeteries and crematoriums on tangata whenua values and the effects of activities more generally on the values of mapped Wahi Tupuna areas.
449. The runanga did not appear before us to amplify their concerns and the submission was non-specific as to how such an objective(s) might be framed.
450. Mr Barr drew our attention to the relevant provisions of the two iwi management plans that we need to take into account⁴⁰⁵. We note in particular policy direction seeking to discourage subdivision and building in culturally sensitive landscapes.
451. In his discussion of the runanga submission⁴⁰⁶, Mr Barr noted that the submission is made in the context of general support for Chapter 24. In terms of the specific relief, Mr Barr drew our attention to notified Policy 24.2.1.12 and Assessment Matter 27.7.2(aa) as already addressing the concern expressed. Mr Barr also noted that the notified rules would make crematoriums, landfills or cemeteries non-complying activities.
452. We agree with Mr Barr that the issues raised by the runanga appear to be addressed already by the notified provisions. To the extent that the notified provisions operate in conjunction with Chapter 5, the submitters did not of course have the benefit of seeing the Decisions Version of that Chapter (which is now beyond appeal) when framing their submission. When we get to submissions on Policy 24.2.1.12, we will have some more to say about the adequacy of how that policy is framed, but in the absence of evidence identifying exactly what form an objective might take or analysing it in terms of section 32, we do not think we can take the runanga submission further. Insofar as it seeks an objective, we recommend that it be rejected.
453. Queenstown Trails Trust⁴⁰⁷ sought a new objective and two new policies recognising and enabling the benefits from public walking and cycling trails. Mr Barr drew our attention to the provisions of Chapter 3⁴⁰⁸ already providing for the trail network, together with notified Policy 24.2.1.10. He did not recommend additional provisions be inserted.
454. We concur. We had no evidence from the submitter that would enable us to satisfy the requirements of section 32 and we agree with Mr Barr's reasoning⁴⁰⁹ that while the merits of

⁴⁰⁴ Submission 2329

⁴⁰⁵ See C Barr, Section 42A Report at 5.16-5.19

⁴⁰⁶ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 9.7 and following

⁴⁰⁷ Submission 2575

⁴⁰⁸ Specifically Objective 3.2.4.5 and Policy 3.3.28

⁴⁰⁹ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 11.10-11.11

the trail network are clear (and would likely result in a well-designed and located trail being approved), it is important that trails do not degrade an amenity landscape. We are also concerned that the suggested objective (seeking to recognise and enable the benefits of land development) is expressed far more generally than the submitter's reasons would support, and might have anticipated adverse effects if expressed as baldly as the submitter has proposed

455. The remaining submission we should address is that of Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴¹⁰. That submission sought a new objective be added to Chapter 24 worded as follows:

“Subdivision and land use development protects and enhances biodiversity values with special regard to ecological links across the Basin.”

456. The submission included a map of ecological corridors to assist understanding of the relief sought. The submitter did not, however, appear before us to provide greater detail and evidential support for the relief sought. In his discussion of this submission⁴¹¹, Mr Barr drew our attention to its related submission that sought explicit provision for development incentives for the protection and establishment of indigenous biodiversity values similar to those contained within the Auckland Unitary Plan.

457. Mr Barr supported a focus on the restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity in the area of the Wakatipu Basin. He considered that that would assist the Council to give effect to its statutory function to maintain indigenous biodiversity. However, he did not support changes seeking to shift the focus of Chapter 24 from landscape character and visual amenity values derived from the existing Wakatipu Basin landscape to one of providing development rights in exchange for the enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values. Mr Barr's view, based on the landscape evidence provided in the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) hearings, was that the landscape character and visual amenity values sought to be maintained or enhanced under Chapter 24 are not derived from indigenous vegetation attributes. Rather, the vegetation types and patterns that contribute to the character and visual amenity of the Basin are primarily derived from exotic vegetation.

458. Mr Barr's recommendation was that the submission should be addressed by enhanced policy recognition for retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation, but not an additional objective in the terms sought.

459. While we did not have the benefit of evidence from the submitter, we did consider a rezoning proposal (that of Hogans Gully Farms Limited) that proffered a significant indigenous biodiversity enhancement programme as part of its overall proposal, thereby giving us an indication of what benefits might be derived from greater recognition of indigenous biodiversity. What that proposal illustrated to us is that while undoubtedly of benefit from an ecological perspective, there is potential for large scale indigenous biodiversity enhancement to have negative effects on landscape character and visual amenity if not undertaken in a way that replicates natural indigenous biodiversity, and builds on what indigenous biodiversity there is left in the Basin. From that perspective, we accept Mr Barr's caution in embracing

⁴¹⁰ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

⁴¹¹ At his Section 42A Report, Section 12

indigenous biodiversity measures in an environment whose values are not principally driven by indigenous biodiversity.

460. In summary, we recommend that the Reforestation Trust submission seeking a new objective not be accepted, largely for the reasons set out in Mr Barr's Section 42A Report.

3.6 Part 24.2.1: Policies

461. The notified Part 24.2.1 had 12 policies supporting the objective discussed above. The first of those policies (24.2.1.1) read as follows:

"Implement minimum and average lot sizes within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct to protect landscape character and visual amenity values."

462. Most of the focus in the submissions was on the reference to protection of landscape character and visual amenity values. Submitters on the point sought either that reference be to maintaining those values or to maintaining and enhancing them⁴¹².
463. The Slopehill Properties submission⁴¹³ also suggested deletion of reference to the purpose of the policy entirely, saying that the reason why minimum and average lot sizes are employed could be contained in background material such as the section 32 analysis. Slopehill Properties also suggested that the policy apply to unspecified parts of the Wakatipu Basin.
464. Williamson et al sought that the policy be reworded to be specific to the Rural Amenity Zone with a similar policy specific to the Precinct under Objective 24.2.5.
465. In his evidence in support of the Williamson et al submissions, Mr Vivian pointed out that the Policy was factually incorrect because there is no average lot size applicable to the Rural Amenity Zone under the rules of Chapter 24.
466. In his rebuttal evidence, Mr Barr acknowledged Mr Vivian's point and suggested rewording to address it.
467. Clearly, as Mr Barr recognised, the notified policy wording has to be changed. Having identified that there are different mechanisms in place for the Precinct than for the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, we think that the sensible course is to follow the suggestion of the Williamson et al submissions and have a separate policy for the Precinct in Section 24.2.5.
468. We also consider that the Slopehill Properties submission has merit. While the submission is correct and there is no need to say why a particular policy mechanism has been put in place on the face of the policy, we think in this particular instance there is a second and more pressing reason why we should recommend the acceptance of the submission. One of the issues that troubled us throughout the hearing was whether, given the restricted discretionary activity status of subdivision and development in the Precinct, that might be seen as a de facto controlled activity status for applications meeting the minimum lot size and the minimum

⁴¹² See Submissions 2307, 2376, 2377, 2540 and 2584: Supported by FS2717, FS2746, FS2795 and FS2796; Opposed by FS2732

⁴¹³ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

average lot size standards. We asked a number of planning witnesses for their opinion on the point. Many of them pointed to the legal position, that of course a restricted discretionary activity consent can be refused. Mr Ferguson, however, giving planning evidence for Crown Investments et al expressed rather more cautiously, saying that “*in theory*” the assessment matters would still give the ability to decline an application. Mr Philip Blakely, giving landscape evidence for X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust told us, however, that the very term “*Precinct*” implies a level of development can proceed. Ms Louise Taylor, giving planning evidence for the same submitters, responded to our query as to whether she agreed with Mr Blakely by pointing us to the objective and related policies that she regarded as enabling. The end result is that, in our view, there is an unsatisfactory ambiguity as to the extent to which development is enabled within the Precinct. Our recommendation in relation to Objective 24.2.5 was partly based on a desire to make the intention clearer, namely that while enabling to a degree, development of the Precinct is not a given. A case still needs to be made. As already discussed, not every site within the Precinct will be able to be subdivided and/or built on.

469. It follows that we do not want a policy flagging standards that have to be met to imply that if those standards are met, the desired result (protection or maintenance of landscape, character and visual amenity values as the case may be) will necessarily be achieved.
470. We do not, however, consider that the policy would be assisted by the additional amendment proposed by Slopehill Properties, given the lack of clarity that would result as to when it applied.
471. In addition, given that the relevant standards are based on minimum net site areas and (in the Precinct) minimum average net site areas, we think that that same terminology should be utilised. We also consider that the actual minimum net site area specified in the Rules for the balance of the Rural Amenity area not within the Precinct should be stated. Because this is clear in the rules, we regard that as a minor change assisting lay readers of the Plan.
472. While we will return to it in the context of the density standards in Part 27.5.1 of the Proposed District Plan, we do not support the submissions who sought reconsideration of the minimum lot size in the Rural Amenity Zone, without nominating an alternative they supported⁴¹⁴. As discussed in section 2.4 above, a significant reduction in the minimum lot size would indicate a difference in approach that we do not support. A more minor reduction would require evidence assessing relative costs and benefits, and indicating how it fitted into the overall structure of Chapter 24 that we did not have.
473. In summary, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.1 be worded as follows:
- “Require an 80 hectare minimum net site area be maintained within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone outside of the Precinct.”*
474. We will discuss the wording of the policy covering this point in relation to the areas within the Precinct in the context of our discussion of the policies of Part 24.2.5.

⁴¹⁴ See e.g. some of the Bagrie et al submissions

475. Notified Policy 24.2.1.2 read as follows:

“Ensure subdivision and developments are designed (including accessways, services, utilities and building platforms) to minimise modification to the landform, and maintain and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values.”

476. The Department of Conservation⁴¹⁵ and Federated Farmers⁴¹⁶ supported the Policy as is.

477. Submissions that sought material amendments to the Policy included:

- a. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴¹⁷ sought addition of reference to indigenous vegetation so its removal would be minimised along with landform modifications;
- b. Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant⁴¹⁸ sought rewording of the policy to recognise that landform modifications are acceptable provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced, and to provide for temporary modification of landforms;
- c. Morven Ferry et al sought a grammatical change to refer to subdivision and development, rather than subdivisions and developments, and to insert reference to *“inappropriate”* landform modifications;
- d. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴¹⁹ sought that the policy be deleted.

478. In his discussion of the submissions on this policy, Mr Barr recommended that the grammatical change sought by Morven Ferry et al be accepted, but otherwise the policy remain unchanged. His view⁴²⁰ was that the concern of the Reforestation Trust was better addressed by a new policy inserted in Part 24.2.4. We concur and will discuss Mr Barr’s suggested policy in that context. We also note that Policy 24.2.1.7 that we will discuss shortly already directs control of vegetation clearance.

479. Mr Barr did not specifically address the Dennison and Grant submission, but in relation to the Morven Ferry et al request for reference to inappropriate modification, he considered⁴²¹ that that amendment would read as though a range of effects from modification were anticipated, and that the policy only needs to ensure inappropriate activities are minimised *“and that these would be confined to activities involving unacceptable or intolerable modification effects”*. He did not support that change. Considering whether the policy was too absolute, he concluded, in summary, that it was not. He thought that a requirement to minimise modification provided sufficient leverage for the nature and scale of rural living and other activities to occur.

480. Mr Barr disagreed with the contention in the Slopehill Properties submission that the matters within the policy are not required to achieve the objective. We agree with that view. Landscape modification associated with subdivision and development is an obvious way in which landscape, character and visual amenity values can be degraded, if not properly controlled. This can occur in a number of ways. We heard evidence describing unsatisfactory

⁴¹⁵ Submission 2242

⁴¹⁶ Submission 2540

⁴¹⁷ Submission 2293

⁴¹⁸ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁴¹⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴²⁰ Barr s42A Report at 12.16-18

⁴²¹ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 20.27

effects of uncontrolled formation of new access roads from Mr James Hadley. We also note Policy 6.3.23 focussing on potential effects as a result of activities associated with mitigation of proposed development. While that policy relates to activities in Rural Character Landscape areas, Policy 24.2.1.2 is obviously responding to the same concern as underlies Policy 6.3.23. We should note, in that regard, the submission of Tonnie & Erna Spijkerbosch that sought limitation on the use of earth bunds to hide developments on the basis that they create an unnatural landscape. We think that Policy 24.2.1.2 responds to that concern also.

481. Having said that, we consider that the Slopehill Properties submission might be accepted in part to delete the reference at the end to maintaining and enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values. We think that element of the policy is better addressed in the following policy that provides guidance as to what values are relevant.
482. We also do not share Mr Barr's confidence that the policy is not framed too absolutely. On the face of the matter, a policy directing minimisation of all modifications to the landform irrespective of scale, duration or effect would seem to go too far. We think it unwise to attempt to categorise exceptions in any exclusive manner, as suggested by the Dennison/Grant submission. We think the starting point is to focus on modifications to the "natural" landform on the basis that modifications to developed areas are less of an issue. Secondly, we recommend acceptance of the Morven Ferry et al submission that sought the use of appropriateness as a qualification. Application of the guidance from the Supreme Court's decision in *King Salmon* would indicate that appropriateness is judged as to whether it achieves the objective, and so we do not consider this lacking clarity.
483. Lastly, we agree with Mr Barr's recommendation that the grammatical change suggested by Morven Ferry et al be accepted. Subdivision and development is a defined term, and the specific reference to accessways, services and utilities suggest that that is what is being referred to.
484. In summary, therefore, we recommend that the policy be reworded to read:
"Ensure subdivision and development is designed (including accessways, services, utilities and building platforms) to minimise inappropriate modification to the natural landform".
485. As notified, Policy 24.2.1.3 read:
"Ensure that subdivision and development maintains and enhances the Wakatipu Basin landscape character and visual amenity values identified for the landscape character units as described in Schedule 24.8".
486. The Department of Conservation⁴²² and Federated Farmers⁴²³ supported the policy as is.
487. Williamson et al suggested that the policy be made specific to the Rural Amenity Zone and include reference to protection of landscape character and visual amenity values.
488. Morven Ferry et al suggested that reference to Schedule 24.8 be deleted.

⁴²² Submission 2242

⁴²³ Submission 2540

489. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴²⁴ suggested that reference to the landscape character units be deleted.
490. Mr Barr recommended that the reference in the policy to the landscape character units be capitalised (as also suggested by Morven Ferry et al) and that reference to protection be added, as suggested by Williamson et al in order to be consistent with the objective.
491. Addressing the last point, the same logic would suggest that “*protect*” not be inserted as a result of our recommended wording for the relevant objective.
492. We agree that Landscape Character Units should be capitalised. The Morven Ferry et al submission did not provide any reason for deleting reference to the Schedule, and like Mr Barr, we see no reason why the Schedule should not be referred to. Moreover, omitting reference to it might leave open the inference that the relevant landscape character and visual amenity values might not be those stated in the Schedule.
493. We also see no necessity to describe the relevant values as the “*Wakatipu Basin*” landscape character and visual amenity values. The relevant values are those identified in the Schedule.
494. Slopehill Properties Limited suggested in its submission that the extent of each landscape unit, the values identified within each unit and the District Plan provisions managing the units “*require finer transparency and evaluation*”. While consistent with the evidential case that the submitter presented, which argued that the boundaries of the landscape character units and planning treatment for areas within them needed to be more finely grained, we have difficulty seeing how the submitter’s objective is achieved by the suggested amendment of deleting reference to the landscape character units.
495. Ultimately, the solution to the submitter’s problem is to amend the Schedule.
496. However, we think that there is merit in the submitter’s suggestion for another reason. The way the policy is framed might suggest that only the landscape character and visual amenity values for the landscape character unit within which a site is located are relevant. While that will obviously be the primary focus, particularly for sites on the margins of landscape character units, the values of the adjacent unit may also be relevant.
497. As previously, we would have preferred to refer to maintenance and enhancement in the alternative, but the submissions on this policy do not give scope for that change.
498. For these reasons, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.3 be worded as follows:
- “Ensure that subdivision and development maintains and enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units”.*
499. The use of Schedule 24.8 in Policy 24.2.1.3 to provide guidance as to the landscape character and visual amenity values in the component areas of the Rural Amenity Zone (including the Precinct) means that we do not support proposals such as those in the Dennison and Grant

⁴²⁴ Submission 2584

submission⁴²⁵ that objectives and policies be developed for subparts of the Basin identified as more able to absorb developments.

500. As notified Policy 24.2.1.4 read as follows:

“Maintain and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Zone and Precinct and surrounding landscape context by controlling the colour, scale, form, coverage, location (including setbacks from boundaries and from identified Landscape Features) and height of buildings and associated infrastructure, vegetation and landscape elements”.

501. Submissions that sought material changes to this policy included:

- a. Williamson et al suggested that it be made specific to the Rural Amenity Zone (albeit accompanied by a submission that there be an equivalent policy in the Precinct);
- b. Morven Ferry et al suggested deletion of reference to boundary setbacks and setbacks from identified Landscape Features;
- c. Federated Farmers⁴²⁶ sought to make enhancement an alternative to maintenance and to insert reference to controls *“where necessary”*;
- d. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴²⁷ sought deletion of the policy.

502. Mr Barr recommended deletion of the reference to *“Precinct”* to avoid confusion as to the status of other policies intended to apply both in the Precinct and the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone and clarification of the reference to Landscape Features, so as to clearly differentiate them from ONFs.

503. Mr Barr did not recommend the amendments suggested by Federated Farmers. He observed that controls on the specified elements of buildings are always necessary to ensure proper oversight of the buildings. He observed that that does not mean that buildings not meeting the standards cannot be the subject of consent.

504. We agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning. We think that that is also the answer to the more general submission of Tonnie & Erna Spijkerbosch⁴²⁸ that we have already noted, and which sought the removal of monotone colour requirements. While the submitter may be justified in expressing a personal view that the result is *“boring”*, we have observed enough architectural statements in the Wakatipu Basin to agree with Mr Barr regarding the need for controls on building colours and materials to ensure that proposals that will stand out are subject to a degree of scrutiny before they are approved.

505. For the same reason, we recommend rejection of the Slopehill Properties submission.

506. We do recommend, however, the second amendment proposed by Federated Farmers, making enhancement as an alternative, essentially for the reasons set out in Section 2.7 above.

⁴²⁵ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁴²⁶ Submission 2540

⁴²⁷ Submission 2584

⁴²⁸ Submission 2133

507. No reason was given in the Morven Ferry et al submission for deletion of reference to setbacks. Based on the evidence of Ms Gilbert, clearly there are features outside ONLs and ONFs that require protection through provision of appropriate setbacks, and Mr Skelton noted in his evidence for Banco Trustees that the area between dwellings is a key element in retention of rural character.
508. We think, however, that the policy would read more clearly if the Landscape Features were referred to separately from other setbacks.
509. As regards submissions on the reference in the notified policy to both the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct, we do not think the clarification sought is required, but to avoid any room for future argument, we suggest some rewording.
510. In summary, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.4 be reworded to read:
- “Maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Rural Amenity Zone including the Precinct, and surrounding landscape context by:*
- a. controlling the colour, scale, form, coverage, location (including setbacks from boundaries) and height of buildings and associated infrastructure, vegetation and landscape elements;*
 - b. setting development back from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps.”*
511. Notified Policy 24.2.1.5 read as follows:
- “Require all buildings to be located and designed so that they do not compromise the qualities of adjacent or nearby Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes, or identified landscape features”.*
512. Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant⁴²⁹ sought that the word “nearby” be deleted or replaced with a term that is more well defined. United Estates Ranch⁴³⁰ made a similar submission.
513. Federated Farmers⁴³¹ sought to soften the opening words to refer to management of location and design of buildings with specified purposes.
514. Slopehill Properties⁴³² sought that the words “adjacent and” be deleted along with the reference to identified landscape features.
515. Mr Barr did not support the relief sought by Federated Farmers, taking the view that it is necessary to be strict in this instance.
516. Mr Barr likewise did not recommend amendment to delete “nearby” buildings. He noted that activities in the foreground of an ONF, but not necessarily adjacent to it, could compromise views of the ONF.

⁴²⁹ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁴³⁰ Submission 2126: Supported by FS2706, FS2745 and FS2791

⁴³¹ Submission 2540

⁴³² Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

517. The only amendment he recommended was to clarify the reference to identified landscape features in the same manner as above.
518. We agree with Mr Barr’s comment that a strict approach is required in this context because of the statutory instruction to recognise and provide for protection of ONLs and ONFs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. However, we consider that Federated Farmers submission might partly be met by being more specific about what qualities of ONLs and ONFs are relevant in this context. Objective 3.2.5.1 and Strategic Policy 3.3.20 focus on the landscape and visual amenity values, and natural character of ONLs and ONFs. Consistent with that, we recommend that should be the focus of this policy. As regards the location of buildings, we agree with Mr Barr that the focus should not just be on buildings immediately adjacent to ONLs and ONFs. On the other hand, we also have sympathy for the view that a focus on “nearby” buildings introduces a level of uncertainty. On one view, every location in the Wakatipu Basin is nearby to an ONL or an ONF, but if this were intended, the policy could have been non-specific regarding the location of buildings. Mr Barr emphasised the need to exercise control over buildings in the foreground of ONFs. As he noted⁴³³ Policy 6.3.26(b) specifically addresses subdivision use and development forming the foreground for an ONF or ONL. The latter policy applies in the Rural Character Landscape areas. In Section 2.5, we concluded that we did not have scope to recommend a new section in Chapter 6, adopting (with modifications) all of the Rural Character Landscape policies from Chapter 6, but this is one policy that could appropriately be tailored for adoption in this context.
519. Lastly, we agree with the Slopehill Properties submission that suggested deletion of reference to landscape features, although not for the reasons stated in the submission. What are shown on the maps are lines identifying the top of escarpments and river cliffs and particular ridgelines. The setback prescribed in the rules and recognised in the preceding policy seeks to protect more than the identified “feature” and so the policy does not correctly capture what the setbacks seek to achieve. Given that it is already covered in Recommended Policy 24.2.1.4, we think further reference to these features can be deleted from this policy.
520. If we had recommended retention of “nearby” as a descriptor, then we would have agreed with the Slopehill Properties submission that it was not necessary to cover buildings adjacent to ONLs and ONFs; something that is adjacent is necessarily also nearby. Given our conclusion that rather than utilising an imprecise distance requirement, the focus should be on a visual perspective, we think that the policy should still cover adjacent buildings. Adjacent buildings might not be in the foreground of the view of an ONF, but still have adverse effects on it.
521. In summary, we therefore recommend that Policy 24.2.1.5 be revised to read:
- “Require all buildings to be located and designed so that they do not compromise the landscape and amenity values and the natural character of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes that are either adjacent to the building or where the building is in the foreground of views from a public road or reserve of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.”*

522. Notified Policy 24.2.1.6 reads:

⁴³³ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 20.40

“Ensure non-residential activities avoid adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity values.”

523. The Telcos and Slopehill Properties Limited⁴³⁴ sought that this policy be deleted. Federated Farmers⁴³⁵ sought to soften the policy so that non-residential activities are consistent with landscape character and visual amenity values.
524. Morven Ferry et al sought that the policy be reworded to read:
“Ensure the scale and location of non-residential activities maintains or enhances landscape character and visual amenity values.”
525. Mr Barr was of the view that an avoidance policy poses too high a bar in this context. He thought that commercial activities could be appropriate throughout the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct areas, and could even enhance the environment if suitably located, designed and scaled. He also drew our attention to the overlap with Policy 24.2.5.3. That policy is specific to the Precinct and provides for non-residential activities that ensure the amenity, quality and character of the Precinct is retained.
526. Mr Barr recommended that the Policy be modified generally as sought by Morven Ferry et al, except that he considered the element of design needed to be included.
527. We discussed with Mr Barr whether this policy was appropriately located, given that Part 24.2.2 addresses non-residential activities. In his reply evidence, Mr Barr took on board that point and suggested that the policy as he recommended it be amended be located as new Policy 24.2.2.7. Having reflected on it further, we think that the policy also overlaps with notified Policy 24.2.2.1. We will discuss that policy shortly but in summary, given Mr Barr’s recommendation that the policy be moved from a strict avoidance approach (which we agree with), we think that it can properly be deleted. We therefore recommend that the Telco and Slopehill Property submissions be accepted.
528. Notified Policy 24.2.1.7 read:
“Control earthworks and vegetation clearance so as to minimise adverse changes to the landscape character and visual amenity values.”
529. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴³⁶ sought deletion of this policy on the basis that the matters covered in it are addressed in other District Plan Chapters.
530. Federated Farmers⁴³⁷ sought that the policy manage earthworks and vegetation clearance, rather than control those activities.
531. Morven Ferry et al sought that the reference in the policy should be to minimising adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values rather than adverse changes.

⁴³⁴ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴³⁵ Submission 2540

⁴³⁶ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴³⁷ Submission 2540

532. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴³⁸ sought that the policy focus should be on native vegetation clearance (rather than all vegetation).
533. Mr Barr disagreed with the suggestion that the policy be removed. He considered that the matters covered by it are relevant, because of the potential adverse impact that poorly designed subdivision and development could have on the Wakatipu Basin.
534. Mr Barr did not see any meaningful difference between controlling and managing the activities covered by the policy and therefore saw no advantage in adopting the Federated Farmers relief. While he tended to think the same was true of the Morven Ferry et al relief, with “*adverse changes*” being virtually identical to “*adverse effects*”, he came to the opposite view on the basis that the relief sought provided greater certainty and better aligned the policy to an effects-based context.
535. For our part, while we agree that there is a clear overlap with the earthworks provisions in Chapter 25 of the Proposed District Plan, we tend to agree with Mr Barr that because of the importance of earthworks management to landscape outcomes in a sensitive amenity landscape, it is worth reinforcing that point. In addition, Chapter 33 deals with indigenous vegetation and biodiversity. The Proposed Plan does not have a policy approach to exotic vegetation that is not specifically protected (under Chapter 32) or Wilding (addressed under Chapter 34). In an amenity landscape that depends in part for its visual amenity values on exotic vegetation, we consider that it is important to provide policy direction in relation to that vegetation. That is also the reason why we recommend rejection of the Reforestation Trust submission that would limit the policy to indigenous vegetation.
536. Like Mr Barr, we are ambivalent as to whether the policy should manage or control the relevant activities. While there is no magic in the existing text so that a submitter needs to have good reason to change it, we note that the rationale for the Federated Farmers submission was that the submitter perceived the existing text to provide a stronger regulatory approach. We are by no means sure that is correct, but if there is a difference, we prefer the stronger approach in this context. We do not consider it to be inconsistent with the rules that provide for earthworks and vegetation clearance as a permitted activity. The control is exerted by the standards applying to those rules.
537. We likewise share Mr Barr’s view that although perhaps a marginal call, reference to adverse “*effects*” is to be preferred to adverse “*changes*”.
538. We also think that a minor grammatical change might be made to express the policy more simply.
539. In summary, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.7 be reworded as:
- “Control earthworks and vegetation clearance to minimise adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values”.*

⁴³⁸ Submission 2293

540. As a result of insertion of additional policies under this objective that we will discuss shortly, this policy will be renumbered 24.2.1.9.
541. Notified Policy 24.2.1.8 read:
- “Ensure land use activities protect, maintain and enhance the range of landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Zone, Precinct and wider Wakatipu Basin area.”*
542. Mr Barr noted Morven Ferry et al as having sought that this policy be removed. He recommended⁴³⁹ that this submission be accepted on the basis that the policy duplicates more specific Policies 24.2.1.3 and 24.2.1.4. This also necessarily addressed the submissions of Crown Investments et al and Federated Farmers that sought to soften the extent of the regulatory direction it provided.
543. We agree with Mr Barr’s analysis, essentially for the same reasons. Accordingly, we too recommend that Policy 24.2.1.8 be deleted.
544. Notified Policy 24.2.1.9 read:
- “Provide for activities that maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness in which buildings are subservient to natural landscape elements.”*
545. Federated Farmers⁴⁴⁰ sought acceptance of this policy. Peter Dennison & Stephen Grant⁴⁴¹ sought that this policy not apply to the Operative Rural Residential zoned land at North Lake Hayes on the basis that it does not exhibit openness and spaciousness currently.
546. Crown Investments et al sought deletion of the policy on the basis that the terms openness and spaciousness are capable of wide interpretation and are in any event characteristics of ONLs.
547. Morven Ferry et al sought that reference to buildings be replaced with *“built form”* and that *“subservient”* be replaced with *“complements”*.
548. Mr Barr did not accept that the policy was uncertain. He considered that it would be interpreted in the context of the objectives, rules and other provisions.
549. As regards the Morven Ferry et al submission, he did not consider that referring to *“built form”* would offer any advantage over *“buildings”*. He was more definite in his preference for the existing wording as regards subservience. Mr Barr considered they would provide clearer direction about the outcomes sought and therefore better achieve the objective.
550. Mr Barr did not discuss the Dennison/Grant submission.

⁴³⁹ Section 42A Report at 20.56

⁴⁴⁰ Submission 2540

⁴⁴¹ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

551. For our part, while it is something of a marginal call, we think that there is some minor improvement if the policy were to refer to “*built form*” since that draws attention to the way in which buildings are designed and located in the landscape rather than their very existence.
552. We share Mr Barr’s view, however, that the policy should provide a greater level of direction, seeking that built form is “*subservient*” to natural landscape elements.
553. As regards spaciousness and openness, however, we think that the Dennison/Grant submission makes a valid point. As they observe, the discussion of the characteristics of Landscape Character Unit 8 (Speargrass Flat) in Schedule 24.8 contrasts different parts of the unit, referring to the juxtaposition of open and spacious areas with more intensively developed rural residential areas.
554. We also note Policy 6.3.27 that focusses on openness in the Wakatipu Basin “*where such openness is an important part of its landscape quality or character*”.
555. While that policy has been rather overtaken by rezoning the bulk of the Wakatipu Basin as Rural Amenity Zone (including the Precinct Sub-zone), we consider it offers useful guidance as to how the Dennison/Grant submission might be accommodated.
556. In summary, therefore, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.9 be renumbered 24.2.1.11 and reworded as follows:
- “Provide for activities whose built form is subservient to natural landscape elements and that, in areas Schedule 24.8 identifies as having a sense of openness and spaciousness, maintain those qualities.”*
557. Notified Policy 24.2.1.10 read:
- “Facilitate the provision of walkways, cycleway and bridle path networks.”*
558. Queenstown Trails Trust⁴⁴² supported the policy as is.
559. Williamson et al sought that bridle paths should be limited to appropriate areas.
560. C Dagg⁴⁴³ sought unspecified amendments to manage reverse sensitivity effects on farming activities, particularly from walking tracks.
561. Mr Vivian gave evidence for the Williamson et al group. He suggested to us that bridle paths need high levels of maintenance and have less potential for public use and therefore that walkways and cycleways should be prioritised over bridle paths. He suggested rewording the policy to read:
- “Facilitate the provision of walkway and cycleway networks, and in appropriate locations, bridle path networks.”*

⁴⁴² Submission 2575

⁴⁴³ Submission 2586

562. In his rebuttal evidence, Mr Barr accepted the distinction Mr Vivian had made was valid and adopted Mr Vivian's suggested wording. We discussed it with Mr Barr because it appeared to us that the revised wording raised more questions than it answered: it gave no indication as to what locations might be appropriate and it implied that walkway and cycleway networks might be facilitated in inappropriate locations.

563. In his reply evidence, Mr Barr suggested a further alternative worded:

"Facilitate the provision of walkway and cycleway networks, and encourage opportunities for bridle path networks."

564. None of these alternatives address the point made in the Dagg submission. While we did not hear from the submitter, we did hear evidence from Ms Debbie MacColl on the problems establishment of the trail network at Barnhill Farm has had for ongoing farming operations. In the absence, however, of a clear option as to how a policy might be amended to address the submission, we have no basis to take it further and accept Mr Barr's revised wording. We would note, however, that the policy seeks to facilitate walkway and cycleway networks rather than require them.

565. In summary, we recommend the wording annexed to Mr Barr's reply evidence for this policy, as quoted above, and renumbered 24.2.4.6, to reflect the fact that it sits more appropriately under Objective 24.2.4, given the focus of that objective on recreation values.

566. Notified Policy 24.2.1.11 read:

"Manage lighting so that it does not cause adverse glare to other properties, roads, public places or the night sky."

567. Mr Barr noted Morven Ferry et al as having sought that the word "adverse" in this policy be replaced with "inappropriate" and that Federated Farmers⁴⁴⁴ sought the policy be amended to refer to significant or permanent glare.

568. Mr Barr's view was that adverse glare is necessarily inappropriate and that if anything the policy is already less restrictive than the provisions in other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.

569. We agree with Mr Barr's analysis in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. The only amendment we recommend is a minor change to ensure consistency with Policy 6.3.5 applying to other Rural Zones: refer to degradation of views of the night sky. We regard this as a minor clarification because the only way that the night sky can actually be affected is if views of it are degraded.

570. In summary, therefore, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.11 be renumbered 24.2.1.12 and reworded as follows:

⁴⁴⁴ Submission 2540

“Manage lighting so that it does not cause adverse glare to other properties, roads, public places or degrade views of the night sky.”

571. As notified, Policy 24.2.1.12 read:

“Have regard to the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of Tangata Whenua.”

572. Mr Barr noted Morven Ferry et al as having sought that this policy cross reference to Chapter 5. We also note the submission of a number of Kai Tahu runanga⁴⁴⁵ who sought consistent cross referencing to Chapter 5 and mapped wahi tupuna areas. Mr Barr’s view was that Chapter 5 would clearly be the first point of reference for guidance in implementing this policy. He did not consider a specific cross reference to be necessary. While we take Mr Barr’s point, the policy is very generally expressed, and, on this occasion, we think there is value in highlighting that the way in which the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of tangata whenua need to be factored into resource management decision making is in the manner directed in Chapter 5. That will necessarily incorporate any mapped areas of wahi tupuna in the future, since those areas will doubtless be referred to in a revised version of Chapter 5.

573. In summary, therefore, we recommend that Policy 24.2.1.12 be renumbered 24.2.1.13 and revised to read:

“Have regard to the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of Tangata Whenua in the manner directed in Chapter 5: Tangata Whenua.”

574. Turning to the question of new policies that might be inserted in Part 24.1, a number of submitters sought additional policies to enable and/or recognise the benefits of rural living. These varied from generally expressed relief that sought to enable development from Bagrie et al to specific policy wording provided in the Donaldson et al and Morven Ferry et al submissions.

575. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁴⁶ suggested an alternative set of policies to enable rural living and soften any environmental standards such development might need to meet.

576. Our consideration of these requests overlaps with the related submissions seeking new objectives on the same subject, discussed in Section 3.5 above. For the reasons set out in that section, we consider that additional policies on this subject in Part 24.2.1, applying to all of the Rural Amenity Zone, and therefore including that land zoned Rural Amenity outside the Precinct, is inconsistent with the structure of Chapter 24, which seeks to set a high bar for further development outside the Precinct areas. We note that Mr Farrell, giving expert evidence for Slopehill Properties, did not provide any support for the policies sought in its submission.

⁴⁴⁵ Submission 2329

⁴⁴⁶ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

577. Having said that Chapter 24 sets a high bar, we note Mr Barr’s evidence⁴⁴⁷ that many of the matters sought to be the subject of policy guidance are inherently recognised and provided for within the framework of the rule structure of Chapter 24. Accordingly, we recommend that these submissions be rejected.
578. A related request from Morven Ferry et al was for a new policy that would recognise that the amenity and landscape characteristics of the Rural Amenity Zone “*are derived from historical rural and rural living subdivision and development*”.
579. We also note the submission of Bruce McLeod⁴⁴⁸ who sought that the history of the Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential Zones be taken into account. While not explicitly seeking an additional policy, Mr McLeod seemed to be making the same point.
580. For his part, Mr Barr did not disagree with the thinking underlying the Morven Ferry et al submission, but he did not consider an additional policy to be necessary because the existing objectives, policies, rules and other provisions already provide adequate recognition of the historic patterns of development.
581. We would go further and say that the requested policy is positively unhelpful, because of its generality. The analysis of landscape, character and visual amenity values in Schedule 24.8 is quite specific. It recognises where rural living development has occurred in a way that has altered the landscape character and visual amenity of identified parts of the Basin. It also identifies where rural use continues to predominate. We think that this is preferable to a more general policy that is non-specific as to the areas where rural living development, for instance, has influenced landscape, character and visual amenity.
582. It follows that we recommend that this submission not be accepted.
583. There were also many submissions seeking policy recognition of existing development rights. Again, we have already addressed the submissions seeking new objectives on this subject. In our discussion of that aspect in Section 3.5, we recommended rejection of generally expressed objectives referring to property rights or development rights. We also noted counsel’s advice that the relevant development rights were those conferred by existing building platforms. We consider that that should be the focus of any new policy, rather than some more general description of existing rights.
584. In that regard, Crown Investments et al sought a new policy worded:
“Recognise established residential building platforms and enable buildings subject to achieving appropriate standards.”
585. This formulation was supported by Mr Ferguson in his planning evidence for the submitters.
586. The use of building platforms as a means to identify the potential location of residential homes in the rural environment was a feature of the Operative District Plan. As a result, there are

⁴⁴⁷ Section 42A Report at Section 21

⁴⁴⁸ Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783, and FS2784

now a large number of building platforms registered on Computer Freehold Registers for land in the Wakatipu Basin that have been onsold to purchasers on the understanding that while not uncontrolled, those building platforms provide a guaranteed right to build a house. We did not have evidence quantifying the implications of that understanding for the value of property but, from our own knowledge, we understand this to be a valuable right. Certainly, that was the submission made to us by counsel for a number of parties.

587. We discussed the difference between a right and an expectation in Section 3.5. While the identification on a Computer Freehold Register of the Building Platform does not, of itself, provide a right to build a dwelling on the property (that can only be conferred by the District Plan), it is something quite tangible that has been ascribed considerable value up to now.
588. The legal submissions we received suggested that we ought not to undermine that value without good reason.
589. In this case, the WB Landscape Study appears to have treated building platforms that are unbuilt as part of the baseline environment; e.g. in the assessment of the capacity of LCUs to absorb further development. Certainly, that was the case for other assessments undertaken by the Council's expert witnesses⁴⁴⁹. We note the concern expressed by Ms Gilbert⁴⁵⁰ that at least some of the approved and unbuilt platforms within the Basin are likely to have been consented before the standard suite of development controls that have been applied in more recent years became widely used. However, in the absence of a quantification of what proportion that part might represent, we are not able to factor that into our assessment of costs and benefits of the competing positions.
590. We do not regard the policy formulation in the Crown Investments et al submission as satisfactory given that the word "*established*" could refer to building platforms established in future. For the reasons that we will discuss in the context of the rules, we think that whatever the merits of recognising building platforms shown on Computer Freehold Registers up to now, the position is rather different going forward: there is, in our view, a greater reason for increased controls over buildings constructed in the future. We agree, however, that whichever building platforms are contemplated by a new policy, they should be subject to the standards in Chapter 24, in order to address at least in part Ms Gilbert's concerns about too wide a latitude given to those seeking to build within existing building platforms.
591. For his part, Mr Barr suggested a reframed policy reading:
- "Enable residential activity within building platforms created prior to 23 November 2017 subject to achieving appropriate standards."*
592. We think that Mr Barr's wording is preferable to the Crown Investments et al relief insofar as a policy seeking only to recognise something lacks direction as to what is in fact intended to be done. Mr Ferguson agreed with that view, and that the desired course of action might be expressed more simply. We consider, however, that adopting the date of notification of the

⁴⁴⁹ See the analysis of different estimates of future capacity within the notified Chapter 24 provided under cover of the Memorandum of Counsel for the Council dated 24 July 2018

⁴⁵⁰ At paragraph 65.13 of her Evidence in Chief

Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) is unnecessarily restrictive (not to mention retrospective). We consider that the relevant date should be the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2), which will coincide with all of the rules in Chapter 24 having legal effect (pursuant to section 86B(1) of the Act).

593. We therefore recommend a new policy numbered 24.2.1.10 be inserted into Chapter 24.2.1 worded as follows:

“Enable Residential Activity within building platforms created before [insert decision date] subject to achieving appropriate standards.”

594. Another new policy suggested for Part 24.2.1 was contained in the submission of Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Inc⁴⁵¹ and worded:

“To utilise legal mechanisms at the time of subdivision or land use consent to require landowners to prevent the ongoing establishment of trees and plants with wilding potential.”

595. Mr Barr did not support this policy⁴⁵² on the basis that Chapter 34 of the Proposed District Plan better addresses the Society’s point than would a new policy.

596. We concur, essentially for the same reasons.

597. Before leaving Part 24.2.1, we should note the Telco submissions that sought rationalisation of the policies in this section to remove overlaps and inconsistencies.

598. Mr Barr discussed this submission⁴⁵³ and was satisfied that the policies were addressing different issues and did not conflict. Mr Mathew McCallum-Clark gave planning evidence for Telcos. He reiterated the submission, suggesting to us that this was an opportunity that ought not to be missed to rationalise and reorganise the objectives and policies. While he accepted there was no harm in a complex policy mix, in his opinion it increased interpretation issues and inefficiencies particularly at the time of consenting. The recommendations that we have already made to delete notified Policy 24.2.1.8 and to shift notified Policy 24.2.1.6, accept the Telco submissions in part. The amendments we have recommended to Policy 24.2.1.2 remove the overlap with the following policy that the Telcos highlighted. We have likewise recommended an amendment to Policy 24.2.1.5 that removes the overlap with the previous policy. We do not agree that, as amended, Policy 24.2.1.5 is surplus to requirements.

599. In summary, therefore, we think that if our recommendations are accepted, the Telco submission is best described as accepted in part.

3.7 Part 24.2.2: Policies

600. Notified Policy 24.2.2.1 read as follows:

“Support commercial, recreation and tourism related activities where these activities protect, maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values.”

⁴⁵¹ Submission 2190: Supported by FS2746

⁴⁵² Refer Barr s42A Report at 17.17

⁴⁵³ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 19.4-19.8

601. BSTGT Limited⁴⁵⁴ and Department of Conservation⁴⁵⁵ supported the policy as notified.
602. Fire and Emergency New Zealand⁴⁵⁶ sought that the policy be amended to include community activities, so as to provide policy support for strategically placed fire stations to be located in the Rural Amenity Zone.
603. Morven Ferry et al sought that the policy be reworded as follows:
- “Provide for a range of non-residential activities, including commercial, recreational and tourism related activities which rely on the rural land resource and maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in the relevant Landscape Classification Unit.”*
604. Federated Farmers⁴⁵⁷ also sought supported removal of reference to protection.
605. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴⁵⁸ sought that reference be made on the end of the policy to native habitat restoration.
606. Mr Barr discussed the Reforestation Trust’s submission more generally, recommending a new policy that we will discuss further in section 3.9 below as the appropriate means to address the submission.
607. Mr Barr did not support the Fire & Emergency New Zealand submission. He felt that given the definition of community activities in the Proposed District Plan, the Rural Amenity Zone was not an obvious choice for their location over the life of the Plan. Rather, he considered that a location within the Urban Growth Boundaries and close to transport routes were likely to be preferable.
608. Mr Barr likewise did not support broadening of the range of non- residential activities. He drew our attention to the fact that the rules make industrial activities not associated with wineries a non-complying activity.
609. He did think, however, that reference to reliance on the rural land resource was a useful addition to the policy.
610. Lastly, Mr Barr did not consider the reference to Landscape Classification Units to be necessary because in his view, the policy has a broader application than the matters that might be identified in the Landscape Classification Units. He did however, make a minor grammatical recommendation (delete “the” in the last line of the policy).
611. We discussed with Mr Barr the fact that the policy omits reference to the most obvious non-residential activity which might take place in rural areas, namely farming, and whether this

⁴⁵⁴ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

⁴⁵⁵ Submission 2242

⁴⁵⁶ Submission 2660

⁴⁵⁷ Submission 2540

⁴⁵⁸ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

was consistent with the permitted activity status farming has under the Chapter 24 Rules. Having reflected on the point, Mr Barr recommended that farming be referenced in the policy based on the general submissions of Federated Farmers supporting recognition and provision for primary production activities. We agree with that suggestion. We also agree with Mr Barr that qualifying the policy so as to require some reliance on rural land resources is a useful amendment which makes the policy more consistent with the Rules that only provide favourably for a limited range of commercial activities.

612. With that addition, however, we think that Mr Barr’s reasoning for not accepting the Fire and Emergency submission seeking reference to community activities rather falls away. If community activities can demonstrate a reliance on the rural land resource, then we think it is legitimate that it be given some policy recognition. We regard this also as consistent with the rules that, as Mr Barr pointed out, would make such activities a discretionary activity.
613. We agree, however, with Mr Barr that making the list of activities inclusive, and thereby potentially assisting industrial activities that the Plan classifies as non-complying, would not be appropriate.
614. We also agree that support for indigenous habitat restoration is better dealt with as a discrete topic.
615. Although Mr Barr did not specially address it, we also consider that the word “*protect*” should be deleted since the relevant objective does not use it.
616. Looking at the interrelationship between this policy and the objective, as we have recommended it be amended, there are two clear inconsistencies. The first is that we have recommended that reference to landscape character values be deleted from the objective (to remove duplication between it and Objective 24.2.1). Second, the objective refers to amenity values, whereas the policy focuses on visual amenity values. The latter are of course a subset of the former. We think that the solution is to shift this policy, as amended, so it sits under Objective 24.2.1, with which it would be consistent.
617. Accordingly, we recommend that Policy 24.2.2.1 be relocated in Part 24.2.1, numbered 24.2.1.6, and worded:

“Provide for farming, commercial, community, recreation and tourism related activities that rely on the rural land resource, subject to their maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.”

618. Notified Policy 24.2.2.2. read as follows:

“Ensure traffic, noise and the scale and intensity of non-residential activities do not adversely impact on the landscape character and visual amenity values or affect the safe and efficient operation of the roading and trail network or access to public places.”

619. The sole submission Mr Barr noted on this policy was that of Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁵⁹, who sought that the policy be qualified to refer to significant adverse impacts. Mr Barr did not recommend acceptance of that submission. He thought a limitation to significant effects would go too far and that as worded, it could not be construed as a “no effects” policy. While we agree with Mr Barr that a limitation to significant impacts would go too far, we have less confidence than him that it could not be interpreted as a no effects position. We therefore recommend insertion of a “no more than minor” test.
620. More fundamentally, the reference to landscape character and visual amenity values raises the same issues with the previous policy, as discussed above. On the face of the matter, it might also be transferred to Part 24.2.2.1. However, unlike Policy 24.2.2.1, it is not clear to us that this policy is correctly focused on landscape character and visual amenity values. It is difficult to conceive how traffic and noise for instance could have adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values. Such matters are much more obviously related to maintenance of the broader range of amenity values that the objective is focussed on.
621. The absence of any submissions giving us scope to further amend the policy to align it with the objective puts in something of a quandary, because our reading of the intent of the policy would align it with Objective 24.2.2. We therefore do not recommend that it be shifted. Rather, we recommend that it be renumbered 24.2.2.1 and amended to read:
- “Ensure traffic, noise and the scale and intensity of non-residential activities do not have an adverse impact on landscape character and visual amenity values that is more than minor, or affect the safe and efficient operation of the roading and trail network or access to public places.”*
622. We further recommend that if the Council shares our view that this policy should more correctly be focussed on amenity values, rather than landscape character and visual amenity values, then it notify a variation to make that change.
623. As notified, Policy 24.2.2.3 read:
- “Restrict the type and intensity of non-residential activities to those which are compatible in visual amenity terms and in relation to other generated effects (e.g. traffic, noise, and hours of operation) with surrounding uses and the natural environment.”*
624. Mr Barr drew to our attention the submission of Morven Ferry et al that sought this policy be deleted. The submission argues that there is no justification for compatibility or comparability of non-residential activities and suggests that the different scale and nature of effects generated from non-residential use means that the policy could not often be achieved in most instances. It is also suggested that the policy repeats the “reverse sensitivity concerns” addressed in Policy 24.2.2.2.
625. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁶⁰ also suggested that the policy was not necessary for implementing relevant objectives given the overlap with other proposed policies.

⁴⁵⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴⁶⁰ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

626. Mr Barr thought that there was utility in the policy, particularly in an environment dominated by rural living land uses. He thought that a focus of the Rural Amenity Zone should be on managing and maintaining amenity generally, while recognising that farming occurs, but a relatively lower intensity than in the Rural Zone elsewhere in the district.
627. Addressing the concerns expressed in the Morven Ferry et al submission, the policy does not say that effects should be comparable with surrounding uses, but rather that they should be *“compatible”*. We think that if, by contrast, the effects of a proposed non-residential use are incompatible with the surrounding uses, those are certainly something we consider worthy of policy direction.
628. In terms of the suggested duplication with notified Policy 24.2.2.2, we agree that there is a level of duplication that should be addressed, because both focus on visual amenity issues, but because this policy addresses the wider range of amenity effects, we consider that there is a role for it. We might have had a different view had we had the ability to focus Policy 24.2.2.2 on the full range of amenity effects but, for the reasons discussed above, that is not the position.
629. In summary, we recommend that this policy be renumbered 24.2.2.2 and amended to read:
- “Restrict the type and intensity of non-residential activities to those which are compatible in relation to generated effects (e.g. traffic, noise, and hours of operation) with surrounding uses and the natural environment.”*
630. Notified Policy 24.2.2.4 read:
- “Ensure traffic generated by non-residential development does not individually or cumulatively compromise road safety or efficiency.”*
631. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁶¹ sought that this policy be deleted on the basis that it is not necessary to implement the relevant objectives, given the overlap with other proposed policies.
632. NZTA supported the policy, but sought that it refer to the safety and efficiency of the entire transport network, including pedestrians, cyclists, active networks: i.e. not just the road.
633. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of the NZTA submission. He did not specifically address the Slopehill Properties request, but obviously concluded it was not justified.
634. For our part, we think there is a role for this policy because it is the only policy addressing cumulative effects on the road network. However, having recommended deletion of reference to infrastructure in this objective, we think this policy is more appropriately placed in Part 24.2.4.

⁴⁶¹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

635. However, we do not agree that its scope needs to be broadened beyond the road network and its users, including pedestrians and cyclists. The policy focusses on “*traffic*” effects. We did not have any evidence suggesting that traffic generated by non-residential activities has the potential to adversely affect use of pedestrian walkways and cycle trails, and we do not consider that it can be read, sensibly, as including pedestrian or cycle traffic on such trails.
636. In summary, we recommend that notified Policy 24.2.2.4 be shifted and renumbered 24.2.4.7, but otherwise be left unchanged.
637. Notified Policy 24.2.2.5 read:
- “Ensure non-farming activities with the potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, water bodies and any residential activity.”*
638. Consequent on other recommended amendments, we recommend this be renumbered 24.2.2.3.
639. Federated Farmers⁴⁶² supported this policy.
640. Mr Barr noted the submission of C Dagg⁴⁶³ as being relevant in this context. As previously noted, that submission sought amendments to policies to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects of establishing activities in close proximity to farming units in established rural residential properties are considered.
641. Morven Ferry et al sought deletion of the policy as being repetitive of notified Policy 24.2.2.2.
642. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁶⁴ sought that the policy be amended to refer to non-farming commercial activities so as to exclude the potential nuisance effects from rural living activities.
643. Mr Barr did not agree with the Morven Ferry et al submission. He considered that it is more specific to the natural resources that amenity is derived from within the Basin.
644. As regards the Dagg submission, Mr Barr noted the absence of specificity as to what exactly was sought and concluded that in the absence of additional information from the submitter, the existing reverse sensitivity policies in Chapter 24 are the most appropriate. Accordingly, he recommended retention of the policy unchanged.
645. We did not hear any evidence in support of the Dagg submission, and thus are in no better position to augment the reverse sensitivity provisions of the chapter based on it than was Mr Barr.
646. We also disagree with the Morven Ferry et al submission, essentially for the same reasons as discussed above: because the existing form of Policy 24.2.2.2 does not address amenity values other than visual amenity values, there is a role for this policy.

⁴⁶² Submission 2540

⁴⁶³ Submission 2586

⁴⁶⁴ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

647. We do not accept the relief sought by Slopehill Properties Limited. Inserting the word “commercial” would potentially permit industrial activities with nuisance effects to establish in the Rural Amenity Zone, which we do not regard as either desirable or consistent with Objective 24.2.2. We do agree, however, that the submitter has a point and that, in this regard at least, rural living activities should be classed along with farming. We think that this can be done more directly with some suitable rewording as follows:

“Ensure non-residential activities other than farming, with the potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects, are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.”

648. Consequent on other recommended amendments, this Policy would be 24.2.2.3.

649. Notified Policy 24.2.2.6 read:

“Ensure informal airports are located, operated and managed to maintain the surrounding rural amenity, having regard to the differing densities of the Zone and Precinct.”

650. Mr Barr noted only the submission of Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁶⁵ as being relevant to this policy. That submission sought that the words “having regard to the differing densities of the Zone and Precinct” be deleted as superfluous. Mr Barr did not agree with that submission. He noted⁴⁶⁶ that there are not likely to be sites created under the Precinct that could meet the permitted activity standard that requires a 500 metre separation from the boundary of a residential unit.

651. That would seem likely as a matter of fact⁴⁶⁷. However, we had difficulty following Mr Barr’s reasoning linking that to the wording of the policy. We understood him to be saying that informal airports are not likely to be able to be located in a manner that maintains the surrounding rural amenity (using the 500 metre separation as a proxy for maintenance of rural amenity).

652. However, the difficulty with the existing policy wording is that it could be read as suggesting that a lesser standard of separation is appropriate in the Precinct areas, having regard to the higher density of development envisaged as potentially occurring in that sub-zone. For reasons that we will discuss further in relation to Submission 2663 on Rules 24.4.12, 24.4.28, and 25.5.18, we do not think that is appropriate. Accordingly, we recommend that Policy 24.2.2.6 be renumbered 24.2.2.4 and amended as sought by the Slopehill Properties submission to read:

“Ensure informal airports are located, operated and managed to maintain the surrounding rural amenity.”

⁴⁶⁵ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴⁶⁶ Section 42A Report at 22.30

⁴⁶⁷ Given a one hectare site is nominally 100m x 100m

3.8 Part 24.2.3: Policies

653. Mr Barr did not identify any submissions opposing Policy 24.2.3.1, which relates to reverse sensitivity effects on informal airports. We need therefore not consider it further, and recommend it be adopted as notified.

654. Policy 24.2.3.2 as notified, read:

“Ensure reverse sensitivity effects on residential lifestyle and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated.”

655. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁶⁸ sought that the words *“residential lifestyle”* be replaced by *“rural living”*. The stated rationale for the submission is to address a lack of clarity as to what is meant by *“residential lifestyle”*.

656. Mr Barr did not specifically discuss this submission other than to the extent that the tables attached to his Section 42A Report recommended its rejection.

657. For our part, the revised wording sought in this submission would result in the wording of the policy better aligning with the objective. However, we have a more substantive problem with the policy as stated. As discussed above in the context of submissions on Objective 24.2.3, reverse sensitivity issues arise when a new more sensitive activity locates in proximity to an existing activity, giving rise to adverse effects that had not previously been an issue. Residential activities, including in the rural environment, are typically regarded as a sensitive activity with the potential to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects. We cannot currently conceive of a more sensitive activity whose establishment adjacent to a residential activity in the rural environment might give rise to reverse sensitivity effects.

658. We therefore wonder whether Policy 24.2.3.2 is round the wrong way, and what is in fact meant to be ensured is that reverse sensitivity effects resulting from new rural living and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated. The way the objective is framed would suggest that to be the case.

659. Be that as it may, the limited scope for amendment provided by submissions means that if the policy does not capture the intended course of action, it will need to be addressed by way of variation. We recommend that the Council consider what this policy is seeking to achieve with that possibility in mind.

660. As it is, however, we recommend that the sole submission on it be accepted and that the policy be reworded to read:

“Ensure reverse sensitivity effects on rural living and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated.”

⁴⁶⁸ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

661. The sole submission on Policy 24.2.3.3, which seeks to support productive farming activities, is that of Federated Farmers⁴⁶⁹ which supported the retention of the policy unchanged. We recommend it be adopted as notified.

3.9 Part 24.2.4: Policies

662. As notified, Policy 24.2.4.1 read:

“Avoid adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.”

663. The only submission we have identified on this policy is that of Slopehill Properties Limited that sought that all of the policies in this section of Chapter 24 be deleted on the basis that any matter addressed in them could be captured in the alternative policy framework suggested seeking to provide for rural living. The Slopehill Properties Limited submission was the subject of expert planning evidence from Mr Farrell who provided no evidential support for the alternative policies set out in the submission. We infer that he did not support the relief sought. On that basis, we do not think it necessary to consider the submission further as it related to Policy 24.2.4.1, or indeed the policies in the balance of this section of the chapter.

664. We therefore recommend that Policy 24.2.4.1 be adopted as notified.

665. As notified, Policy 24.2.4.2 read:

“Provide for improved public access to and the maintenance and enhancement of the margins of waterbodies including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes.”

666. Aside from the Slopehill Properties Limited submission noted above, the sole submission specifically on this policy is that of Federated Farmers⁴⁷⁰, who sought that it be reworded as follows:

“At the time of subdivision or land use change, provide for improved public access to and the maintenance or enhancement of the margins of water bodies including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes, as development occurs.”

667. This submission pointed out that there may be practical difficulties in improving public access over or in proximity to farm land.

668. Mr Barr did not consider the suggested amendments to be required. He noted⁴⁷¹ that the Proposed District Plan generally, and Chapter 24 in particular, regulate development and cannot initiate courses of action until development is proposed. Thus, while he agreed with the point underlying the submission, he did not think an amendment to the policy was required.

⁴⁶⁹ Submission 2540

⁴⁷⁰ Submission 2540

⁴⁷¹ Section 42A Report at 24.8

669. We concur with Mr Barr's reasoning and note that Mr Cooper's tabled evidence for Federated Farmers did not seek to pursue the matter. However, for the reasons set out in section 2.7 above, we do support Federated Farmers submission insofar as it seeks that maintenance and enhancement be expressed as alternatives. We also consider the policy would read more easily with some punctuation. Accordingly, we recommend that the policy be amended to read:

"Provide for improved public access to, and the maintenance or enhancement of, the margins of waterbodies, including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes."

670. For reasons that will shortly become apparent, we recommend that this policy be renumbered 24.2.4.3.

671. As notified Policy 24.2.4.3 read:

"Provide adequate firefighting water and fire service vehicle access to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response."

672. Fire and Emergency New Zealand⁴⁷² sought that the words "fire service" be replaced by "emergency". Mr Barr supported that suggested change.

673. Morven Ferry et al sought that this and the following two policies be deleted and replaced by a cross reference to the provisions of Chapter 27. Mr Barr did not support that suggested change on the basis that Chapter 27 applies to subdivision and development, but not all development is derived from a subdivision. We agree with Mr Barr's recommendation, essentially for the same reasons. Having recommended that the objective relate both to subdivision and development and land uses not forming part of subdivision and development, it is important that the policies of this section of Chapter 24 provide guidance on infrastructure requirements related to land uses.

674. We likewise concur with Mr Barr's reasoning in relation to the Fire and Emergency New Zealand submission. We do not know if the requirements for access for fire engines differ from those of other emergency vehicles, but clearly the policy should provide for all emergency vehicles.

675. We therefore recommend that Policy 24.2.4.3 be renumbered 24.2.4.4 and amended to read:

"Provide adequate firefighting water and emergency vehicle access to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response."

676. As notified, Policy 24.2.4.4 read:

"Ensure development does not generate servicing and infrastructure costs that fall on the wider community."

677. Federated Farmers⁴⁷³ supported this policy.

⁴⁷² Submission 2660

⁴⁷³ Submission 2540

678. NZTA⁴⁷⁴ sought that the policy be amended to direct that costs not fall on infrastructure providers.
679. In his Section 42A Report, Mr Barr indicated that this policy was not intended to be a “no cost” policy to the Council, but rather to ensure that activities not otherwise contemplated by the Rural Amenity Zone framework do not place an undue burden on infrastructure providers. Accordingly, his initial recommendation was that the NZTA submission be accepted.
680. We discussed with Mr Barr whether the recommended policy set too high a bar for subdivision, development and land use. In his reply evidence⁴⁷⁵, Mr Barr accepted that as he had initially recommended it, the policy could be interpreted to say any cost generated by the development does not fall on the community. As he noted, costs associated with development do in practice fall on the community, but the Council has the opportunity to manage those costs through development contributions and rates set under the Local Government Act.
681. Mr Barr recommended that he policy be rephrased to align with the intention set out in Section 42A Report. His revised recommendation was that the policy be amended to read:
- “Ensure development has regard to servicing and infrastructure costs that fall on the wider community including infrastructure providers.”*
682. We agree with the intent of Mr Barr’s recommendation, but consider it can be better expressed if the policy were reworded to read:
- “Ensure that consideration of development has regard to servicing and infrastructure costs that are not met by the developer.”*
683. This formulation ensures that the focus of intention is on the processing of development applications and avoids any issue as to who the “wider community” might consist of. As Mr Barr observed, the Morven Ferry et al submissions that sought deletion of the policy provide scope for the changes recommended. As a consequence of other recommendations, the policy is renumbered 24.2.4.5
684. As notified, Policy 24.2.4.5 read:
- “Ensure development infrastructure is self-sufficient and does not exceed capacities for infrastructure servicing.”*
685. Aside from the Morven Ferry et al, this policy was the subject of two interrelated submissions from Public Health South⁴⁷⁶. The first submission sought that the words “self-sufficient” be deleted from the Policy as noted.
686. The second submission suggested addition of a new policy worded as follows:

⁴⁷⁴ Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by 2765 and FS2766

⁴⁷⁵ At 11.22

⁴⁷⁶ Submission 2040

“A reticulated water and wastewater system is preferentially installed in any new subdivision should it not be possible to join existing infrastructure.”

687. The Public Health South submission explained the rationale for the relief it sought as related to the natural ecological limits to the cumulative effects from onsite wastewater disposal systems in the district, given that the majority of LCUs with high capacity to absorb development are not connected to reticulated sewage or drinking water. The submitter supported a proactive approach to installing and connecting to reticulated systems to reduce ecological harm and to protect health. The submission also referred to the issues for Council if smaller satellite communities serviced by their own systems fail due to overloading, and therefore suggested a preference for joining existing schemes.
688. We discussed with Mr Barr whether, like the previous policy, Policy 24.2.4.5 sets too high a bar for subdivision and development, particularly given the stance the Council had taken on road infrastructure capacity.
689. Mr Barr addressed the issue in reply⁴⁷⁷ suggesting that the policy refer only to development infrastructure that is self-serviced. Mr Barr suggested also that the policy might refer to environmental capacity, so as to address in part the Friends of Lake Hayes Society⁴⁷⁸ submission discussed in Section 2.8.
690. While we understand the rationale for Mr Barr’s recommendation, we think this particular policy suffers from a lack of clarity as to what it is trying to achieve. Chapter 27 already has detailed policy direction regarding the capacity of water supply and wastewater disposal systems required as a result of subdivision to create new lots. While we have come to the view that some policy guidance needs to be provided for infrastructure associated with development that occurs other than as part of the subdivision, the lack of clarity as to the role of this policy does not suggest that it is required for that purpose.
691. We also note that Policy 27.2.5.6 already provides the preference for connection of new subdivisions to reticulated systems that Public Health South sought.
692. As regards the expansion of the policy to refer to environmental constraints, we consider that such a generally expressed policy instruction takes the Council potentially too far into the sphere that is properly that of Otago Regional Council.
693. In Section 2.8, we discussed the need for an additional layer of regulation over and above that provided by Otago Regional Council in the specific case of subdivision and development in the Lake Hayes Catchment. We formed the view that that level of additional regulation met the requirements of section 32 for the reasons stated above. The generality of the policy wording proposed by Mr Barr does not enable us to reach the same conclusion for the suggested policy.
694. In summary, therefore, we believe that Policy 24.2.4.5 might properly be deleted (as sought by Morven Ferry et al) and that the additional policy sought by Public Health South is not required either, given that it would only duplicate Policy 27.2.5.6.

⁴⁷⁷ At 11.25

⁴⁷⁸ Submission 2140

695. We believe that what is required is a more targeted policy providing a framework for the recommended zoning of properties within the Lake Hayes catchment discussed in section 2.8.
696. Such policy direction has to recognise and give effect to the Objectives of the NPSFM discussed in Section 2.8. Accordingly, the reference point is improvement in the water quality of a degraded catchment.
697. We therefore recommend a new policy be inserted in Part 24.2.4 as 24.2.4.2 reading:
- “Restrict the scale, intensity and location of subdivision, development and land use in the Lake Hayes catchment, unless it can occur consistently with improvement to the water quality in the catchment.”*
698. That policy aligns with the distinction we have drawn between development connected to reticulated wastewater disposal systems and that which does not. We regard the policy as consequential relief arising from our acceptance of the Friends of Lake Hayes submission.
699. Notified Policy 24.2.4.6 read:
- “Ensure that other utilities including regionally significant infrastructure are located and operated to maintain landscape character and visual amenity values, having regard to the important function and location constraints of these activities.”*
700. The Telcos suggested that this policy be shifted to either Part 24.2.1 or 24.2.2 and be amended to qualify the obligation to maintain character and visual amenity values *“to the extent practicable”*, together with other minor grammatical changes.
701. Transpower New Zealand Limited⁴⁷⁹ sought that rather than maintain landscape character and visual amenity values, adverse effects on those values be avoided, remedied or mitigated, and that the cross reference to constraints at the end of the policy include reference to technical constraints.
702. Mr Barr did not recommend shifting this policy. He was of the view that utilities, and more specifically regionally significant infrastructure, are linked to subdivision and development and that the policy therefore sits well with the other policies in Part 24.2.4 that address infrastructure associated with subdivisions.
703. As regards the request to soften the requirement to maintain landscape character and visual amenity values, Mr Barr did not consider the relief sought would achieve the objectives of Chapter 24. He considered that the provisions of Chapter 30 would provide sufficient leverage for utilities to be established notwithstanding the requirement to maintain landscape character and visual amenity values. Insofar as Transpower suggested that the NPSET required a different view, Mr Barr suggested that with no part of the National Grid actually within the

⁴⁷⁹ Submission 2442

Rural Amenity Zone, Policy 24.2.4.6 did not need to be recast to align with the NPSET “on the chance that the National Grid may one day extend into the Zone”⁴⁸⁰.

704. Mr Barr also did not see any meaningful difference between a functional and technical constraint so as to require reference to the latter.
705. In his rebuttal evidence, Mr Barr provided more commentary on these issues, addressing, in particular, the evidence of Mr McCallum-Clark for the Telcos that amendment to the wording of the policy was required to better align the policy with the RPS and with the provisions of Chapter 30.
706. Mr Barr analysed the provisions of Chapter 30 and observed that although Policy 30.2.7.1 includes a practicability exception, it provides better guidance as to why undertaking a certain approach for practicable reasons is likely to be appropriate.
707. Ultimately, Mr Barr considered that a “*where practicable*” approach for utilities within Chapter 24 could be warranted, but he did not support its use in the manner requested without further qualification⁴⁸¹. He did, however, recommend minor changes to the wording of the policy to better express the intent.
708. We did not have the benefit of evidence or legal submissions from Transpower New Zealand Limited, but Report 3 from the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) hearing process contains helpful commentary on the NPSET, and what is required to give effect to it in the context of the District Plan⁴⁸².
709. While we understand Mr Barr’s reluctance to allow the NPSET to drive policy outcomes in the Rural Amenity Zone given that the National Grid line into Frankton does not traverse the Rural Amenity Zone, as we have observed already, it appears that the National Grid line comes quite close to the boundary of the Rural Amenity Zone east of Morven Hill and we could foresee a scenario in which the objectives and policies of the Rural Amenity Zone might come into play when considering modifications to that line.
710. Quite apart from the legal obligations we have (discussed in Section 2.1 above), we therefore think it is important that we be satisfied that the provisions that would apply to the National Grid give effect to the NPSET.
711. Having said that, as Mr Barr pointed out in his rebuttal evidence, Transpower’s relief (a simple “*avoid, remedy or mitigate*” approach) is neither required by, nor entirely consistent with, the NPSET that seeks (in Policy 8) that planning and development of the transmission system “*should seek to avoid adverse effects on ... areas of high natural character and areas of high recreation value and amenity...*”.

⁴⁸⁰ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 24.22

⁴⁸¹ C Barr, Rebuttal Evidence at 14.13

⁴⁸² See in particular Report 3 at sections 2.11, 8.6 and 8.7

712. We also need to consider the implications of the recently revised provisions of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 that require that the functional needs of infrastructure that has regional or national significance be provided for⁴⁸³.

713. In this context, Operative RPS Policy 4.3.4(c), addressing the adverse effects of nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, is also relevant:

“Avoid, remedy or mitigate, as necessary, adverse effects on highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascapes in order to maintain their high values.”

714. These provisions need to be read against a background where Policy 4.3.2 recognises the national and regional significance of, among other things, the National Grid, electricity sub-transmission infrastructure, telecommunication and radio communication facilities, roads classified as being of national or regional importance, and municipal infrastructure.

715. Against that background, we consider that a greater level of direction is required as to the extent to which landscape character and visual amenity must be maintained, or putting the issue in terms of the Partially Operative RPS 2019, the extent to which it is necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on those values.

716. We share Mr Barr’s reluctance to countenance a general practicability exception without greater guidance as to what is actually required.

717. It seems to us that with minor amendments to properly align with the objectives of Chapter 24, Policies 6.3.24 and 6.3.25 might both provide the submitters with the flexibility that they seek while also ensuring that appropriate environmental outcomes are achieved. We therefore recommend that Policy 24.2.4.6 be replaced with two new policies worded as follows:

“Ensure that the location and operation of utilities including regionally significant infrastructure seeks to avoid significant adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values, while acknowledging that location constraints and/or the nature of the infrastructure may mean that this is not possible in all cases.

In cases where it is demonstrated that utilities cannot avoid significant adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values, such adverse effects shall be minimised.”

718. Lastly, we need to consider the appropriate location of these policies. Notwithstanding Mr Barr’s view that infrastructure is closely associated with subdivision and development, which we accept, we think that there is a case to recognise provision of utilities as a stand-alone issue requiring its own policy direction. We recommend that the two policies quoted above be located in Part 24.2.1 and numbered 24.2.1.7 and 24.2.1.8. That location will also assuage the concern expressed in the Telco submissions that utilities might be considered to be commercial activities falling within the notified Policy 24.2.2.1 that we have also recommended be shifted into Part 24.2.1. While Mr McCallum-Clark agreed with Mr Barr’s

⁴⁸³ Policy 4.3.3

interpretation of Policy 24.2.2.1 (that this was not the case), providing separately for utilities in the same section of Chapter 24 will put the matter beyond doubt.

719. Mr Barr recommended two additional policies for this part of Chapter 24. The first responds to the submission of the Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Inc⁴⁸⁴. The submitter sought a new policy worded:

“Avoid the retention of trees and plants with wilding potential as part of development proposals.”

720. Mr Barr thought that such a policy went too far and that there may be instances where an established tree that has a low risk of wilding spread makes a particularly important contribution to character or to mitigating the effects of development. As Mr Barr put it, management of wilding trees should not *“be at the expense of the amenity of the Zone and ability to achieve the objective of Chapter 24”*⁴⁸⁵.

721. By Mr Barr’s reply, he had settled on the following wording that he recommended to us:

“Encourage the removal of trees with wilding potential as part of development proposals, and where necessary, require non-wilding species as replacements to maintain landscape character and amenity values.”

722. The submitter did not appear, and so Mr Barr’s evidence is all we have to go on.

723. We agree with Mr Barr’s caution in adopting too directive an approach in this case. While wilding trees are clearly a problem in the District generally, there is a real danger that a policy requirement that trees and plants with wilding potential be removed as part of development proposals imposes an obligation which might be out of all proportion to the extent of the adverse effects of the proposal, particularly given that *“wilding potential”* exists in a spectrum ranging from the species listed in Chapter 34 whose planting is prohibited, to species with rather lower wilding potential. In addition, as Mr Barr notes, there may be instances in the Wakatipu Basin where trees and plants with wilding potential have visual amenity benefits as such that the benefits of their removal would be outweighed by the adverse effect on visual amenity values.

724. The submitter anticipated some of these issues and provided a definition of trees and plants *“with wilding potential”*. However, the definition provided rather tended to reinforce Mr Barr’s point, with examples of some of the species listed being listed as Protected under Part 32.7 of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1).

725. We therefore think that Mr Barr pitched it correctly when he suggested encouraging removal of wilding trees. Once one gets to that point, however, we do not think one can very well *“require”* replacement of trees whose removal, the Council is encouraging. That is an invitation for wilding trees to remain, defeating the purpose of the policy.

⁴⁸⁴ Submission 2190

⁴⁸⁵ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 17.18

726. We therefore recommend that a new policy be added to Chapter 24.2.4, numbered 24.2.4.8 and reading:

“Encourage the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.”

727. The second new policy Mr Barr recommended is derived from the submission of Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴⁸⁶. As discussed in Section 3.5 above, Mr Barr did not support acceptance of the Trust’s relief, but did recognise that there was a need for policy recognition of indigenous biodiversity maintenance and enhancement.

728. The policy Mr Barr recommended was worded as follows:

“Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation including in locations that have potential for regeneration or to provide stability, and particularly where productive values are low, or in riparian areas or gullies.”

729. By contrast, the submitter sought some 4 new policies seeking to provide incentives for subdivision and land use development to protect and increase indigenous vegetation cover and implement pest and weed control regimes, facilitate the protection and enhancement of indigenous habitats within and outside identified ecological corridors and source areas, and to ensure native vegetation is appropriate to the area.

730. The submission enclosed a copy of the relevant provisions from the Auckland Unitary Plan, which are extensive. As Mr Barr noted, the Unitary Plan provisions are a wide-ranging chapter affecting all subdivision in rural areas throughout the Auckland Region, raising obvious questions as to which specific parts need to be incorporated. Mr Barr also drew attention to the lack of connection between the objectives in the Unitary Plan and the Chapter 24 objectives focussed on maintaining and enhancing an amenity landscape.

731. Perhaps even more importantly, from our point of view, we cannot assume that the section 32 analysis supporting the Auckland Unitary Plan provisions is equally applicable in the Wakatipu Basin and the submitter provided us with no evidence that would enable us to assess the costs and benefits of the relief it proposed.

732. In the absence of any material sufficient to enable us to undertake a section 32 analysis of the suggested new provisions, we agree with Mr Barr’s more modest proposal for recognition of the desirability of enhancement of indigenous vegetation.

733. Having said that, some aspects of the Reforestation Trust relief might usefully be incorporated in a new policy. As discussed in Section 3.5, we think that it is important that the indigenous vegetation encouraged in any policy is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, rather than appearing unnatural in the Wakatipu Basin environment.

734. In summary, we recommend inclusion of a new Policy numbered 24.2.4.9 into Chapter 24.2.4 reading as follows:

⁴⁸⁶ Submission 2293

“Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability.”

735. At this point, we should discuss another new policy suggested by the Wakatipu Reforestation Trust reading:

“Support innovative alternatives to traditional infrastructure such as Low Impact Development (LID), especially where those alternatives support ecological biodiversity and amenity values.”

736. Mr Barr did not appear to discuss this particular suggested policy in his Section 42A Report.

737. As already noted, the submitter did not appear at the hearing.

738. While the concept of *“Low Impact Development”* is superficially attractive, we have literally no evidence as to what it might involve, and its costs and benefits. It appears, however, to be something different to the low impact design methods now Operative RPS Policy 4.5.4 relates to. We do not think that we can take this suggestion further.

3.10 Part 24.2.5: Policies

739. We have already discussed the introductory wording to the policies of Part 24.2.5 and recommended revised wording⁴⁸⁷.

740. As notified, Policy 24.2.5.1 read:

“Provide for rural residential subdivision, use and development only where it protects, maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values as described within the landscape character unit as defined in Schedule 24.8.”

741. This policy was the subject of numerous submissions.

742. Slopehill Properties Limited⁴⁸⁸ sought that it be deleted (along with all of the other policies in this section) and replaced by the policies we have already discussed in Section 3.9 above.

743. Morven Ferry et al sought that the word *“only”* be deleted and that the reference to landscape character unit be capitalised.

744. Dalefield Trustee Limited⁴⁸⁹ sought that the word *“only”* be deleted and that rather than stating a requirement to protect, maintain or enhance the relevant values, the policy say that those values are not adversely affected.

745. Williamson et al sought recognition that the values described in Schedule 24.8 will change over time.

⁴⁸⁷ Refer Section 3.3 above

⁴⁸⁸ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁴⁸⁹ Submission 2097

746. Donaldson et al sought that the policy be reframed to read:

“Provide for rural residential subdivision use and development while taking into account and avoiding, remedying or mitigating any potential adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity values as described within the landscape character unit as defined in Schedule 24.8”.

747. Crown Investments et al sought that the policy be reworded to read:

“Provide for rural residential subdivision, use and development within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.”

748. The submission stated that the Landscape Character Units are important for establishing the extent of the Precinct and for managing subdivision, use and development within the more sensitive areas of the Zone outside the Precinct. It opposed the uncertainty created through reference to those values within the Precinct.

749. Many of the submissions were the subject of expert planning evidence. In the case of Slopehill Properties Limited, as already noted, Mr Farrell’s evidence did not in fact support the revised policies sought in the submission in substitution for the notified policies. As with the parallel submission in relation to the policies in Part 24.2.4, we think that we need not therefore take that submission any further.

750. Mr Vivian’s evidence for Williamson et al reiterated the submission seeking acknowledgement of future changes to values and suggested that the word *“protect”* in the policy was not supported by the objective. Mr Vivian’s opinion was that anticipated landscape changes could not occur if existing landscape character and visual amenity values are protected.

751. Mr Jeff Brown, giving evidence for Donaldson et al, suggested a revised formulation of policies from that contained in the submissions that would combine elements of both notified Policy 24.2.5.1 and the following policy. As he described it, he sought to divide the themes of the policies into an enabling function (a new Policy 24.2.5.1) and a regulatory function (a new Policy 24.2.5.2). Read together the two suggested policies were:

“Provide for rural residential activities and promote, design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision, use and development.

Ensure that new subdivision, use and development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on, and wherever possible maintains and enhances, the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, taking into account the relevant values described in Schedule 24.8.”

752. Mr Brown reasoned that:

- a. Deletion of *“protect”* was necessary because otherwise it introduced a *“much more stringent test”* than the objective provides for;
- b. Deletion of *“maintain and enhance”* was necessary for the same reasons as Mr Brown had discussed in the context of the relevant objective: i.e. a specific activity has been provided for which will inevitably cause change;

- c. The new Policy 24.2.5.2 gave better effect to the objective;
 - d. Softening the significance of the Landscape Character Units in the assessment was appropriate given that they represent a snapshot view of the landscape at the time of the WB Landscape Study⁴⁹⁰.
753. Mr Ferguson’s evidence for Crown Investments et al put the amended wording suggested for Policy 24.2.5.1 in the context of a broader opposition to reference to protection of amenity landscapes but did not discuss the rationale for deleting reference to Schedule 24.8.
754. Mr Barr reviewed the evidence that was pre-lodged in his rebuttal evidence. He recommended only minor changes to the Policy. He opposed, in particular, the reframing of the policy supported by Mr Brown and Mr Ferguson that would omit any environmental test on the basis that such a policy could create conflict with the objectives and might be used to support a poorly designed proposal not achieving the specified density.
755. Mr Barr accepted that the objective did not explicitly seek the protection of landscape character and visual amenity values, but was of the view that the policy *“is more fine grained and is specific to the context of landscape character and visual amenity values as described in the Landscape Character Units in Schedule 24.8”*⁴⁹¹.
756. By his reply evidence, Mr Barr recommended the following formulation of the policy:
- “Provide for rural living subdivision, development and land use only where it protects, maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values as described within the Landscape Character Unit as identified in Schedule 24.8.”*
757. In our consideration of all of these matters, we start from the premise discussed in Section 3.5 that development of the Precinct will not occur unless it can be absorbed into the landscape, and if it can be absorbed into the landscape, it will not materially change the landscape character and visual amenity values of the area. We therefore do not recommend acceptance of the Williamson et al submission as above, or Mr Brown’s reformulation of Policy 24.2.5.2 to only maintain and enhance landscape character and visual amenity values where possible.
758. We agree with Mr Barr that a policy that only focuses on providing for rural residential development without reference to any environmental performance test is apt to be quoted out of context to support unsatisfactory proposals.
759. While we do not accept the evidence suggesting that a policy focus on protection imposes a significantly more stringent test than one requiring maintenance, for the reasons set out in Section 2.7 above, we agree with the planning evidence suggesting its deletion: we think it is preferable to align the language of the objective in the policy in this regard to avoid future arguments as to whether the difference between the two is material.
760. For the same reason, we reject Mr Brown’s suggested softening of the cross reference to Schedule 24.8. Having said that, we think that some amendment to that part of the Policy is required to make it clear it is the identification of landscape character and visual amenity

⁴⁹⁰ See J Brown, Evidence in Chief at 4.2

⁴⁹¹ C Barr, Rebuttal Evidence at 5.31

values that is the important element of the Schedule, rather than the latter's identification of LCUs. We recommend alignment of the language with that in Policy 24.2.1.3 in that regard.

761. We agree also with Mr Barr's suggestions as to minor improvements which might be made to the language of the policy. In particular, reference to "*rural residential*" development is apt to produce confusion with the Rural Residential Zone provisions of Chapter 22.
762. We agree with the requested deletion of the word "only". It seems to us that this adds only emphasis. This is not required, and because nothing similar has been used in the balance of Chapter 24, it invites suggestions that the lack of emphasis elsewhere might be significant.
763. We therefore recommend that Policy 24.2.5.1 be reworded to read:
- "Provide for rural living subdivision, development and use of land where it maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units."*
764. Notified Policy 24.2.5.2 read:
- "Promote design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development that maintain and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall."*
765. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁴⁹² sought that the policy refer to ecological integrity, as well as the landscape character and visual amenity values.
766. Williamson et al questioned how subdivision and development can enhance landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall. They sought that the policy be made specific to the Precinct only.
767. Donaldson et al sought that the policy be amended so that landscape character and visual amenity values are taken into account (rather than maintained and enhanced), and that the relevant values are those defined in Schedule 24.8.
768. We have already discussed the alternative version of Policy 24.2.5.2 that Mr Brown suggested, giving evidence for the Donaldson et al group of submitters.
769. Mr Vivian also gave evidence on this submission. Having reviewed Mr Barr's comments in his Section 42A Report, Mr Vivian suggested an intermediate position between the policy as notified and the relief sought by Williamson et al, namely that the focus be on the values of the Rural Amenity Zone.
770. In his rebuttal evidence⁴⁹³, Mr Barr expressed a preference to retain the notified wording because it enabled effects of development within the Precinct on land in other zones, including the ONLs and ONFs that are zoned Rural in the Proposed District Plan. We agree with Mr Barr's observation. This is also the reason why Schedule 24.8 is not the appropriate reference point;

⁴⁹² Submission 2293

⁴⁹³ At 5.34

that Schedule does not identify the landscape character and visual amenity values of the areas of the Wakatipu Basin identified as ONLs or ONFs. Accordingly, we recommend a limited amendment to this policy to express maintenance and enhancement as alternatives, for the reasons set out in Section 2.7 above.

771. The Donaldson et al submissions provide scope for that change given that it moves the end result a small distance towards the outcome that they sought.

772. We do not recommend the amendment suggested by the Reforestation Trust. The relevant objective does not provide an obvious platform for the amendment sought, and we consider the new policy recommended for Part 24.2.4 addresses the issue.

773. In summary, therefore, we recommend that the policy be reworded as:

“Promote design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development that maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall.”

774. Notified Policy 24.2.5.3 read:

“Provide for non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation, and commercial recreation activities while ensuring these are appropriately located and of a scale and intensity that ensures that the amenity, quality and character of the Precinct is retained.”

775. Aside from the Slopehill Properties submission already discussed, the only submissions on this policy we heard appear to be those of Williamson et al, who supported the policy as currently framed.

776. To the extent that the policy refers to visitor accommodation, it fell within the scope of the Stream 15 Hearing Panel. However, there were no submissions on that aspect of the policy either and the Stream 15 Hearing Panel does not suggest any amendments to it.

777. Accordingly, we recommend that this policy remain unchanged.

778. Notified Policy 24.2.5.4 read:

“Implement minimum and average lot size standards in conjunction with building coverage and height standards so that the landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the Precinct are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development.”

779. Williamson et al supported this policy.

780. Donaldson et al sought that it be modified to read as follows:

“Implement lot size standards in conjunction with development standards so that the landscape character and visual amenity qualities as defined in Schedule 24.8 are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development.”

781. Morven Ferry et al sought that the policy be reworded to read:

“Implement minimum average lot size standards in conjunction with building coverage and height standards to enable development and variation in subdivision design and layout which reflects the characteristics identified in the applicable Landscape Classification Units”.

782. Mr Brown’s evidence for Donaldson et al suggested a third alternative incorporating only some of the changes sought in the submissions as follows:

“Implement lot size standards in conjunction with development standards so that the landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the Precinct are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development.”

783. In his evidence, Mr Brown explained the rationale for his suggested changes as being because:

- a. Given the spectrum of character and amenity within the Precinct, a standard approach with a minimum and average area is not appropriate for all of the Precinct;
- b. Building coverage and height are only two of the relevant standards that assist in managing effects.

784. Mr Barr did not agree with the Morven Ferry et al submission that sought to alter the stated purpose for minimum average lot size standards to delete reference to cumulative effects. In his view, while a minimum average enables a flexible approach to subdivision and development pattern, assisting with implementing design-led policies, the average density is the key influence on the environmental outcome. He also disagreed with deletion of reference to the minimum lot size. Although less significant as a determinant of environmental outcomes than the minimum average, in his view, it was also relevant.

785. Mr Barr however agreed with Mr Brown that a wider range of development standards might be referred to. Lastly, in reply, Mr Barr recommended reference be to landscape character and visual amenity “values” rather than “qualities” for consistency with the balance of the chapter. Mr Barr regarded that⁴⁹⁴ as a minor grammatical amendment, as do we.

786. We agree also with Mr Barr that the policy should retain reference to minimum and average lot size standards. While Mr Brown is correct and the absorption capacity of the Precinct varies, the minimum average lot size standard is, as Mr Barr identified, a key determinant to the ultimate environmental outcomes in the Precinct.

787. It is therefore important that that key standard has a policy underpinning to support it. That does not mean that it will be impossible to depart from the standard, but it does create a high bar, which we believe to be appropriate (not to mention consistent with non-complying status in the rules).

788. Mr Barr goes part way to recognising the force of Mr Brown’s point in his recommendations for a sliding scale of minimum lot sizes in the Rules. As will be seen in due course, we agree with that recommendation. In the present context, that means in our view that continued reference in this policy to minimum lot sizes is appropriate and that we do not agree with the Morven Ferry et al submission as to the point of minimum and minimum average lot sizes. We heard evidence from a number of landscape architects that an average lot size provides

⁴⁹⁴ Refer C Barr, Reply Evidence at 11.32

flexibility in design, and the greater the difference between the minimum lot size and the average, the more flexibility is created. We accept that evidence, but we regard that fact as a collateral benefit. The justification for minimum and average lot sizes being specified in the Plan is because they exert control over potential adverse effects, including cumulative adverse effects.

789. While we accept Mr Brown's point that relevant development standards extend beyond building coverage and height requirements, we think a generalised reference to "*development standards*" is unhelpful and that a more specific description of the key standards stands a better prospect of achieving the objective.

790. Lastly, we consider that it is helpful that the policy cross reference Schedule 24.8 rather than leaving it open as to which landscape character and visual amenity values are relevant.

791. Therefore, we recommend that the policy be reworded as follows:

"Implement minimum and average lot size standards in conjunction with standards controlling building size, location and external appearance, so that the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, as identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units, are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development."

792. Notified Policy 24.2.5.5 read:

"Maintain and enhance a distinct and visible edge between the Precinct and the Zone."

793. X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust⁴⁹⁵ supported this policy.

794. Morven Ferry et al sought its deletion although the submission appears to provide no clear reason for that relief and Mr Barr did not discuss that as a potential option.

795. We discussed the wording of this policy with both Mr Barr and Ms Gilbert. We queried Mr Barr as to whether the policy direction that a distinct and visible edge be maintained was consistent with a 50 metre setback from the landscape feature lines identified on the planning maps. Having reflected on it, he thought that they were consistent and that the rule (requiring the setback) could work to complement the policy. His concern was, if there was not a strong policy on this subject, the Council would field a succession of non-complying applications at the margin of the Precinct Zone.

796. Ms Gilbert's response was that it is preferable from a landscape perspective to align zone boundaries with clear geomorphological lines. In her view, the amenity characteristics of the Wakatipu Basin mean that it is not appropriate to allow development to creep. She emphasised the need for a strong defensible boundary.

797. We acknowledge Mr Barr's concern about the practical implications if this policy, or something very like it is not retained. Accordingly, we are not minded to recommend acceptance of the Morven Ferry et al submissions that sought its deletion.

⁴⁹⁵ Submission 2619: Opposed by FS2710

798. We are conscious, however, that while desirable, a geomorphological line may not be available in all cases. In addition, given the setbacks required in the rules, the edge will typically not be at the Precinct boundary, but rather set back from it. Lastly, we think it needs to be clear here, as elsewhere, that the Precinct is a sub-zone of the Rural Amenity Zone.
799. We also find it difficult to conceive how the edge between the Precinct and the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone can be enhanced.
800. Accordingly, we recommend that Policy 24.2.5.5 be amended to read as follows:
- “Maintain a defensible edge between areas of rural living in the Precinct and the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone.”*
801. Notified Policy 24.2.5.6 read
- “Retain vegetation where this contributes to landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct and is integral to the maintenance of the established character of the Precinct.”*
802. A number of submissions sought that the policy acknowledge in different ways, the desirability of clearance of wilding trees⁴⁹⁶. Most but not all of the Donaldson et al group sought that the words *“when carrying out development”* be inserted into the policy⁴⁹⁷. Crown Investments et al sought deletion of the policy.
803. Curiously, in view of the more limited relief sought in the relevant submissions, Mr Brown’s evidence for the Donaldson et al group took a strong position that the policy should be deleted. He thought that was necessary because the issue of new landscaping and/or the retention or otherwise of existing vegetation would be one of the factors addressed in subdivision design and in management of effects on the environment.
804. Mr Ferguson’s evidence for the Crown Investments et al group of submitters, referred to the monitoring report underlying the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) which pointed to an increase of vegetation associated with lifestyle block development, including planting designed to mitigate individual consented developments. Mr Ferguson’s view⁴⁹⁸ was that there was no evidence to suggest that the existing planting is being removed, and in fact the evidence points in the opposite direction.
805. He referred also to the absence of any higher-level strategic policy mandating retention of existing exotic vegetation and pointed to Chapter 32 as providing a framework for the identification and protection of trees with high botanical, amenity and heritage values. He suggested that a second layer of regulation would produce confusion.
806. Mr Barr responded to Mr Ferguson’s points in rebuttal. Paraphrasing his evidence, it is that a focus on preservation of exotic indigenous vegetation for landscape character and visual

⁴⁹⁶ See for instance the submissions of Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Inc (#2190), Dennison & Grant (#2301)

⁴⁹⁷ Morven Ferry et al sought that it be expressed as encouraging retention of vegetation

⁴⁹⁸ EIC at 89

amenity reasons is not intended to address an existing issue, but rather to anticipate that the potential development rights afforded to some areas of the Precinct compared with previous District Plan provisions could result in vegetation being removed in an unsympathetic manner to facilitate development.

807. Mr Barr did, however, recognise that there was a potential inconsistency with the policy direction related to wilding trees that needed to be addressed. Because of the varying wilding potential of different species, he did not consider an absolute exclusion, as sought by the Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group, to be justified. He suggested an exclusion for vegetation that does not present a high risk of wilding spread.
808. Mr Barr did not respond directly to the submission of the Donaldson et al group but his commentary on related submissions on the rules suggests that the rationale for not restricting the policy to operate solely at the point of development was to address unmanaged clearance prior to any application for a resource consent⁴⁹⁹.
809. We note Ms Gilbert's evidence⁵⁰⁰ in this regard, that exotic vegetation features make a significant positive contribution to the landscape character of the Precinct areas (and the Basin as a whole) and are a key aspect of the identity or 'sense of place' associated with the Wakatipu Basin.
810. We agree that the concern expressed by Mr Barr is legitimate, which is also the answer to Mr Brown's issue regarding potential duplication.
811. In summary, we agree with Mr Barr's recommendation that this policy serves a valuable purpose in assisting achievement of the objectives of Chapter 24 and, subject to a little redrafting to express the policy instruction more simply and clearly, we agree with Mr Barr's recommendations as to its content.
812. Accordingly, we recommend that Policy 24.2.5.6 be amended to read as follows:
- "Retain vegetation that contributes to landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, provided it does not present a high risk of wilding spread."*
813. That brings us to the end of our discussion of submissions and further submissions on the policies of Chapter 24. We have discussed the reasons for our recommendations throughout. Suffice it to say that having reviewed the policies recommended individually and collectively, we believe that they are the most appropriate means to achieve the objectives that we have recommended.

3.11 Part 24.3.1: District Wide Provisions

814. This part of the Plan draws attention to the district wide chapters of the Proposed District Plan that might be of relevance. As far as we can identify, it was not the subject of submissions. Accordingly, we recommend that it be retained unaltered.

⁴⁹⁹ See C Barr, Section 42A Report at 17.10

⁵⁰⁰ Evidence in Chief at paragraph 66

3.12 Part 24.3.2.: Advice Notes

815. Part 24.3.2 as notified, contained five “*advice notes*” on a variety of subjects. Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁰¹ sought that the first four advice notes be deleted on the basis that the Proposed District Plan should speak for itself. Alternatively, it sought that they be shifted to the beginning or end of the Chapter so as not to disrupt the flow of the key statutory provisions. A third option suggested was that they be put in a separate guideline document outside the statutory plan. Mr Barr did not discuss this submission specifically. However, subject to a point we will discuss shortly, we note that the format of Chapter 24 follows that of the other chapters in the Proposed District Plan. In addition, while it is desirable that the operative provisions of a District Plan speak for themselves, advice notes that provide clarification for lay readers of the District Plan can be of assistance, depending of course on their content. District Plans are not written solely for experts.
816. In summary, we recommend that this submission be rejected at the very general level at which it is pitched, although we will bear it in mind when reviewing the specific provisions.
817. Comparing these provisions with the comparable set in Chapter 21, the latter are headed “*Interpreting and Applying the Rules*”. We think that is a better description for most of these provisions, which are not “*Advice Notes*” in the strict sense.
818. The first “*advice note*” states:
- “A permitted activity must comply with all of the rules and any relevant district wide rules.”*
819. It does not appear to be the subject of any submission (other than the Slopehill Properties submission just discussed).
820. We think that this particular note is of relevance but requires clarification. It assumes that the reader will understand that the reference to “*all of the rules*” means the rules of Chapter 24. While we regard that as implicit and therefore arguably a minor change in terms of Clause 16(2), to the extent that it limits what is currently written, the Slopehill Properties submission provides jurisdiction to record that is the position.
821. We therefore recommend that provision 24.3.2.1 be amended to read:
- “A permitted activity must comply with all of the rules (in this case, of Chapter 24) and any relevant district wide rules”.*
822. “*Advice Note*” 24.3.2.2 as notified read:
- “The surface of lakes and rivers are zoned Rural, unless otherwise identified in the Planning Maps as zoned Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.”*
823. This provision likewise was not the subject of specific submission. We discussed with Mr Barr whether the objectives and policies of the Rural Amenity Zone provided any guidance as to activities on the surface of lakes and rivers. He confirmed that it did not have the policy

⁵⁰¹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

framework that the Rural Zone had on these matters. We also asked whether the planning maps were in fact clear (e.g. as to the zone Mill Creek is located in). On the second point, Mr Barr agreed that there was a problem identifying what the position is from the Planning Maps. In his reply evidence⁵⁰², Mr Barr therefore recommended that the language in 21.3.2.8 be used and that lakes and rivers should be zoned Rural. That provision states that the surface of and beds of lakes and rivers are zoned Rural unless otherwise stated. We agree with Mr Barr's observation that the Slopehill Properties Limited submission provides scope to change this advice note; if it were deleted, provision 21.3.2.8 would apply.

824. Accordingly, we recommend that this provision be amended to read:

"The surface of and bed of lakes and rivers are zoned Rural."

825. "Advice Note" 24.3.2.3 provides guidance as to the position as regards conditions on previous approvals. Point (a) states the requirements related to building platforms and conditions of consent.

826. Point (b) relates to applications to alter or cancel conditions on existing resource consents. Williamson et al sought that these advice notes be deleted on the basis that the requirements in relation to variations to past consents or consent notices in the Act should be relied upon.

827. In his discussion of this submission⁵⁰³. Mr Barr inferred that other recommendations he had made would meet the submitters' concern. He recorded his view, however, that an advice note cannot usurp the provisions of the Act but, in any event, he was of the view that the requirements of the Act were correctly stated.

828. Mr Vivian gave evidence for the submitters and agreed with Mr Barr's recommendation (that the Advice Note not be deleted). We discussed with Mr Barr, one aspect of this advice note; whether the reference in 24.3.2.3(b) to a "proposal" was sufficiently clear. In his evidence in reply, Mr Barr suggested that reference to a "resource consent" might be substituted as a minor change. We have some difficulty with that suggestion. While section 127(3) of the Act provides that an application for change and cancellation of consent conditions is treated as if it were an application for a resource consent, it is not correctly described as such. We think it would be clearer if the text referred to "an application".

829. In addition, the provision refers to the objectives and provisions of both the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct as being relevant to such an application. That will be the case for an application within the Precinct, but not where an application is located in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone. We suggest a minor clarification of that point also.

830. The end result we recommend is accordingly that Provision 24.3.2.3 be amended so that sub-provision (b) reads:

"Applicants may apply to alter or cancel any conditions of an existing resource consent as a component of an application for resource consent for development. Whether it may be

⁵⁰² At 11.34 and 11.35

⁵⁰³ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 26.4

appropriate for the Council to maintain, or to alter or cancel these conditions shall be assessed against the extent to which an application accords with the objectives and provisions of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (as applicable)."

Otherwise, we recommend that this advice note remain as notified.

831. "Advice Note" 24.3.2.4 advises the abbreviations used within the rules for the status of different activities. It is not the subject of any specific submission and accordingly, we recommend that it be retained unamended.
832. "Advice Note" 24.3.2.5 as notified read:
"Clarifications of the meaning of root protection zone, minor trimming of a hedgerow, minor trimming and significant trimming are provided in Part 32.3.2 of the Protected Trees Chapter 32.
833. The only submissions specifically on this provision were those of Morven Ferry et al who sought that it be deleted. Mr Barr observed that this relief is linked to the submitters' request to remove Rule 24.4.29 on the basis that it is ultra vires Section 76 of the Act. We will discuss that rule shortly but suffice it to say, we do not recommend that it be deleted. Accordingly, in our view, the provision serves as a useful purpose although, as Mr Barr notes, the cross reference needs to be altered to refer to Chapter 2 since that is where the relevant clarifications are now located. Mr Barr regarded this as a minor amendment within the scope of Clause 16(2), as do we.
834. Accordingly, we recommend that this provision be revised to read:
"Clarifications of the meaning of root protection zone, minor trimming of a hedgerow, minor trimming and significant trimming are provided in Chapter 2- Definitions."
835. Having observed that the provisions of Part 24.3.2 are mostly more correctly described as providing direction in interpreting and apply the Rules, this provision is arguably the exception and properly categorised as an advice note. We recommend it be placed in a separate part, as 24.3.3.1.
836. Transpower New Zealand Limited⁵⁰⁴ sought a new advice note to better recognise the National Grid and the particular rules for the National Grid contained in Chapter 30. Mr Barr did not consider this amendment to be necessary because Chapter 30 is already referenced. He also noted that if the provisions about utilities were to be specifically referenced, the relevant provisions of the earthworks chapter (Chapter 25) would also need to be noted.
837. Transpower did not appear before us to explain why this particular amendment was required and we agree with Mr Barr's reasoning. The provisions related to the National Grid, and indeed those related to utilities generally, are located in the District Wide provisions that Part 24.3.1 already directs the reader to. We do not believe that an additional advice note would assist readers of the Plan.

⁵⁰⁴ Submission 2442

838. Mr Barr did, however, recommend an additional advice note be inserted to direct readers of the Plan to the requirements of the Otago Regional Plan: Water in relation to wastewater treatment systems within the Lake Hayes catchment. While we have recommended more substantive relief in response to the submissions, in particular of the Friends of Lake Hayes, we think that the advice note suggested by Mr Barr is a useful adjunct. As discussed in section 2.7 above, the need to obtain resource consents for on-site wastewater disposal within the Lakes Hayes Catchment appears to have escaped many landowners, and it can do no harm to reinforce that statutory requirement. Because an advice note has no regulatory force, Mr Barr classified the suggested amendment as falling within Clause 16(2), or accordingly within the jurisdiction provided by the Friends of Lake Hayes submission. We agree with that advice, on both counts. This is an Advice Note in the strict sense, and we recommend it be labelled as such.

839. Accordingly, we recommend a new advice note, numbered 24.3.3.2 be inserted reading:

“On-site wastewater treatment is subject to the Otago Regional Plan: Water. In particular, Rule 12A.1.4 of the Otago Regional Plan: Water requires that within the Lake Hayes Catchment all on-site wastewater treatment systems obtain a resource consent from the Otago Regional Council.”

3.13 Part 24.3.3: General Rules

840. There is no apparent reason why the two ‘general rules’ in this Part are separated from the other rules we have recommended be under the heading indicating they relate to interpretation and application of the rules. We recommend a rearrangement accordingly.

841. Rule 24.3.3.1 seeks to explain the application of the Rules to the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct. It was subject to two sets of submissions. The first from Williamson et al sought a consequential amendment consistent with their submissions that sought separation of the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct into separate zones. As discussed in section 2.4 above, we do not recommend separation of the Precinct into a separate zone, and we note that Mr Vivian (giving evidence for the submitters) supported Mr Barr’s recommendation that the Rule remain unchanged⁵⁰⁵.

842. The only other submission that we had identified on this rule is that of Darby Planning LP⁵⁰⁶ seeking consequential changes, consistent with the submitter’s request that a new Precinct for the Lake Hayes Cellars property be introduced. As discussed in Report 18.6, we do not recommend acceptance of that submission, and accordingly, the suggested consequential relief falls away.

843. We therefore recommend that General Rule 24.3.3.1 be relocated and renumbered 24.3.2.5, but apart from minor rewording for consistency, remain as notified.

844. There do not appear to be any submissions on General Rule 24.3.3.2, which describes the way in which Tables 24.1 to 24.3 are intended to operate, applying to all activities. Accordingly, we recommend that that too remain unchanged other than minor rewording for consistency and renumbering it 24.3.2.6.

⁵⁰⁵ Refer C Vivian, Evidence in Chief for Williamson et al at 2.62

⁵⁰⁶ Submission 2376: Supported by FS2782, FS2783 and FS2784

3.14 Part 24.4 – Table 24.1: Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.

845. The structure of Part 24.4 is that activities across the entire Rural Amenity Zone are the subject of the rules in Table 24.1. Table 24.2 provides a small number of rules that are specific to activities in the Precinct. Table 24.3 provides the standards that apply to all activities listed in the two previous tables.’
846. On general formatting matters, the notified rules utilised bullet points when specifying matters to which discretion was restricted in Restricted Discretionary Activity rules. As with the Stage 1 decisions, we think it is preferable to provide each element of the rule with a unique identifier. Mr Barr recommended an alphanumeric approach, which is consistent with the Stage 1 decisions. We have adopted that without further comment.
847. Before considering the detail of the rules, we should address the submission of Bruce McLeod⁵⁰⁷, who sought that all rules relating to activities be grouped together. In effect, the desired end result is to amalgamate the standards in Table 24.3 into the rules governing activities in Tables 24.1 and 24.2.
848. While we agree that this might assist readers at one level, in our view, it would result in significant duplication, as many of the standards apply to more than one rule. It also does not reflect the style of the balance of the District Plan. We therefore recommend that this submission be declined.
849. In this section we will address submissions on Table 24.1, working down the list of rules that Mr Barr recommended in his reply evidence. We will then address submissions seeking additional rules that Mr Barr did not recommend.
850. The first rule in Table 24.1 is rule 24.4.1 reading:
“Any activity not listed in Tables 24.1 to 24.3.”
851. Activities within the scope of this rule are non-complying.
852. BSTGT Limited⁵⁰⁸ and Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁰⁹ sought that the activity status for this rule be *“permitted”*.
853. Boxer Hills Trust⁵¹⁰ and Trojan Helmet Limited⁵¹¹ sought that the default status be *“discretionary”*.
854. Williamson et al sought amendment to the rule to make it clear that Table 24.3 lists standards not activities.

⁵⁰⁷ Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

⁵⁰⁸ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

⁵⁰⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁵¹⁰ Submission 2385: Supported by FS2784

⁵¹¹ Submission 2387: Opposed by FS2772 (although not apparently on this point)

855. None of the submitters seeking a materially different activity status to that in the notified rule presented evidence or legal submissions supporting that position. While the Slopehill Properties submission asserted that there was insufficient policy support or evidence to justify a non-complying activity status, we disagree. The structure of the Chapter 24 Rules is that while seeking to be comprehensive, they are not written as “*effects-based*” rules. Accordingly, there is potential for an activity not listed to have significant adverse effects. There is ample evidence that the areas covered by Chapter 24 are high value amenity areas. We think it would be unfortunate if an activity with significant adverse effects could establish as permitted because, though inadvertence, it had not specifically been listed in one or other table in the Chapter.
856. BSTGT Limited, did however, present legal submissions that the effect of the rule, combined with what was suggested to be a narrow definition of “*farming*” meant that the clearance of any vegetation for farming purposes would be non-complying. Mr Barr analysed the definition of farming in his reply evidence⁵¹². He pointed out that it focuses on the purpose of the use of land. In his view, if vegetation was being cleared for farming purposes, it falls within the definition. We agree. Certainly, we do not consider that the default status in the plan needs to be altered on that account, although to be fair, counsel for the submitter did not suggest that as the answer to the concern she was raising.
857. We therefore believe that non-complying status is appropriate in this instance.
858. If an appropriate activity is not listed is the subject of application then, in our view, it could pass one or both gateways in Section 104D of the Act and receive consent.
859. Mr Barr recommended that the Williamson et al submissions be accepted as the fundamental point being made is correct. Table 24.3 does not list activities. We concur. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.4.1 be amended to read:
“Any activity not listed in Tables 24.1 and 24.2.”
860. Notified Rule 24.4.2 listed “*Farming*” as a permitted activity.
861. Associated with his discussion of the BSTGT submission in relation to the previous rule, Mr Barr suggested an amendment to Rule 24.4.2 so that it refers to “*Farming Activity*”. He considered that that would be a minor change in terms of Clause 16(2). We concur. Given that the only submissions we could identify on the rule were in support of its current form, we recommend that the sole change to Rule 24.4.2 be that it relate to “*Farming Activity*”.
862. Following Rule 24.4.2 there are a series of rules under the heading “*Buildings and Residential Activities*”. Given that the focus of Table 24.1 is on activities, we consider that the heading should be reversed. We recommend that it read “*Residential Activities and Buildings*”. We regard this as a minor change within Clause 16(2).
863. Rule 24.4.3 is a permitted activity rule. As notified, it read:

⁵¹² At section 6

“The use of land or buildings for residential activity except as provided for in Table 24.1 or Table 24.2.”

864. There do not appear to be any submissions specifically on this rule, but Mr Barr suggested some minor rewording of it to introduce reference to Table 24.3 (for clarification). Although that does no more than repeat General Rule 24.3.3.2 (and is therefore a minor change in terms of Clause 16(2)) the demand for residential activities in the Wakatipu Basin is such that we consider it needs to be made crystal clear that this particular activity is only permitted if it complies with all of the standards.
865. Mr Barr sought to find a formulation of words that collected together all of the tables, but we consider that some expansion is required to make it clear that readers need to look at the balance of Table 24.1 for additional activity rules that apply, but that the rule is in any event subject to the standards in Table 24.3.
866. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.4.3 be amended to read:
- “The use of land or buildings for residential activity except as otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 or Table 24.2 and subject to the standards in Table 24.3.”*
867. The next rule in the notified Table 24.4 was unhelpfully numbered 24.3.4. It provided as a permitted activity, *“One residential unit per site”*.
868. This rule was the subject of a number of submissions. Morven Ferry et al sought that it be expanded to provide that there might also be one residential unit per residential building platform.
869. Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant⁵¹³ and Neil McDonald⁵¹⁴ sought that the rule be deleted.
870. The Dennison/Grant submission explained its reasoning as being based on the argument that residential units should be able to be developed consistent with the minimum lot size, in advance of subdivision, and if necessary, an additional rule should be provided to say just that.
871. Bruce McLeod⁵¹⁵ also opposed this rule, but on the basis that it creates the expectation of a development right on the number of rural sites with no current development right. He also noted the potential relevance of the amended definition of “site” for the application of this rule.
872. Mr Barr identified the issues created by these submissions as linked to the ability to create building platforms as a discrete land use activity. He noted the Morcom et al and Williamson et al submissions as having sought this relief. For our part, we observe that the Morcom et al submissions did not identify what activity status the proposed rule should have. Williamson et al suggested restricted discretionary activity status. Morven Ferry et al also sought a new rule to this effect, but suggested full discretionary status.

⁵¹³ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁵¹⁴ Submission 2303

⁵¹⁵ Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

873. Ultimately, Mr Barr recommended deletion of the (mis-numbered) Rule 24.3.4, insertion of a new rule (24.4.XA) providing for identification of a building platform as a restricted discretionary activity and new rules (numbered 24.5.XA and 24.5.XB) located in Table 24.3 and providing density standards for residential activity in the Rural Amenity Zone and Precinct respectively.
874. We asked Mr Barr whether identification of a building platform is a land use in terms of section 9. Mr Barr thought it was, but he agreed that a land use rule providing for it was potentially not necessary. When we queried whether identification of a building platform served a resource management purpose, Mr Barr thought it did, namely to provide for development, but he agreed that that was what resource consents for buildings were for. He also noted that he had seen a lot of examples identifying a 1000m² building platform that just specified the height and colour of the building.
875. We pursued these questions with a number of other planning witnesses. Asked what the relevant land use is and how it is implemented, Mr Jeff Brown responded that the only implementation is by registering the building platform. He agreed that it is not a land use.
876. Mr Chris Ferguson responded to a similar question, saying that he thought that identification of a building platform as a land use is a residential activity. In his view, such a consent lapses if the building platform is not registered on the relevant Computer Freehold Register. He did accept however that there were shades between Mr Barr's suggested rule and outline development plans. He emphasised the fact that registration of a building platform creates a useable right, but he didn't disagree with the view that that right is a commodity and making provision for it to date has just created a commodity market. Ultimately, he tended to agree that the rule was not necessary and was just adding an unnecessary layer of consenting.
877. In his reply evidence⁵¹⁶, Mr Barr sought to address the concerns that were evident in our questions. He emphasised that the suggested rule specifically refers to the activity within the building platform authorised as a residential unit. He also referred us to decisions both of the Environment Court and of Council applying the rule in the Operative District Plan⁵¹⁷ enabling identification of a building platform without comment as to the appropriateness of such a rule.
878. Mr Barr remained of the view that the suggested rule was appropriate.
879. Looking back at the origins of the rule in the Operative District Plan on this subject, it appears to have arisen in the Environment Court's 2001 decision on the District Plan⁵¹⁸. At paragraph [76], the Court identified an anomaly in that an application as part of a subdivision for identification of building platforms was necessarily considered without reference to matters of house appearance or design⁵¹⁹, and a subsequent application to construct a dwelling was treated as a controlled activity the subject of limited matters of discretion, whereas an application for a resource consent to erect a dwelling on land that did not contain a building

⁵¹⁶ At Section 5

⁵¹⁷ Rule 5.3.3.(i)(b)

⁵¹⁸ C75/2001

⁵¹⁹ Referring to *Brookes v QLDC* C81/94 and *Darrington v Waitakere City Council* W68/96

platform would be the subject of much broader scrutiny with the ability of others to make submissions.

880. Subsequently, however⁵²⁰, the Court determined that the ability to impose land use conditions on a subdivision consent is more a question of reasonableness in the circumstances than of a sharp definition of powers⁵²¹, thereby providing an alternative route to avoid the identified anomaly. We have not identified any discussion by the Environment Court of the issue thereafter. Nor have we identified any discussion by the Court of the question that was troubling us; what exactly is the land use that the proposed land use rule provides for?
881. We do not think that the fact that subsequent decisions have taken the Operative District Plan Rule as a given and sought merely to apply it is significant. It is understandable that the Court, and indeed Council Hearing Panels, would apply the rules of the Operative Plan as stated, certainly unless the issue were drawn to their attention.
882. In addition, we have the guidance provided by the Environment Court in its decisions related to framework plans in the context of the Auckland Unitary Plan⁵²². Those decisions emphasised the need for rules in District Plans to relate to land uses, rather than to broader preliminary frameworks for land uses that are yet to be undertaken.
883. Applying those considerations, we find it difficult to identify what the relevant land use is. While, as Mr Barr noted, its purpose is to facilitate residential activity, the land use is clearly not a residential activity, because the only action taken as a consequence of consent being granted is the registration of a building platform. Ultimately, identification of a building platform is just a process of drawing lines on the Computer Freehold Register. It does not actually authorise construction of anything although, as discussed above, it does give rise to expectations that it will be possible to construct buildings within the identified area.
884. Put another way, if the relevant activity was a residential activity, the consent would lapse under Section 124 of the Act if the residential activity had not been undertaken within five years (or such other period as the consent might specify), and clearly this is not the case.
885. As both Mr Brown and Mr Fergusson observed, the consent in this case is treated as being implemented when the building platform is registered. To us, that creates a sound policy reason for not endorsing Mr Barr's proposed land use rule; it creates a land use consent that, so long as the building platform is registered, will never lapse. It sits on the Computer Freehold Register in perpetuity. A residential building may never be built. We regard that situation as contrary to the purpose underlying Section 124.
886. In addition, as Mr Ferguson frankly accepted, the ability to create building platforms with no time limit on construction of buildings facilitates a commodity market.
887. One of the problems the Council faces in exercising its statutory functions in the Wakatipu Basin is the extent to which past decisions enabling creation of building platforms have created

⁵²⁰ In its Operative District Plan Decision C100/2001

⁵²¹ See [43]

⁵²² *Re Application for declarations by Auckland Council* [2016] NZEnvC 056 and [2016] NZEnvC 65

an overhang of sites where residential homes may be built into the future. We do not consider it desirable to perpetuate that situation if it is not clearly necessary to do so.

888. In section 32 terms, we do not regard the suggested rule as being effective or efficient in achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan and we do not recommend that it be inserted into Chapter 24.

889. We do agree, however, with Mr Barr's recommendation that mis-numbered Rule 24.3.4 should be deleted. Quite apart from the legitimate substantive issues in the Dennison/Grant and McLeod submissions, it is not an activity. It is framed in the language of standards, and as currently framed, it is not consistent with the density standards proposed to be inserted into Chapter 27 governing subdivision in the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct.

890. We recommend that it be deleted. We will discuss the standards that are inserted into Part 24.5 later in this Report.

891. Notified Rule 24.4.5 provided as a restricted discretionary activity:

"The construction of buildings including exterior alteration to existing buildings including buildings located within an existing approved/registered building platform area."

892. This rule was the subject of a very substantial number of submissions summarised by Mr Barr at Section 16 of his Section 42A Report. Submitters either sought that construction of buildings within a previously approved building platform be a controlled activity (as per the Operative District Plan) or a permitted activity, arguing that identification of a building platform either does create, or should be taken to have created, a guaranteed development right. As Mr Barr noted⁵²³, a number of submissions drew attention to the apparent inconsistency in the approach taken in this regard with the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) provisions governing the construction and alteration of buildings within building platforms in the rural zones (which provide for this as a permitted activity).

893. Mr Barr acknowledged Ms Gilbert's contrary view (that a restricted discretionary activity consent at time of building allows for appropriate consideration of potential in adverse effects of a specific building design⁵²⁴) but concluded that it was insufficiently efficient to require a restricted discretionary activity resource consent to construct buildings within previously approved and registered building platforms.

894. Accordingly, Mr Barr recommended:

- a. The construction and alteration of residential buildings within a building platform either approved through the rule framework of Chapter 24 or any previous resource consent be a permitted activity;
- b. External alteration of existing buildings not located within a building platform up to 30% over a ten year period be a permitted activity subject to standards controlling colour and materials;
- c. Standards for fire-fighting emergency vehicle access be added to the Plan;

⁵²³ Section 42A Report at 16.6

⁵²⁴ B Gilbert, Evidence in Chief at section 65

- d. Standards relating to colour be added for alterations to buildings and omitted from conditions pertaining to building platforms.
895. Mr Barr's recommendations were largely supported by the planning witnesses (and legal submissions) we heard. Most of the evidence seeking further amendments related to the standards recommended by Mr Barr.
896. In Section 3.6 of this report, we discussed our support at a policy level for recognition of building platforms created before the date of decision on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2). We need not repeat our reasoning in that regard. We should, however, note that our recommended policy focuses on building platforms that have been created by the trigger date. A building platform is 'created' when it is registered on the relevant Computer Freehold Register. If an earlier step in the process were adopted (such as the date resource consent was granted, as Mr Barr suggested), that would enable landowners to take the benefit of identification of a building platform without also accepting the conditions related to development of the platform that are registered on the Computer Freehold Register as Consent Notices contemporaneously with registration of the building platform.
897. Addressing the extent to which construction and alteration within building platforms should be enabled (Policy 24.2.1.10 that we have recommended) the status quo under the Operative District Plan is that such activities are controlled. We do not regard the decisions made on the provisions of the rural zones as part of the Stage 1 process as being determinative. Those decisions were largely addressing development outside the Wakatipu Basin, and it is within the Basin that the greatest pressure for residential development in rural areas is located. It is consequently the area where the greatest risk to degradation of the amenity values of a highly valued landscape (in terms of the Proposed RPS) exists.
898. While we respect Mr Barr's view that efficiency considerations should prevail over the desirability of exercising a higher degree of regulatory oversight over building construction and design in a highly valued landscape, we consider that Ms Gilbert expressed valid concerns that the relatively high level and broad brush consideration of controls exerted through the subdivision process have the potential to produce untoward adverse effects if the design and construction of buildings is not the subject of adequate control at the subsequent construction stage.
899. Mr Barr's evidence as to the limited extent of controls imposed in practice on many building platforms likewise indicate the need for caution in this regard.
900. We think that the risks of untoward outcomes is much less for alterations of existing residential buildings, and that provided adequate standards are imposed to limit the extent of alteration and ensure alterations are subject to appropriate standards governing colours, materials and height, it might appropriately be provided for as a permitted activity. We will discuss the relevant standards in section 3.16 of our report, below.
901. Morven Ferry et al also sought recognition (as a permitted activity) for building construction that would have been permitted or controlled as at notification of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2). We discussed the extent to which prior Plan provisions could create legitimate development expectations in Section 3.6. For the reasons set out in that section, we do not regard the status under prior plans of activities that have not been exercised as being

determinative of their status under a new Plan, particularly where, as here, cogent landscape evidence supports a need for a greater level of control over development than hitherto. We do not recommend the suggested amendment.

902. In summary, therefore, we recommend insertion of two new rules. The first is permitted activity rule numbered 24.4.4 reading:

"The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity".

903. The second new rule is a controlled activity rule, numbered 24.4.6, reading:

"The construction of buildings for residential activity that are located within a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register before [insert plan Decision date].

Control is reserved over:

- a. Landscape character;*
- b. Visual amenity values;*
- c. Access;*
- d. Infrastructure;*
- e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed)."*

We have taken the proposed matters of control from our recommended Rule 24.4.7 that we will discuss shortly. The exception is natural hazards that would have already been considered in identification of a building platform.

904. Turning then to the position of construction of buildings within building platforms established in the future, we think that the balance of considerations shifts materially. First, the concerns about loss of existing development rights pressed on us by counsel for a number of submitters, do not arise.

905. Secondly, and unlike the Decisions Version Chapter 27 provisions⁵²⁵, Proposed Rule 27.7.6.1 governing subdivision in the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct, does not explicitly enable consideration of landscape character and visual amenity values, either directly, or indirectly through control over the external appearance of buildings constructed within building platforms. The only relevant discretion is over the location of the building platform. In addition, as we will discuss when we get to that rule, there appear to be no submissions that would enable us to broaden the scope of inquiry when the building platform is created.

906. Accordingly, it follows that a greater degree of control is required at the point when consent is sought to construct buildings within building platforms if the objectives and policies of the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct, are to be achieved.

907. The existing Rule 24.4.5 would make the construction of such buildings a restricted discretionary activity and we did not hear any evidence or legal argument which would suggest a need for a more restrictive activity status, at least where building is within a registered building platform.

⁵²⁵ See Rule 27.5.8

908. The position is, in our view, different where there is a building platform registered on the Computer Freehold Register, but it is proposed that buildings be located outside it. A number of the Donaldson et al group⁵²⁶ sought that residential buildings outside building platforms be non-complying. While Mr Brown did not refer to this aspect of their submissions in his evidence for these parties, it seems to us that there are good reasons why this should be the case. In particular, if a subdivision has been approved on the basis of the identified (and subsequently registered) building platforms, then it seems to us that departing from the basis of that approval should require greater justification than restricted discretionary activity status would imply. In addition, if building outside existing building platforms were not discouraged, it might facilitate sequential applications, first to build outside the building platform, and then to build a second dwelling (as a controlled activity) within the building platform.
909. We therefore recommend inclusion of a new non-complying activity rule (24.4.8) worded as follows:
- “The construction of buildings for residential activity outside a building platform approved by resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register on a site where there is such a building platform.”*
910. Rule 24.4.7 needs to be subject to that rule. Returning to the balance of Rule 24.4.7, taking the existing Rule 24.4.5 as the starting point, Mr Barr suggested a rationalised set of matters of discretion that we believe largely captures all relevant issues. The two exceptions are that Mr Barr deleted reference to landform modification, without materially expanding what was previously stated, and amended the matter of discretion previously referring to “*natural hazards*” so it just read “*hazards*”. As Mr Barr observed in reply⁵²⁷, the assessment criteria can flesh out the matter for inquiry and the end result is a more efficient set of matters of discretion. While landform modification would normally be considered as an aspect of landscape character and visual amenity values, such modification also has the potential to influence off-site water quality and so we consider it deserves specific mention. Likewise, the notified reference to planting in association with landform modification picked up issues around wilding trees and made specific reference to that, as sought by Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group⁵²⁸, unnecessary. Mr Barr did not discuss the change to the scope of hazards. We consider it potentially significant and in the absence of a submission seeking that relief (we have not identified one), we consider it out of scope. With those qualifications, we regard Mr Barr’s suggested revisions as an improvement.
911. The notified version of the rule contained an explicit exclusion for farm buildings provided for in Rule 24.4.8. Limiting the rule to residential buildings removes the need for that exclusion, as well as removing potential inconsistency with the rules providing for other types of non-residential buildings.

⁵²⁶ See e.g. Donaldson (#2229), Lake Hayes Investments Ltd (#2281: Supported by FS2748, FS2750, FS2765, FS2766, FS2783, FS2784 and FS2787), Boxer Hills Trust (#2386; Supported by FS2769) and Trojan Helmet Ltd (#2387: Supported by FS2703, FS2753 and FS2779)

⁵²⁷ At 10.3

⁵²⁸ Submission 2190: Opposed by FS2746

912. Taking account of the suggested new permitted activity rule for building alteration, and the provisions for residential flats that we discuss next, we recommend a revised restricted discretionary activity rule numbered 24.4.7 reading:

"The construction of buildings for residential activity that are not provided for in Rule 24.4.5 or 24.4.6 and not listed in Rule 24.4.8.

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Landscape character;*
- b. Visual amenity values;*
- c. Access;*
- d. Infrastructure;*
- e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed);*
- f. Natural Hazards."*

913. Notified Rules 24.4.6 and 24.4.7 provided for residential flats. The first rule provided that such flats were permitted if attached to the Residential Unit and if they did not exceed 150m² gross floor area. The second rule provided for residential flats not attached to the residential unit as a restricted discretionary activity.
914. The only submission specifically on these rules we have identified was that of Slopehill Properties Limited⁵²⁹: it sought two additional matters of discretion be added, namely the benefits of the proposal and locational or other practical constraints.
915. Mr Farrell, who gave planning evidence for the submitter, did not address this particular submission, and the reasons set out in the submission are relatively uninformative. For our part, we think that the suggested additions are unnecessary, certainly in the absence of any cogent evidence to the contrary.
916. Mr Barr did suggest insertion of a qualification in Rule 24.4.7 to state that the requirement for a residential flat to be attached to a residential unit does not apply where the buildings are located within a building platform. He relied upon the numerous submissions seeking recognition for buildings within building platforms as permitted activities to provide jurisdiction for the suggested addition.
917. Given our suggested revisions to the rules to refer to buildings constructed for residential activity, we do not consider that this rule is still required. A detached residential flat will fall within Rule 24.4.6 if it is within an existing building platform or within Rule 24.4.7, if it is within a future building platform. If a detached residential flat is outside a building platform, it will be non-complying under our recommended new Rule 24.4.8. We believe that outcome is appropriate for the same reasons as set out above. If there is no building platform, Rule 24.4.7 will apply.
918. In summary, therefore, the only amendment we recommend to existing Rule 24.4.6 other than renumbering it 24.4.5 is to make it clear that the rule relates to construction of a building, rather than just an activity. The renumbering reflects a general reorganisation of the rules we recommend so that, like the tables of rules in other chapters in the Proposed District Plan,

⁵²⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719,

permitted activity rules under each rule heading are grouped, followed by controlled activities, working down progressively to the greatest level of restriction.

919. The recommended wording for Rule 24.4.5 is therefore:
- “The construction of a residential flat not exceeding 150m² and attached to the residential unit.”*
920. Our suggested wording for Rule 24.4.7 inserts a cross reference to this rule to ensure it will operate as intended.
921. As above, we recommend deletion of notified Rule 24.4.7.
922. Before leaving the rules related to residential flats, we should draw Council’s attention to a more general issue that we noted during preparation of this report.
923. The definition of the term *“residential flat”* includes limits on floor areas – 150m² in the Rural Zone and the Rural Lifestyle Zone, 70m² in all other zones. Stage 1 Report 14 noted that a number of definitions in Chapter 2 are quasi-rules because they include standards, and recommended Council address this by variation. This is another example.
924. Notified rules 27.4.6 and 27.4.7 (and indeed Rules 27.4.25 and 27.4.26 that we are yet to come to) relate to *“residential flats”* up to 150m² in floor area. This creates an internal contradiction within the Plan. Residential flats within the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct, greater than 70m² in area are not residential flats, as defined. As a result, it could be argued that other aspects of the definition (e.g. that there can only be one residential flat per residential unit) similarly to not apply. This is unsatisfactory. We note that this particular definition is not the subject of appeal and we recommend it be addressed by a variation. The obvious interim solution is to insert reference in the definition to the Rural Amenity Zone.
925. Notified Rule 24.4.8 provided that *“farm buildings”* were permitted.
926. The submissions of Williamson et al supported this rule but sought clarification that construction of small farm buildings is anticipated to occur outside of building platforms.
927. Bruce McLeod⁵³⁰ opposed permitted activity status for farm buildings. Mr McLeod’s submission queried the difference of effects on the landscape of farm buildings, as compared to dwellings within building platforms, along with the efficacy of the proposed standards.
928. Mr Barr did not believe the clarification requested by Williamson et al was required. We agree. Our suggested Rules 24.4.6, 24.4.7 and 24.4.8 relate only to residential buildings.
929. The key difference between farm buildings and residential dwellings justifying permitted activity status for the former is that they are subject to a 50m² floor area standard. We think it safe to assume no permanent dwelling would be constructed in the Wakatipu Basin at that size.

⁵³⁰ Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

930. Mr McLeod presented no evidence to suggest that the concerns he expressed about the efficacy of the standards on farm buildings were well founded, nor any suggestions as to how the issues he had identified around a proliferation of small farm buildings might be addressed. In the circumstances, we do not consider we have a proper basis to recommend substantive amendments to the Chapter 24 rules governing farm buildings. However, we recommend that Council monitor implementation of these rules to identify if this is a material issue, and if so, insert further controls by way of variation.
931. Accordingly, we agree that this rule should be retained unamended. Mr Barr identified, however, that the rule did not sit appropriately under a heading related to residential buildings. He suggested that it be shifted to sit with other non-residential activities. We agree with that suggestion. As a result, the rule should be relocated to follow the heading “Non-residential activities and buildings” and renumbered 24.4.9 consequential on insertion of new Rule 24.4.8, but otherwise be retained unamended.
932. Notified Rule 24.4.9 provided as a full discretionary activity:
- “The construction of any buildings including the physical activity associated with buildings such as roading, access, lighting, landscaping and earthworks not specifically provided for by any other rule in Table 24.1 or Table 24.2.”*
933. Mr Barr noted the submission of BSTGT Limited⁵³¹ as having sought deletion of this rule. He agreed that it was largely redundant as a result of the amendments to other rules he had recommended. We concur, and therefore recommend that Rule 24.4.9 be deleted.
934. The next section of rules sits under a heading labelled “Non-residential activities”. For consistency with the first group of rules, we recommend that it be labelled “Non-residential activities and buildings”.
935. The first rule sitting under this heading is the transplanted rule 24.4.8 we have already discussed. Notified Rule 24.4.10 provided as a permitted activity:
- “Roadside stall buildings”*
936. The only submission specifically on this rule that we have identified supported the current rule. Accordingly, we recommend that the rule be retained unamended.
937. Notified Rule 24.4.13 is another permitted activity, this time providing for “Home occupation”.
938. This rule does not appear to have been the subject of any specific submission. We therefore recommend that it be retained unamended, save as to renumber it 24.4.11.
939. Rule 24.4.12 is another permitted activity rule, providing for “informal airports”. This rule was the subject of four submissions. Bruce McLeod⁵³² opposed the rule on the basis of potentially

⁵³¹ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

⁵³² Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

significant impact on neighbouring properties. Rene Kampman⁵³³ also opposed the rule and sought that informal airports within 750 metres of a neighbouring property be a discretionary activity. Dalefield Trustee⁵³⁴ and Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association of New Zealand Inc⁵³⁵ also made submissions on informal airports, but the relief sought related to the standards that apply to such airports (and in the latter case, also the activity status in the Precinct sub-zone) , and so we will consider them later in this report.

940. Mr Barr considered that Mr Kampman’s submission failed to take account of the standards applying to informal airports which, in his view, already achieve the general intent of the submission. Given the additional evidence we heard at the 24 October 2018 hearing and that was tabled subsequently in relation to Submission 2663 as to the basis of the standards applying to informal airports, we agree with that analysis. We also think the same reasoning provides a sound basis for us to recommend rejection of Mr McLeod’s submission in this regard.
941. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.4.12 be retained unamended.
942. Notified Rule 24.4.13 provided as a permitted activity:
- “Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine growing, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site”.*
943. It needs to be read together with notified rule 24.4.14:
- “Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site where the access is onto a State Highway.”*
944. The latter is stated to be a full discretionary activity.
945. The only submissions on Rule 24.4.13 were in support.
946. Federated Farmers⁵³⁶, however, sought that the activity status of Rule 27.4.14 be altered to restricted discretionary, with relevant criteria related to safety and visual amenity.
947. Mr Barr supported the suggested activity status change, but noted that the rule relates to the activity only, whereas any landscape or visual amenity effects would be associated with buildings, which are controlled independently. He therefore suggested that discretion be restricted to traffic and safety related issues. He also recommended that this particular rule be noted as an exception to the general classification of restricted discretionary activities as non-notified, to provide a route for NZTA to provide input into the consent process. NZTA filed a submission supporting the rule as notified, but in Mr MacColl’s evidence, he advised that the Agency accepted Mr Barr’s recommendations in this regard⁵³⁷.

⁵³³ Submission 2433

⁵³⁴ Submission 2097

⁵³⁵ Submission 2663

⁵³⁶ Submission 2540

⁵³⁷ Refer A MacColl, Evidence in Chief at 5.3

948. We agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.4.13 be retained unchanged, and that Rule 24.4.14 be renumbered 24.3.16 and amended, so that it describes a restricted discretionary activity worded as follows:

“Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site where the access is onto a State Highway.

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Access safety and transportation effects;*
- b. On-site parking.”*

949. Notified Rule 24.4.15 related to a permitted activity, worded:

“Commercial recreational activities that are undertaken on land, outdoors and involve not more than 12 persons in any one group.”

950. It needs to be read together with the following notified Rule 24.4.16 which provided that those activities are full discretionary activities if they involve more than 12 persons in any one group.

951. It appears that neither rule was the subject of specific submission and on that basis, we recommend they be retained unamended save that they be renumbered 24.4.14 and 24.4.19.

952. Notified Rule 24.4.17 provided that *“cafes and restaurants”* are full discretionary activities.

953. Two members of the Morcom et al group submitted that discretionary activity status was inconsistent with restricted discretionary activity status under Rule 24.4.22 for industrial activities associated with wineries.

954. Mr Barr disagreed, noting⁵³⁸ that Rule 24.2.22 governs activities ancillary to a farming activity. In his view, cafes and restaurants might not have a clear relationship with the rural land resources or have effects similar to activities ancillary to farming. He instanced hours of operation for as an example. We agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning. We see few if any parallels between industrial activities associated with wineries on the one hand, and cafes and restaurants. We recommend that the rule be renumbered 24.4.19, but otherwise be retained unamended.

955. Notified Rules 24.4.18 and 24.4.19 both relate to visitor accommodation activities and accordingly fell within the jurisdiction of the Stream 15 Hearing Panel. That Panel has recommended that the two rules be retained unamended – the recommended changes are all to the standards applying to Rule 24.4.18 (as notified), which we will discuss in the context of Part 24.5. Accordingly, the only changes to these rules shown in our attached revision of Chapter 24 is to renumber them as Rules 24.4.15 and 24.4.21 respectively.

956. Notified Rule 24.4.20 provided that *“community activities”* are full discretionary activities. Fire & Emergency New Zealand⁵³⁹ sought that the activity status of fire stations be amended to restricted discretionary status.

⁵³⁸ C Barr, Section 42A Report at 27.14

⁵³⁹ Submission 2660

957. Mr Barr did not support that suggested change. While he accepted that fire-fighting and emergency services are of clear importance to the community, he did not believe it was appropriate to have a bespoke rule for one of potentially many community activities in circumstances where there was no evidence provided by the submitter that there is a real likelihood of a fire station being required in the Rural Amenity Zone. We agree with Mr Barr's reasoning. While we have recommended amendment to notified Policy 24.2.2.1 (now numbered 24.2.1.6) to provide for community activities that are reliant on rural resources, it is not obvious to us that fire stations are in that category. Nor would the policy support singling out fire services among many community activities that might wish to locate within the Rural Amenity Zone. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.4.20 be renumbered 24.4.21 but otherwise be retained unchanged.
958. Notified Rule 24.4.21 provided for "*activities on or over the surface of water bodies*" as full discretionary activities.
959. Although the only submissions on this rule either supported it⁵⁴⁰, or sought that it be expanded to cover the area within 3 metres of the surface of water bodies⁵⁴¹, Mr Barr recommended its deletion consequent on the amendments discussed above to notified Advice Note 24.3.2.2. We agree with Mr Barr that the rule as notified is redundant if water bodies are zoned Rural. There is a potential role for the rule if it were related just to the 3 metres on the landward side of water bodies, as sought by Wakatipu Reforestation Trust. However, a global discretionary rule governing all activities within 3 metres of water bodies would impose significant costs on the community and could only be justified with a robust section 32 analysis. The submitter did not appear and did not provide evidence that would support its submission.
960. On that basis, we recommend that notified Rule 24.4.21 be deleted.
961. Notified Rule 24.4.22 was a restricted discretionary activity rule worded:
- "Industrial activities directly associated with wineries and underground cellars within a vineyard."*
962. The only submissions on this rule supported the rule in the form it was notified.
963. Accordingly, we recommend that it be retained as notified, save as minor reformatting and to renumber it 24.4.17.
964. Notified Rule 24.4.23 noted as a non-complying activity, "*Any commercial or industrial activity not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 including those associated with farming*".
965. Submissions on this rule included:
- a. Bruce McLeod⁵⁴², who sought clarification as to whether the rule applies to the selling of livestock;

⁵⁴⁰ Otago Fish & Game Council (#2455)

⁵⁴¹ Wakatipu Reforestation Trust (#2293: Opposed by Federated Farmers (FS2746)

⁵⁴² Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

- b. Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁴³, who sought that the activity status be discretionary.
966. Mr Barr did not specifically address these submissions, but we note the discussion elsewhere in his Section 42A Report⁵⁴⁴ putting non-complying status under this rule in the broader context of the treatment of non-residential activities within the Rural Amenity Zone.
967. In a zone where maintenance and enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values is a key objective, we see there being little place for commercial and industrial activities other than as specifically provided for. We regard non-complying status as appropriate in the circumstances and we note that Mr Farrell, who gave planning evidence for the submitter, did not seek to support its submission on this particular aspect of Chapter 24.
968. As regards Mr McLeod's request for clarification of the rule, sale of livestock, on the face of the matter, is a commercial activity associated with farming and therefore within the terms of the rule. Mr McLeod has not sought to amend the rule and we do not consider that further clarification is required.
969. We therefore recommend that notified Rule 24.4.23 be renumbered 24.4.23, but otherwise be retained unamended.
970. Notified Rule 24.4.24 provided as a non-complying activity:
- "Panel beating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motor body building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956.*
- Excludes activities undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or as a permitted home occupation."*
971. We did not identify any submission on this rule. However, we think it could be expressed more clearly if the separate exclusion were drawn into the description of the activity, following the style of Rule 22.4.14.
972. The end result would therefore be worded as follows:
- "Panel beating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motor body building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act, except where such activities are undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or a permitted home occupation".*
973. We regard that alternative as a minor change within Clause 16(2) and accordingly recommend it to Council. It remains numbered 24.4.24.
974. One consequence of our recommendation that Rules 24.4.4-24.4.8 focus on the construction and alteration of residential buildings is that the construction and alteration of non-residential buildings needs to be the subject of a separate rule. To be consistent with notified Rule 24.4.5

⁵⁴³ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁵⁴⁴ At 22.12

(given we had no submissions seeking more restrictive status), this should be a restricted discretionary rule.

975. We therefore recommend insertion of a new restricted discretionary rule numbered 24.4.18 worded as follows:

“The construction and alteration of buildings for non-residential activities, not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Landscape character;*
- b. Visual amenity;*
- c. Access;*
- d. Natural Hazards;*
- e. Infrastructure;*
- f. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).”*

3.15 Part 24.4 – Table 24.2: Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct

976. Notified Rules 24.4.25 and 24.4.26 relate to residential flats that are not attached to the principal residential unit. Such flats are full discretionary activities if they are not separated from the principal residential unit by more than 6 metres under Rule 24.4.25, and non-complying activities if they are separated from the principal residential unit by more than 6 metres. Submissions on these rules were either subsumed within the broader position advanced for construction of residential units within building platforms or suggested positions consistent with it. Morven Ferry et al, therefore suggested that residential flats not attached to the principal residential units might be permitted if located within a building platform, but non-complying otherwise. Many of the Donaldson et al submissions sought controlled activity status for new buildings within a building platform and discretionary status otherwise.

977. Rene Kampman⁵⁴⁵ had a different approach. He sought restricted discretionary status for residential flats that are more than 6 metres from the principal residential unit, in line with notified rule 24.4.7.

978. To meet the first set of submissions, Mr Barr recommended that both rules remain unamended other than to add the statement:

“Except the requirement that the Residential Flat must be attached to the Residential Unit does not apply where the buildings are located within a building platform.”

979. From the discussion of the point in his evidence in reply⁵⁴⁶, we understand the intention is that where a residential flat is located within a building platform, construction is permitted without a resource consent. This appears to be subject to compliance with the relevant standards, which include provisions as to density, location in relation to roads and external appearance. Mr Barr observed that any potential adverse effects associated with the sprawl of buildings will have been addressed through the consenting of the building platform⁵⁴⁷.

⁵⁴⁵ Submission 2433

⁵⁴⁶ At 12.6

⁵⁴⁷ Section 42A Report at 28.4

980. Mr Barr did not accept the comparison Mr Kampman sought to draw with residential flats in the Rural Amenity Zone. He observed that the separation of buildings on the same site in the Precinct is a more critical issue to manage than in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, given the higher densities envisaged in that sub-zone.
981. We consider that the question of whether a residential flat not attached to the principal unit is located within a building platform is something of a red herring given the maximum building floor area is 500m², and the maximum area of a building platform is 1000m². We have observed that dwellings located in the rural areas of the Wakatipu basin do not tend to be small in size, leaving little room in practice for a detached residential flat. We did not receive any evidence suggesting to us that it was more than a theoretical possibility that a residential flat of up to 150m² might be able to be located within a building platform if physically separated from the principal unit. However, the logic of our recommendation that existing building platforms be recognised (in Rule 24.4.6) suggests that it would be consistent to recognise that as an exception.
982. We regard the position as different going forward. Our interpretation of Proposed Rule 27.7.6.1 is that there would be no ability to consider issues created by multiple buildings within building platforms consented in future as part of the subdivision process.
983. In our view, the issues we noted above regarding the mismatch between the definition of “residential flat” and the activity these rules describe also indicate the need for caution assigning residential flats of up to 150m² a more favourable activity status if located within building platforms in future.
984. Addressing Mr Kampman’s submission, the underlying rationale of these rules is obviously to encourage clustering of residential buildings. We agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning as to why a more rigorous analysis is required in the Precinct than in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone in the absence of any evidence supporting the approach Mr Kampman has suggested. That is also the reason why we recommend that submissions that sought more favourable status for residential flats in the Precinct⁵⁴⁸ not be accepted, except to the limited extent provided for in Rule 24.4.6.
985. It is also necessary to clarify the relationship between these rules and our recommended Rule 24.4.8. Again, consistency with our reasoning for recommending that rule would suggest it prevail, where it would apply.
986. Lastly, we think it would be useful to clarify the inter-relationship with Rule 24.4.6, to put that beyond doubt. Accordingly, we recommend that the description of the activity in Rules 24.4.25 and 24.4.26 be amended as follows:

“Rule 24.4.25

⁵⁴⁸ See e.g. the submissions of Hermione Mauvernay (#2555) and Slopehill Properties Ltd (#2584: Supported by FS2719)

Residential flat not exceeding 150m² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by no more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6, and is not listed in Rule 24.4.8.”

Note: Residential flats attached to the principal residential unit are covered by Rule 24.4.5.

Rule 24.4.26

Residential flat not exceeding 150m² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6 and is not listed in Rule 24.4.8.”

987. Notified Rule 24.4.27 was in the same terms as notified Rule 24.4.24, but is noted as being a prohibited activity.
988. We have not identified any specific submissions on this rule and accordingly, save for the same minor rewording that we recommended to the parallel rule as above and renumbering it 24.4.28, we recommend that it remain as notified.
989. Notified Rule 24.4.28 provided that “*informal airports*” be full discretionary activities in the Precinct.
990. Submissions on this rule included:
- a. Dalefield Trustee Limited⁵⁴⁹ who sought that informal airports be permitted activities subject to specified standards, namely:
 - i. No more than two flights per fortnight (compared to two flights per day);
 - ii. The landing area be located no more than 100 metres from the notional boundary of a dwelling not on the same site (compared to 500 metres); and
 - iii. Aeronautical guidelines for flying in residential areas are met (no equivalent);
 - b. Hunter Leece and Anne Kobienia⁵⁵⁰, who sought that informal airports be prohibited;
 - c. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association of New Zealand Inc⁵⁵¹, who sought permitted activity status throughout the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct, subject to the noise standards in Chapter 36, or alternatively subject to a 150m separation requirement combined with a maximum frequency of 2 aircraft movements a day..
991. In his initial Section 42A Report, Mr Barr recommended that the Leece/Kobienia submission not be accepted. In his view, the relief sought was too onerous and he noted that no evidence had been provided to justify such a prohibition. He also did not consider prohibited activity status as deriving any support from the recommended objectives and policies.
992. Mr Barr did not specifically consider the Dalefield Trustees submission but, because of the overlap with the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association’s submission, effectively addressed the

⁵⁴⁹ Submission 2097

⁵⁵⁰ Submission 2122

⁵⁵¹ Submission 2663

- relief sought in the subsequent (October) hearing. Dalefield Trustees Ltd appeared at the hearing but did not address this aspect of its submission.
993. At the October 2018 hearing, we also heard from Mr RJ Tapper for the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. Mr Tapper has had a distinguished career in the aviation industry including extensive experience as a private pilot. Mr Tapper emphasised that private use of Queenstown Airport was strongly discouraged. He also drew our attention to the progressive constraints on private flying operations in the Wakatipu Basin, with former informal air strips being closed down and or converted to alternative land uses. He argued that a 500 metre separation from residential uses was unnecessary; the noise standards in the plan were adequate to manage noise effects and if some additional constraint were required, a 150m setback was sufficient given the limitation of flight movements to two per day.
994. Mr Tapper also referred us to the provisions of the Dunedin City and Waimakariri District Plans that just utilised the noise standards to control informal airports.
995. Mr Barr identified that the Waimakariri District Plan rules that Mr Tapper relied upon applied in a situation with a less dense pattern of development that is envisaged in the Precinct. Our own researches suggest that the same is even more the case under the Taieri Plain provisions in the Dunedin City Plan that Mr Tapper referred to. Mr Barr relied on Dr Chiles' evidence that where aircraft use is sporadic, the noise standards are ill equipped to manage the resulting adverse effects, necessitating a minimum separation distance. Mr Barr also expressed concern about practical enforcement when use is sporadic.
996. The submissions of Mr Boyd we received subsequently for the Association sought to emphasise the conservatism of a 500 metre separation when combined with a maximum of one flight (two flight movements) a day. Mr Boyd produced expert acoustic commentary from Mr Van Hout peer reviewing Dr Chiles modelling. We do not think there is any substantive disagreement between the acoustic experts in this regard, but Mr Van Hout's commentary highlights that the noise limits are only not met by a standard AS350 helicopter at a 500 metre separation if the number of flights approaches 10 flights a day. Mr Boyd also drew to our attention recent resource consent decisions approving non-commercial helicopter landing facilities that have a separation distance from nearby residences of significantly less than 500 metres.
997. Mr Boyd also argued that the only section 32 commentary specifically related to informal airports (that forming part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) hearings on the Rural Zone) supported avoidance of excessive regulation, including a need for resource consent applications and hearings. He contended that with a 500 metre separation requirement, the proposed rules provided no reduction in regulation in the Wakatipu Basin and therefore no benefit, because of the density of existing development.
998. We note that Mr Van Hout's peer review accepts that the position is less clear for fixed wing aircraft than for helicopters (concluding that there was insufficient information to identify an appropriate setback distance for the former) and also counselled caution if a different helicopter from the AS350 model Dr Chiles had modelled were used.
999. Mr Van Hout did not offer a view on Dr Chiles' opinion that the noise standards cannot be relied upon when use is sporadic. Dr Chiles picked up on this in his tabled evidence, noting that the average noise limits that were the subject of his modelling and on which Mr Van Hout

had commented, do not address the noise from individual helicopter movements. Accordingly, while Dr Chiles agreed with Mr Van Hout's conclusion that a 500 metre separation was conservative when considered from the perspective of average noise, in his view, they provided a proxy control over sound from individual movements. Dr Chiles observed that even from the latter perspective the required separation was still conservative, but he considered that insufficient information had been analysed to optimise it further.

1000. Commenting on Mr Boyd's proposed reduction in separation combined with a maximum of one flight per day, Dr Chiles agreed that the separation distance could be reduced for helicopters (but not fixed wing aircraft) if flights were limited to one per day and three per week, but advised us that additional limits would be required on helicopter types and flight paths. As Dr Chiles observed, the latter were the subject of conditions in the resource consent approvals Mr Boyd had relied upon.
1001. The evidence before us that we have summarised above supports the view that the noise standards are an insufficient control on their own to manage intermittent informal airport use. That is sufficient to cause us to recommend rejection of the submitter's primary relief (seeking permitted activity status for informal airports throughout the Rural Amenity Zone, including the Precinct, subject only to compliance with the noise standards).
1002. Turning to the submitter's alternative relief, and considering first the position in the Precinct, Mr Tapper's advice was that even a 150 metre separation, as sought in the Aircraft Owner and Pilots Association submission, would be too great in practice to permit a new informal airport for fixed wing aircraft to be established in the Precinct given the average one hectare density applying in the sub-zone. Mr Boyd likewise noted that fixed wing aircraft movements were constrained by the ability of aircraft to utilise available runway length. It follows that the practical benefit of any change to Rule 24.4.28 would accordingly be limited to helicopters, which the noise standards recognise as being louder and more intrusive than fixed wing aircraft.
1003. In any event, given the agreement between Mr Van Hout and Dr Chiles that there is insufficient evidence on which to base a reduction in the required separation distance for fixed wing aircraft, we do not consider that we have a sound basis to recommend amendment to the standard, as it applies to fixed wing aircraft, either in the Precinct, or in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone.
1004. Turning to the provision made for helicopters, we are concerned that a proliferation of helicopters taking off and landing from different sites within the Precinct would not maintain or enhance amenity values in terms of Objective 24.2.2, particularly given the practical enforcement issues that Mr Barr drew to our attention.
1005. Even in the relatively less densely developed balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, while we accept Dr Chiles' evidence that a 500 metre separation for helicopter landing sites is conservative, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is clear that the degree of conservatism is less than the modelling relied on by Mr Van Hout and Mr Boyd, because of the use of average noise values in the modelling.
1006. In addition, while Dr Chiles accepted that a lesser separation might be able to be arrived at if additional controls around the type of helicopter and flight paths were included (as well as

maximum flight movements per day), his evidence was that the drafting of such additional controls required “*further consideration*”⁵⁵².

Mr Van Hout identified the AS350 and AS355 models as being the subject of previous noise modelling, but we had insufficient evidence to assess the costs and benefits of nominating those models to the exclusion of any others.

1007. Even more problematically, we had no suggestions as to how a generic standard governing flight paths might be framed so as to ensure an acceptable outcome. Ms Edgley considered that a rule seeking to control flight paths would be “*complex*” and having the potential to lead both to inefficiencies and loss of confidence in the administration of the rule.
1008. We consider her view to be something of an understatement. Mr Boyd produced a copy of a recent resource consent decision⁵⁵³ approving an informal airport for helicopters in the Wakatipu Basin that contains a condition mapping the required helicopter flight path into and out of the “airport”. That is possible in the context of a resource consent application, because the decision-maker can address a specific fact situation. We have difficulty envisioning how a generic plan standard could be framed to reach the same outcome.
1009. We do not know if the aeronautical standards sought to be included in the standard by Dalefield Trustees Ltd would adequately address the issue. We had no evidence on which to base a view either as to their content or efficacy in this regard. More generally, aeronautical requirements will of course apply irrespective of what is in the District Plan. We also have to take account of the limitations on the Council’s powers in relation to control of aircraft in flight⁵⁵⁴. For these reasons, we do not recommend the additional standard suggested by Dalefield Trustees Ltd.
1010. Nor do we consider that limiting the rule(s) to apply to recreational and private use (i.e. excluding commercial use), as suggested by Mr Boyd, to be a solution to the concerns we have about the relief the Aircraft Owner and Pilots Association sought. While Mr Boyd advised that other unnamed districts had made such a distinction in their district plans, we agree with Ms Edgley’s concern that such a distinction would not be justified on the basis of effects, and would be difficult for the Council to monitor.
1011. Accordingly, we agree with Ms Edgley’s opinion⁵⁵⁵ that it is more efficient and effective to have a conservative separation distance in order that the other relevant issues, including but not limited to flight paths might be addressed on a site-specific basis.
1012. We have considered Mr Boyd’s argument based on the section 32 analysis. We consider he overstates the extent to which reduction in regulation was supported as the most effective and efficient outcome. The primary area where the section 32 analysis concluded efficiency gains were both possible and desirable was where informal airports are located on land administered by the Department of Conservation and/or reserve land and are therefore the subject of controls under other legislation. That situation largely does not arise in the areas the subject of PDP Chapter 24.

⁵⁵² Evidence of Dr S Chiles at 4.5 and 4.6’

⁵⁵³ Decision of Commissioners on application by T Roberts (RM180396 dated 30 November 2018

⁵⁵⁴ See section 9(5) of the Act

⁵⁵⁵ Evidence of C Edgley at 5.8

1013. We should note though that we consider there might have been a case to amend the activity status and/or non-compliance status to restricted discretionary, but Mr Tapper was not equipped to provide us with the analysis that would have supported such a change in terms of section 32 and Mr Boyd did not address it in his submissions. We therefore had no basis to take that possibility further.
1014. Accordingly, we recommend that save for renumbering it 24.4.27, notified Rule 24.4.28 be retained unamended. We will return to the standards applying to informal airports, but suffice it to say for the moment that we do not recommend the amendments to those standards sought by Dalefield Trustees Limited or the Aircraft Owner and Pilots Association.
1015. Notified Rule 24.4.29 provided as a restricted discretionary activity:
- “Clearance works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation that is of a height greater than 4 metres.”*
1016. This rule was the subject of an extensive range of submissions that opposed and sought its deletion for a range of reasons. The submissions are discussed at some length in section 17 of Mr Barr’s Section 42A Report. We rely on that description of the submissions. Mr Barr addressed the submission of Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁵⁵⁶ that sought expansion of the rule to indigenous vegetation separately.
1017. Consideration of those submissions needs to bear in mind our recommendation that Policy 24.2.5.6 be amended to acknowledge the risk of spread of wilding species, but otherwise continue to seek retention of vegetation contributing to landscape character and visual amenity values⁵⁵⁷.
1018. The same reasons that prompted us to recommend retention of that policy support retention of the accompanying rule to provide some general protection for exotic vegetation that is more than 4 metres in height.
1019. Addressing the key points in submissions, Morven Ferry et al argued that the rule is ultra vires section 76 of the Act. That is clearly not correct. As Mr Barr noted, section 76 relates to trees in urban environments⁵⁵⁸. Counsel for a number of the Morven Ferry et al parties, Ms Hill, suggested to us that this was a ‘technical’ issue and argued, somewhat faintly it must be said, that we might have regard to Parliamentary intention. Discussing it with her, however, she accepted that it was probably Parliament’s intention to draw the distinction evident in section 76 between urban and non-urban environments.
1020. We agree also with Mr Barr’s reasoning for recommending rejection of suggested amendments to the rule. As he observed, the submission of Boxer Hills Trust⁵⁵⁹ that sought

⁵⁵⁶ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

⁵⁵⁷ See section 3.10 above

⁵⁵⁸ More specifically, to any urban environment allotment, which is defined in s76(4C) of the Act to be an allotment that, among other things, is no greater than 4000m² and is connected to reticulated water supply and wastewater services

⁵⁵⁹ Submission 2386: Supported by FS2769

vegetation clearance issues be considered as part of a collateral development application would invite clearance in advance of any application being made.

1021. Mr Tony Milne, giving landscape evidence for D Hamilton and L Hayden⁵⁶⁰ suggested the restriction on vegetation clearance might be limited to the 75 metre road setback. As he acknowledged, there is no qualifying vegetation within that setback on the Hamilton/Hayden property. Although Mr Milne recorded that his view was based on a wider assessment, when we asked him about it, he said it was prompted by the importance of the Hunter Road corridor (that the Hamilton/Hayden property has frontage to). Ms Gilbert did not support the suggested limitation. Her view⁵⁶¹ was that the value of exotic vegetation extends beyond road frontages generally, and Hunter Road in particular. We agree with Ms Gilbert's assessment that such vegetation makes a significant contribution to visual amenity values of the Basin generally, particularly when viewed from prominent elevated outlooks. We do not recommend the limitations Mr Milne suggested.
1022. Submissions such as those of Dalefield Trustee Limited⁵⁶² that sought that the rule be triggered for vegetation greater than 6 metres in height were not supported by evidence. As Mr Barr noted, Ms Gilbert supported a 4 metre test.
1023. Dalefield Trustee also suggested specific exclusion for identified pest species. The approach taken in Policy 24.2.5.6 is to recognise that wilding species exist in a spectrum and that some species are more of problem than others. This suggests the need to consider applications on their merits at the time. While an application is still required, with the accompanying costs, Chapter 24 provides that such applications are non- notified and thus the cost and delay will be minimised.
1024. Mr Barr recommended against expansion of the rule to indigenous vegetation. We agree that this is already (and better) addressed through Chapter 33.
1025. In summary, we recommend that Rule 24.4.29 be renumbered 24.4.28, but otherwise retained as notified. Because clearance of vegetation does not fall neatly into the division of the balance of Table 24.2 into residential and non-residential activities, we recommend insertion of a heading before this rule:

"Clearance of exotic vegetation".

3.16 Part 24.5 – Table 24.3 - Standards

1026. Mr Barr's recommended revision of Part 24.5 commenced with four new standards that are consequential additions resulting from the amendments he recommended to the rules in Table 24.1. The first two recommended standards related to residential density both in the Precinct and in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, and are consequential on his recommended deletion of notified rule 24.3.4 (accepting inter alia the Dennison/Grant submission in that regard) and his recommendation that greater provision be made for residential development within building platforms. The density provisions are closely related to those contained in Chapter 27, applying in the case of subdivision. Given that the focus of

⁵⁶⁰ Submission 2422

⁵⁶¹ B Gilbert, Rebuttal Evidence at 3.9-3.12

⁵⁶² Submission 2097: Supported by FS2746

submissions was principally on the standards governing subdivision, we will discuss those issues in the latter context. Suffice it to say that we largely agree with Mr Barr's recommendations that:

- a. In the Precinct for sites up to 1 hectare in the Precinct, the standard should be one residential unit per site;
- b. For sites at the Precinct greater than 1 hectare, residential activity should not exceed an average of one residential unit per hectare;
- c. For sites in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, the specified density should be one residential unit per 80 hectares.

1027. We do not consider it is necessary to specify a minimum site area in the Precinct as Mr Barr recommended. Given our recommended Rule 24.4.6 is limited to existing sites, minimum site areas in future will in practice be determined in the subdivision process.

1028. However, these standards need to be formulated in a context where the Rural Amenity Zone has within it sites with a wide variety of areas. We do not believe it is either reasonable or efficient that construction of a single residential unit on such sites should slide to non-complying status, particularly in legacy areas formerly zoned Rural Residential. While we have not accepted submissions and evidence that suggested such sites should have a guaranteed ability to be developed for residential purposes (unless a building platform has already been registered on the relevant computer freehold register), small sites have a limited range of activities for which they are suited. We therefore recommend a discrete standard (of one residential unity per site) for sites whose titles were issued before the date of decisions on the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2).

1029. We also consider that the density standards might be expressed more clearly with a little redrafting and reconfiguration of Mr Barr's suggested rules. In particular the situation of split sites, partly zoned Precinct and partly zoned Rural Amenity needs to be addressed with some care given the revised definition discussed in section 4.2 below.

1030. In summary, we recommend residential density standards numbered 24.5.1 be inserted in Table 24.3 worded:

"24.5.1.1 For sites with a net site area of 1 hectare or less and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per site.

24.5.1.2. For sites with a net site area greater than 1 hectare and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, no more than one residential unit per hectare on average of the net site area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.

24.5.1.3 Where Rule 24.5.1.1 or Rule 24.5.1.2 applies, all residential units (including residential flats) must be located within the area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct

24.5.1.4 Any site in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone located wholly outside the Precinct in respect of which the Computer Freehold Register for the site was issued before [insert date of plan decisions] and with an area less than 80 hectares, a maximum of one residential unit per site.

24.5.1.5 For that part of all other sites in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone wholly located outside of the Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per 80 hectares net site area.

1031. We agree that non-compliance status should be non-complying, as recommended by Mr Barr. The recommended standards mark a significant shift from the position of one residential unit per site, as notified. As the Dennison/Grant submission identified, the effect of Rule 24.3.4 was to make more than one residential unit per site non-complying. A non-complying non-compliance status effectively retains the status quo position. Given the enlarged scope for development the deletion of Rule 24.3.4 provides, we consider non-compliance with the density standards should require an exceptional case before consent is granted.
1032. Mr Barr recommended a performance standard for alterations to buildings not within a building platform, consequent on his recommendation that a new rule be inserted providing for alteration of lawfully established buildings where there is not an approved building platform on the site. Mr Barr recommended that the relevant standard be a 30% increase in any ten year period. The 30% increase is drawn from standards applying in the Decisions Version of the Rural Zone⁵⁶³.
1033. We had no basis to disagree. Accordingly, we recommend a new Rule 24.5.2 be inserted providing as a standard:
- “Alterations to buildings for residential activities not located within a building platform must not increase the ground floor area by more than 30% in any ten year period.”*
1034. The recommended non-compliance status is Restricted Discretionary with discretion restricted to:
- “a. Landscape character;
b. Visual amenity;
c. External appearance;
d. Infrastructure.”*
1035. Mr Barr recommended a second standard providing for colours and materials of all buildings, including alterations consequent on provision for buildings located within building platforms in his recommended rules. The same logic still applies notwithstanding the amendments we have recommended to the rules. Mr Barr’s suggested wording was drawn from Rules in Chapter 21. We note that Mr Chris Ferguson supported that formulation subject to an amendment that Mr Barr adopted in his reply evidence. The suggested standard is also similar to one proposed by Morven Ferry et al.
1036. We discussed with Mr Barr whether there might be room to improve the drafting and in his reply evidence⁵⁶⁴ he responded that the potential changes we discussed with him were in his view marginal and so he preferred to pursue consistency with Rule 21.7.2 (Stage 1 Rural Zone).

⁵⁶³ Refer Rule 21.7.2.3

⁵⁶⁴ At 12.12

1037. We take his point, but the approach in the rural zones suggests a need for a further slight formatting change.

1038. Accordingly, we recommend a new Rule 24.5.3 worded:

“Building Material and Colours

Any building and its alteration, including shipping containers that remain on site for more than six months, are subject to the following:

All exterior surfaces must be coloured in the range of browns, greens or greys including;*

24.5.3.1 Pre-painted steel and all roofs must have a light reflectance value not greater than 20%; and

*24.5.3.2 All other exterior surface** finishes, except for schist, must have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30%.*

** Excludes soffits, windows and skylights (but not glass balustrades).*

*** Includes cladding and built landscaping that cannot be measured by way of light reflectance value but is deemed by the Council to be suitably recessive and have the same effect as achieving a light reflectance value of 30%.”*

1039. We recommend the non-compliance status for this rule is again Restricted Discretionary with discretion on this occasion restricted to:

- a. Landscape Character;*
- b. Visual Amenity;*
- c. External appearance;*
- d. Visual prominence from both public places and private locations.”*

1040. Notified Rule 24.5.1 contained a building coverage standard which limited the maximum coverage of all buildings to 15% of lot area or 500m² gross floor area, whichever is the lesser.

1041. Mr Barr noted the following submissions on this rule:

- a. Fire and Emergency New Zealand⁵⁶⁵ sought that this and the following three standards be amended so that emergency service facilities are exempt from the rule;
- b. Donaldson et al sought that the rule provide separate coverage limits for different size lots; for lots greater than 4000m² 15% of lot area or 1000m² whichever is the lesser, and for lots less than 4000m² 25% of lot area;
- c. Crown Investments et al sought that the rule apply to any individual buildings (rather than all buildings) and that the word “gross” be amended to “ground”;
- d. Morven Ferry et al sought an increase of the numerical limit to 1000m² and utilisation of the definition of “building coverage”;
- e. Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant⁵⁶⁶ sought that the 15% limit only apply in the Precinct and that the building size limitation be 1000m², applying in all parts of the Rural Amenity Zone.

⁵⁶⁵ Submission 2660

⁵⁶⁶ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

1042. Mr Barr did not recommend acceptance of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand submission. He observed that there do not appear to be any clear resource management reasons justifying the requested exemptions and that, if there were reasons, that could suggest that fire stations might not be an appropriate activity within the zone.
1043. He likewise recommended rejection of proposed increases in the area above 500m², noting that that figure had been supported by Ms Gilbert.
1044. Mr Barr agreed that the ground floor area was the appropriate focus because that was what the rule was seeking to manage in order to achieve the objectives of Chapter 24. He also recommended that the rule refer to “any” rather than “all” buildings although he did not explain his reasoning in this regard.
1045. Mr Ferguson addressed this issue in his evidence. He supported Mr Barr’s recommendations on the basis that the characteristics of the Precinct, as an area having greater capacity to absorb change, would mitigate the visual impact of building.
1046. We did not note any evidence supporting provision for buildings greater than 500m².
1047. We largely accept Mr Barr’s reasoning on these points. We did, however, seek comment from Mr Barr regarding his proposed shift of the rule from being a cumulative limit (on all buildings) to one which limited each building. He explained that the rationale for this outcome was to align with the provisions applying in the Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones. However, with the benefit of hindsight, he agreed that it was inappropriate to allow permitted site coverage allowances to be accumulated building by building, and that would contradict the intent of the rule.
1048. Mr Barr returned to the point in his reply evidence, suggesting further amendments to focus the rule on the size of buildings rather than site coverage. Contrary to the indication of his views as above, Mr Barr did not recommend returning the rule to focus on cumulative building sizes and did not explain his position in that regard.
1049. We record that with this rule having a restricted discretionary non-compliance status, its practical importance is limited to residential buildings. All other buildings are either the subject of their own maximum size standards or are restricted discretionary (or greater) already.
1050. We are concerned that an approach to residential buildings coverage/maximum building size that does not apply a cumulative limit has the potential to produce unsatisfactory outcomes. We note that Ms Gilbert was clearly considering building coverage standards on a cumulative basis when she expressed the conclusion that a 500m² limit was appropriate⁵⁶⁷ and we consider Mr Barr’s initial reaction when we asked him about it (that focussing on individual buildings was inappropriate) is correct.

⁵⁶⁷ Refer B Gilbert, Evidence in Chief at paragraph 67

1051. There is another aspect of this rule that we consider requires some attention. We have recommended that residential buildings within existing building platforms be controlled activities (Rule 24.4.6), among other reasons, because we can have reasonable confidence that the effect of buildings will have been addressed at least in part. It follows in our view that if an existing site is relatively small (less than 3300m²) it should not be subject to an additional building coverage standard, constraining building sizes. To that extent, we recommend accepting the submission of Rene Kampman⁵⁶⁸ in part.

1052. We therefore recommend a new Rule 24.5.4 worded as follows:

“Building Size

Where residential buildings are constructed within a building platform under Rule 24.4.6, the ground floor area of all buildings must not exceed 500m².”

1053. Consistent with the existing building coverage standard, we recommend that the non-compliance standard be restricted discretionary and the matters of discretion be framed as follows:

“Direction is restricted to:

- a. Landscape character;*
- b. Visual amenity.”*

1054. What was notified Rule 24.5.1 needs to cover the balance of buildings.

1055. Accordingly, we recommend that notified Rule 24.5.1 be renumbered 24.5.5 and reworded:

“The ground floor area of all buildings not subject to Rule 24.5.4 must not exceed 15% of net site area, or 500m² ground floor area, whichever is the lesser.”

1056. As previously noted, non-compliance status is restricted discretionary. The matters of discretion notified related to building location, character, scale, form and external appearance, together with landform modification and planting. Mr Barr recommended simplification and rationalisation of these matters of discretion in line with his recommendations on the restricted discretionary rules in Table 24.1. We agree with that suggestion, and with his recommendation that the matters of discretion need not be expanded to include the benefits of the proposal and location or other practical constraints as sought by Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁶⁹. Accordingly, we recommend that the matters of discretion be amended to read:

- “a. Landscape character;*
- b. Visual Amenity.”*

1057. Notified Rule 24.5.2 fixed a minimum setback of any building from internal boundaries as ten metres, with non-compliance being restricted discretionary.

⁵⁶⁸ Submission 2433, who sought linkage with resource consents and/or approved building platforms

⁵⁶⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

1058. Morven Ferry et al suggested that ten metres should be the minimum setback in the Precinct, but elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone, the minimum setback should be 15 metres. This was said to reflect “*ODP rights and established development.*” Mr Barr also noted the submissions of Hunter Leece and Anne Kobienia⁵⁷⁰ who sought that the internal setback be the same as that from roads. That would mean a setback of 75 metres in the Precinct and 20 metres elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.
1059. Debbie MacColl⁵⁷¹, Phillip Bunn⁵⁷² and Steven Bunn⁵⁷³ all sought that the minimum setback be reduced to 6 metres.
1060. Mr Barr expressed the view in his Section 42A Report⁵⁷⁴ that the standard was appropriate as notified. He observed that a 75 metre setback from all boundaries could render a development unlikely to comply with the setback rules.
1061. Given the prescribed average of one hectare in the Precinct, we think that Mr Barr’s comment is something of an understatement. While we agree that private amenity values are relevant, we also consider that the visual amenity enjoyed by the public from roads is of greater significance, particularly in a district that relies so much on its visitor population.
1062. We have discussed the extent to which a former District Plan confers rights already. Suffice to say, we do not recommend acceptance of Morven Ferry et al’s submissions in that regard.
1063. Nor did we have evidence supporting the submitters’ various positions, and accordingly, we accept Mr Barr’s recommendation.
1064. It follows that we recommend notified Rule 24.5.2 be renumbered 24.5.6, but otherwise be retained unamended.
1065. Notified Rule 24.5.3 relates to building height. It specifies a maximum height of 6 metres, with non-compliance being considered as a restricted discretionary activity.
1066. Mr Barr noted a number of submissions seeking that the maximum height be eight metres.
1067. Morven Ferry et al pointed in their submissions to the Operative District Plan limits (again described as “*rights*”).
1068. Mr Barr noted also submissions suggesting that an increased height limit might be accompanied by a more restrictive non-compliance status. Thus, for instance, BSTGT Limited⁵⁷⁵, Donaldson et al, Debbie MacColl⁵⁷⁶, Phillip Bunn⁵⁷⁷, Steven Bunn⁵⁷⁸ and Peter

⁵⁷⁰ Submission 2122

⁵⁷¹ Submission 2350: Supported by FS2734 and FS2749

⁵⁷² Submission 2355

⁵⁷³ Submission 2356

⁵⁷⁴ At 29.14-29.15

⁵⁷⁵ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

⁵⁷⁶ Submission 2350: Supported by FS2734 and FS2749

⁵⁷⁷ Submission 2355

⁵⁷⁸ Submission 2356

Dennison/Stephen Grant⁵⁷⁹ all sought that an increase limit be accompanied by non-complying status for exceedances. Dalefield Trustee Limited⁵⁸⁰ suggested that a 6 metre standard apply to structures with a roof pitch greater than 15 degrees to avoid large flat-roofed structures for which a 6 metre maximum height should apply.

1069. Williamson et al suggested retention of a 6 metre height limit, but with a discretionary non-compliance status.
1070. Rene Kampman⁵⁸¹ sought building heights permitted with respect to approved building platforms prevail.
1071. Mr Barr addressed these submissions at paragraphs 29.20 -29.27 of his Section 42A Report. While he agreed that the Operative District Plan has a height limit of 8 metres for residential buildings, he noted that his experience was that many building platforms have a 6 metre height limit and that it was relatively common for height conditions to be volunteered by applicants for heights ranging between 4.5 metres to 6 metres. He also noted that the non-compliance status in the Operative District Plan is non-complying.
1072. He was of the view that an 8 metre height limit was not justified, at least in the areas of the Rural Amenity Zone and Precinct currently zoned Rural.
1073. Mr Barr also expressed concern that an 8 metre height limit (if accompanied by restricted discretionary non-compliance status) might be treated as the permitted benchmark.
1074. Mr Barr considered that the rule might provide more flexibility if it were amended to provide two height limits, one at 6 metres with non-compliance restricted discretionary, and the other at 8 metres, with non-compliance being non-complying, as per the Operative District Plan.
1075. This issue was the subject of evidence by Mr Ferguson for Crown Investments et al. Mr Ferguson supported an increase in the height limit to 8 metres. He expressed the view that a 6 metre height limit is overly restrictive considering the character of the existing environment. He also noted that an 8 metre height limit is consistent with the Chapter 22 Rules.
1076. Mr Ferguson referred us to expert landscape evidence of Ms Yvonne Pflüger pre-circulated in the Stream 2 hearing process, expressing the view that it was unlikely that than 8 metre box style building would be implemented to take up the maximum size and height, and that variations in building facades and modules of buildings are used with varied roof lines incorporating gables and dormers as the preferred architectural style.
1077. Ms Pflüger's evidence, as above, was never heard by the Stream 2 Hearing Panel (as a consequence of deferral of Stage 1 submissions on the Wakatipu Basin to this hearing) and she was not available for us to discuss the point with her. Accordingly, while we do not discard her evidence entirely, we must necessarily give it less weight than the evidence we heard from Ms Gilbert supporting a 6 metre height limit. Ms Gilbert told us that visibility of buildings is a

⁵⁷⁹ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745; FS2795 and FS2796

⁵⁸⁰ Submission 2097

⁵⁸¹ Submission 2433

key issue in the management of cumulative adverse effects, maintenance of visual amenity values, managing effects on neighbouring ONLs and ONFs and maintaining landscape character values associated with the Basin.

1078. She confirmed Mr Barr's evidence that development to date has in practice been limited to 6 metres in the majority of cases. She also noted that a 6 metre building height would allow a generous stud, potentially incorporating a mezzanine, with a 35 degree roof pitch, or a two storey dwelling using a mono pitched type structure. By contrast, Ms Gilbert saw an 8 metre height limit as signalling two storey dwellings are appropriate throughout the Basin, which in her view, would be at odds with the character of successfully integrated built development which had occurred to date (which is characterised by predominantly single storey buildings). Ms Gilbert acknowledged though that there are likely to be circumstances where buildings that are taller than 6 metres high can be successfully integrated into the landscape.
1079. It seems to us that Ms Gilbert's reasoning provides firm support for the two-step height limit that Mr Barr recommends. While Ms Pflüger might well be correct and developers would not generally be minded to build 8 metre high boxes, an initial height limit with restricted discretionary status for non-compliance is an appropriate control against that possibility.
1080. The importance of building height, as emphasised by Ms Gilbert, also indicates to us that the standard should not be automatically subject to any alternative limits on an unconstructed building platform, as sought by Mr Kampman. Height needs to be considered in the context of building design and its overall appearance.
1081. Accordingly, we recommend that notified Rule 24.5.3 be renumbered 24.5.7 and divided into two rules worded as follows:
- "24.5.7.1 The maximum height of buildings shall be 6 metres.
24.5.7.2 The maximum height of buildings shall be 8 metres."*
1082. We recommend that Rule 24.5.7.1 have a non-compliance status of Restricted Discretionary (as at present) and that non-compliance with Rule 24.5.7.2 would result in the status defaulting to non-complying.
1083. As regards the matters of discretion for Rule 24.5.7.1, Mr Barr recommended that the notified matters of discretion be rationalised to refer to landscape character and visual amenity.
1084. We consider that in this context the more specific and targeted matters of discretion specified in the notified rule are more appropriate. We do recommend, however, that additional text be inserted to make the inter-relationship between rules 24.5.7.1 and 25.5.7.2 clear.
1085. Accordingly, we recommend that in the non-compliance status column related to 24.5.7.1 the text should read:
- "For buildings with a height greater than 6m and not greater than 8m, discretion is restricted to:*
- a. Building location, character, scale and form including the pitch of roofs;*
 - b. External appearance including materials and colours;*
 - c. Landscape modification/planting (existing and proposed).*

Note: Rule 24.5.7.2 applies to buildings with a height greater than 8m.”

1086. Notified Rule 24.5.4 prescribed a minimum setback of any building from road boundaries of 75 metres in the Precinct and 20 metres in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone.
1087. Mr Barr reported a substantial level of opposition to this Rule with a variety of suggested alternatives.
1088. Mr Barr noted, the following submissions:
- a. Crown Investments et al, Debbie MacColl⁵⁸², Phillip Bunn⁵⁸³ and Steven Bunn⁵⁸⁴ also sought a 10 metre setback in all locations. The MacColl and Bunn submissions were based on the operative Rural Residential Zone provisions;
 - b. Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁸⁵ sought a 20 metre setback throughout. Mike and Gemma Smith⁵⁸⁶ also sought that the setback be 20 metres within the Lake Hayes Terrace LCU Precinct area;
 - c. Morcom et al, who sought a 20 metre setback within the Precinct, arguing that the existing rule is too onerous given a 6000m² minimum lot size;
 - d. Dalefield Trustee Limited⁵⁸⁷, who sought a 30 metre setback in the Precinct because of the established pattern of built form along Mountainview Road. Like Morcom et al, this submitter pointed to the limitation on development of properties given the combination of the setback and a 6000m² minimum lot limit.
 - e. Morven Ferry et al, who sought a 10 metre setback in the Precinct and a 20 metre setback in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone;
 - f. Bagrie et al, who sought a 20 metre setback in both zones.
1089. As against those submitters who sought a reduced standard, Erik Moen⁵⁸⁸ sought a 100-200 metre setback in the Precinct.
1090. Mr Barr relied on Ms Gilbert’s analysis on this issue. He supported the concept of an increased setback from road boundaries. He was also of the view that the combination of minimum lot size and minimum average in the Precinct provided sufficient flexibility to achieve compliance with the rule.
1091. Ms Gilbert’s evidence has a detailed discussion on the basis for this standard. She advised that the application of a 75 metre road setback drew from her own field surveys, discussions with the Council’s consent planners and landscape experts assisting on consent processing, and her review of resource consents. She drew our attention to a growing concern regarding mitigation planting on road verges closing out views of the surrounding ONLs and ONFs and reducing the spaciousness and openness within the Basin, leading in turn to a trend in more recent subdivisions for the buildings to be set back approximately 75 metres from the road.

⁵⁸² Submission 2530: Supported by FS2734 and FS2749

⁵⁸³ Submission 2355

⁵⁸⁴ Submission 2356

⁵⁸⁵ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

⁵⁸⁶ Submission 2263

⁵⁸⁷ Submission 2097

⁵⁸⁸ Submission 2054

1092. Ms Gilbert provided us with photographic examples of both approaches to illustrate the point she was making.
1093. Ms Gilbert's evidence canvassed the option of having different provisions governing existing Rural Residential development areas where the development has been set behind dense planting (such as at Dalefield). She foresaw administrative difficulties in implementing such an approach but more importantly, she considered that it might encourage dense road frontage plantings to enable a higher subdivision yield, contrary to relevant Chapter 6 policies.
1094. She compared the Rural Amenity Zone as warranting a more relaxed approach because of the very limited level of development anticipated in that zone.
1095. We discussed with Ms Gilbert whether some roads were more important than others in terms of preservation of views. She did not agree, responding that while some roads are used more frequently than others, it is an amenity landscape. In her view, people choose to live within it because of the amenity values. She also pointed out to us the prevalence of short term rental options within the Basin (AirBnB) together with artist studios and the like.
1096. The position advanced on behalf of the Council was the subject of evidence for submitters. Mr Vivian, for instance, giving evidence for the Williamson et al group, recommended an exemption for development within an approved building platform.
1097. Mr Brown suggested that the setback requirement should only apply to formed legal roads (and not to unformed paper roads) and should be reduced to 20 metres where the Precinct is replacing formerly Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle Zone land where in his view, there was an expectation of being able to build closer to the road.
1098. Mr Ferguson considered that as assessment of any new building platform requires a consideration of the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements, he considered a 75 metre building setback unnecessary, ineffective and inefficient. He supported a universal setback of 20 metres.
1099. Referring to a point made in the submissions, he gave evidence that a setback significantly greater than the existing planning regime would establish a meaningless standard that would not be able to be defended against the established environment in many instances.
1100. Many of these planning considerations were answered by Ms Gilbert. We note and agree with the following statement taken from Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief:
- "I also do not accept that the patterning of existing Rural Residential development at a distance closer than 75m to the road within a discrete area should necessarily provide a cue for the appropriate setback for future development. The Amenity Landscape context together with the high risk of cumulative adverse effects points to a cautious approach in this regard, with careful site-by-site consideration of any relaxation of the standard as allowed for the by the restricted discretionary activity status regime."*
1101. We agree also with Ms Gilbert's evidence indicating the need to signal the desired direction of future development in this regard. In cases where the location of existing building platforms makes achievement of the prescribed setback impractical, landowners will have a case for

waiver of the standard that will be considered on a non-notified basis in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

1102. We also do not agree with Mr Brown’s suggestion that a distinction should be drawn between formed and unformed roads. Unformed paper roads can be formed at any point in the future and it is important, in our view, that development takes proper account of their location.
1103. For future building platforms, this standard will be an element in determining where such platforms should be located.
1104. We likewise agree with Mr Barr’s reasoning for a lesser standard in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, reflecting the very much lower scale of development signalled in the zone rules.
1105. In summary, we recommend retention of Rule 24.5.4 as notified, save only to renumber it 24.5.8 and to make minor wording and formatting changes as shown in the attached revised version of Chapter 24.
1106. Mr Barr recommended a new rule to follow Notified Rule 24.5.4 relating to a setback from the Queenstown Trail. The rationale for the suggested rule is set out at paragraphs 15.5. and 15.6 of Mr Barr’s rebuttal evidence and relates to the desire to constrain development adjacent to the Queenstown Trail on the Waterfall Park Development property.
1107. For reasons set out in our Report 18.5 the suggested rule is not required for that purpose, but it is required consequent on our recommendations in Report 18.8 related to the property of Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, DE and ME Bunn and LA Green. We therefore adopt Mr Barr’s recommendation for that purpose. Accordingly, we recommend a new restricted discretionary Rule numbered 24.5.9, worded as follows:
- “Setback from the Queenstown Trail
Any building should be located a minimum of 75m from the boundary of any identified Queenstown Trail setback as shown on the planning maps.”*
1108. We further accept Mr Barr’s recommendation regarding the matters of discretion. They should accordingly be read:
- “Discretion is limited to:*
- a. Building location, character, scale and form;*
 - b. External appearance including materials and colours;*
 - c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).”*
1109. Notified Rule 24.5.5. is related to setbacks of buildings and accessways from identified landscape features. A 50 metre setback is proposed.
1110. This rule was the subject of a number of submissions. Mr Barr noted:
- a. Queenstown Trails Trust⁵⁸⁹, who sought an exemption from the rule for public trails;

⁵⁸⁹ Submission 2575

- b. X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust⁵⁹⁰ sought that the rule be deleted on the basis that an amenity landscape is thereby given greater protection than ONLs or ONFs;
 - c. Morven Ferry et al also sought that the rule be deleted on the basis that Chapter 6 provides protection for ONLs and ONFs;
 - d. Donaldson et al sought controlled activity status.
1111. We have noted a number of other submissions seeking that the rule be deleted. As against that, Department of Conservation⁵⁹¹ sought that it be retained.
1112. Mr Vivian gave evidence supporting an exclusion for buildings constructed within an approved building platform.
1113. Many of the submissions on this rule reinforce a point we made in section 3.2 above regarding the need for greater clarity as to what is being referred to as “*landscape features*”. Morven Ferry et al appear to have interpreted these as relating to ONLs and ONFs.
1114. We have already addressed the desirability from a policy point of view in recognising the need for setbacks from identified Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features in the context of Policy 24.2.1.4, and it follows that we recommend rejection of those submissions seeking deletion of the proposed rule.
1115. Mr Barr recommended rejection also of a specific exemption for trails and Queenstown Trails Trust did not appear to provide any evidence to the contrary. We therefore accept Mr Barr’s reasoning⁵⁹².
1116. Mr Vivian did not provide an example of a situation where an existing building platform has been located within 50 metres of any of the identified features. If this were the case, and building within the proposed setback apparently countenanced by the terms of the building platform, then we would regard that as a failure in the operation of previous provisions rather than a good reason to alter the rule, given the evidence we heard from Ms Gilbert. In the absence of such evidence, we are not in a position to weigh the costs of the rule not providing such an exemption in the balance required by section 32.
1117. Mr Barr also recommended⁵⁹³ rejection of the submission seeking controlled activity status. As Mr Barr observed, the underlying premise of those submissions (that the purpose of the Precinct is rural residential development) does not fairly capture the extent to which the Precinct is designed to be very responsive to the landscape, with the ability to decline poorly located, designed or mitigated proposals.
1118. In summary, we recommend the terminology and formatting changes suggested by Mr Barr but otherwise recommend that the rule (renumbered 24.5.10) be retained.
1119. The end result is therefore that the text of the rule and non-compliance status would read:

⁵⁹⁰ Submission 2619: Opposed by FS2710

⁵⁹¹ Submission 2242

⁵⁹² Refer Section 42A Report at 11.7-11.11

⁵⁹³ Ibid at 29.43

“Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features

Any building or accessway shall be located a minimum of 50m from the boundary of any Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Feature shown on the planning maps.

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Building location, character, scale and form;*
- b. External appearance including material and colours;*
- c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).”*

1120. Notified Rule 24.5.6 is related to setbacks from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals. A 30 metre setback is proposed.
1121. Federated Farmers⁵⁹⁴ supported this rule. Bruce McLeod⁵⁹⁵ queried whether the restriction contained in this rule applied to hen houses or guinea pig huts. Mr McLeod observed that it seemed rather restrictive.
1122. We put that same point to Mr Barr and he advised that the origins of the rule lay in purpose built buildings in productive rural areas. He accepted that there were issues with its breadth in the context of the Wakatipu Basin and said that he needed to consider possible rewording.
1123. In his reply evidence, Mr Barr recommended amendments to the matters of discretion in this rule (to delete superfluous text). While we agree with the minor non-substantive changes Mr Barr suggested, he did not revert to the scope of the rule, which we consider to be overly restrictive. Although Mr McLeod has a point with the examples he provided in his submission, we can see that there would be difficulties identifying animals whose location near boundaries is not a potential issue and distinguishing them from other animals that would be an issue. The sites in both the Precinct and the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone are large enough that hen houses, dog kennels and the like can readily be located more than 30 metres from any boundary with, we consider, minimal cost. The real problem we foresee is that this particular rule could require a dwelling house to be set back 30 metres from the boundary merely because domestic animals like cats, dogs, or even a budgie) are housed within the dwelling. While we suspect that the rule would be simply ignored in such situations, we think it is preferable that it be revised to avoid the Plan being the subject of ridicule, should the issue ever be raised. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.5.6 be renumbered 24.5.11 and amended to read:

“Setback from Boundaries of Non-residential Buildings Housing Animals

The minimum setback from boundaries for any building whose primary purpose is to house animals shall be 30m.”

1124. The text in the non-compliance column related to this rule suggested by Mr Barr, was:

“RD

Discretion is restricted to the following:

⁵⁹⁴ Submission 2540

⁵⁹⁵ Submission 2231: Supported by FS2734, FS2741, FS2743, FS2744, FS2745, FS2748, FS2749, FS2750, FS2770, FS2783 and FS2784

- a. *Open space, rural living, character and amenity;*
- b. *Privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties and public places;*
- c. *Reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties including odour and noise;*
- d. *Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed)."*

1125. We think there is an issue with (c). The adverse effects on adjacent properties from the odour and noise created by buildings housing animals are not reverse sensitivity effects. As previously noted, reverse sensitivity effects are the effects caused by establishment of a sensitive activity next to an existing activity with existing effects. A building housing animals is not a sensitive activity for this purpose. However, correcting this is arguably a substantive change. Federated Farmers supported the rule as it is. Mr McLeod was seeking that it be made less restrictive rather than more restrictive. Accordingly, if the Council wants to reframe it, we consider it will need to be by way of variation. We recommend the Council consider that option.
1126. In the absence of scope to make any substantive changes, we recommend the non-compliance text be as recommended by Mr Barr.
1127. Notified Rule 24.5.7 relates to setbacks of buildings from waterbodies. It proposes a minimum setback of buildings from the beds of wetlands, rivers or lakes to be 30 metres with non-compliance a restricted discretionary activity. Mr Barr noted the submissions of Paul Dennison and Stephen Grant⁵⁹⁶ and Slopehill Properties Limited⁵⁹⁷ as having sought an exemption for artificial wetlands or watercourses. The Grant/Dennison submissions specifically noted stormwater detention ponds⁵⁹⁸.
1128. Slopehill Properties Limited also sought a reduction in the setback to 10 metres.
1129. By contrast, Otago Fish and Game Council⁵⁹⁹ supported the rule, but sought that it be broadened to ensure focus on all biodiversity values (not just indigenous values) along with residential amenity.
1130. Mr Barr did not recommend an exclusion for artificial waterbodies or a reduction in the setback. His view⁶⁰⁰ was that the extent to which a building within 30 metres of a water body is acceptable could appropriately be addressed through a resource consent process. We agree. While artificial water bodies may be created for a variety of purposes, including treatment and storage of stormwater, that does not mean that they are devoid of biodiversity values or that dwellings should be encouraged within a close proximity of such water bodies without consideration of the issues that are thereby created. For the same reason, in the absence of any evidence supporting a 10 metre setback, we do not recommend a reduction in the setback supported by Mr Barr.
1131. We also agree with Mr Barr's recommendation that the Fish and Game submission be accepted through broadening of the matters of discretion to enable both non-indigenous biodiversity

⁵⁹⁶ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁵⁹⁷ Submission 2581: Supported by FS2719

⁵⁹⁸ See also United States Ranch (#2126: Supported by FS2706, FS2745 and FS2791) to similar effect

⁵⁹⁹ Submission 2455: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by FS2746

⁶⁰⁰ See Section 42A Report at 29.50

values and recreational amenity values to be taken into account, where appropriate. The recognition in section 7 of the habitat of trout and salmon as a matter to which we must give particular regard certainly supports the former, and we have no difficulty concluding that the waterways of the Wakatipu Basin have recreational amenity to a wide range of parties.

1132. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.5.7 be renumbered 24.5.12, but that the only substantive amendments be to amend the specified matters of discretion to read:

“Discretion is restricted to the following:

- a. Biodiversity values;*
- b. Natural hazards;*
- c. Visual and recreational amenity values;*
- d. Landscape and natural character;*
- e. Open space.”*

1133. Notified Rule 24.5.8 relates to farm buildings. Four standards are specified with non-compliance being a restricted discretionary activity. Three of those standards are simplified versions of recommended Rule 24.5.3. The fourth standard is a floor area limit of 50m².

1134. Consideration of this rule occurs against a background where farm buildings meeting the specified standards are permitted under recommended Rule 24.4.9.

1135. Mr Barr noted a number of submissions including those of Morven Ferry et al seeking an increase in the specified size of farm buildings to 150m². He also noted the submission of Rene Kampman as having sought a maximum floor area of 140m² and amendment to the permitted colours to include reference to scoria/barn red.

1136. Federated Farmers⁶⁰¹, sought increases in the permitted light reflectance values by 10% in each case based on concern expressed to it by farmers that achieving lower reflectance values is often difficult. The submission also cited acceptance of a 40% reflectance value in the Southland District Plan.

1137. The submission of C Dagg⁶⁰² was also noted as having sought a 100m² limit on the basis that farm buildings are generally in the order of 80m²-100m².

1138. Mr Barr observed in his Section 42A Report that while the equivalent rule in Chapter 21 provides for farm buildings of up to 150m² in Rural Character Landscape areas, a range of other criteria have to be met, including that the land holding is not less than 100ha in area and the density of buildings combined is not greater than one per 50ha. Mr Barr’s view was that the Rural Zone provisions could not be relied upon as it has a completely different framework that justifies having larger farm buildings.

1139. Mr Barr also drew attention to the fact pressed by many submitters (in support of enhanced provision for rural living) that the Wakatipu Basin does not derive its landscape character from productive farming operations and the latter are not the predominant land use in the Rural

⁶⁰¹ Submission 2540

⁶⁰² Submission 2586

Amenity Zone. He considered that it was a consequence of that that the permitted thresholds for farm buildings needed to be more restrictive than the Rural Zone. Mr Barr provided information suggesting that the costs of compliance are not excessive, contrary to Federated Farmers' submission. He also queried the relevance of the provisions of the Southland District Plan.

1140. Mr Barr also opposed the suggested expansion of permitted colours suggested by Mr Kampman, because barn red has the potential to be visually prominent. In his view, while barn red might be appropriate in particular situations, that needs to be the subject of a case by case analysis in a resource consent setting.
1141. We largely accept Mr Barr's reasoning in this regard. While Chapter 24 seeks to facilitate any farming enterprises that continue to be undertaken in the Wakatipu Basin, the reality is that this is not the predominant land use. There is also a significant risk, given the pressure for land use conversion, that 'farm buildings' of 140-150m² might be constructed with an eye to their conversion to residential use. The witnesses for Millbrook Country Club provided us with an example of just that occurring adjacent to the Millbrook Resort.
1142. We agree with Mr Barr that while barn red might be a classic colour for farm buildings (almost by definition) there is a danger that if located inappropriately, they might have adverse effects.
1143. As regards the Federated Farmers concerns, we note that Mr Cooper did not seek to advance this as an issue in the light of Mr Barr's Section 42A Report. Based on his evidence, we infer that Federated Farmers accepts that analysis. We also observe that both the environment and the environmental values in the Southland District are rather different to the Wakatipu Basin. We would not, ourselves, see the comparison between the two as being particularly persuasive.
1144. In summary, there is only one aspect of this rule that we think requires amendment; this is a clarification of the first standard to make it clear that what is being referred to is the maximum gross floor area "*of any farm building*". At present, the standard could be read as the cumulative total, but given the small specified area, this is not obviously what is intended.
1145. In summary, we recommend that standard (a) be amended to read:
- "The maximum gross floor area of any farm building shall be 50m²."*
1146. In all other respects, save to renumber it 24.5.13 and to reformat the matters of discretion, we recommend that Rule 24.5.8 remain as notified.
1147. Notified Rule 24.5.9 relates to home occupations. The only submission on it Mr Barr noted was that of NZTA⁶⁰³, who supported the rule as notified.
1148. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.5.9 be renumbered 24.5.14 and reformatted consistently with the other rules in Part 24.5, but otherwise retained unamended.

⁶⁰³ Submission 2538

1149. Notified Rules 24.5.10 and 25.5.11 relate to roadside store buildings and other buildings for retail sale of produce and other products produced on site respectively. Mr Barr did not identify any submissions related to these two standards. Mr Barr recommended minor amendments within the scope of clause 16.2 to:
- a. Alter the heading of Rule 24.5.10 to read “*Roadside stalls*”;
 - b. Amend standard (b) in Rule 24.5.10 to refer to “*stalls*” rather than “buildings”;
 - c. Insert a heading “*Retail Sales*” into Rule 24.5.11.
1150. We accept these suggested changes are desirable improvements and recommend that these rules be amended accordingly, renumbered 24.5.15 and 25.5.16 and reformatted consistently with the balance of Part 24.5, but otherwise retained as notified.
1151. Notified Rule 24.5.12 sought to prohibit grazing the animals in or on the margins of water bodies.
1152. Mr Barr noted the submissions of Federated Farmers⁶⁰⁴ and Bagrie et al as having sought deletion of the rule.
1153. He noted also that the same rule was notified in the Rural Zone Chapter 21 and the Hearing Panel for that chapter recommended that it be deleted as it duplicated the functions of the Otago Regional Council. Mr Barr considered that the same logic suggested that this rule also should be deleted. We concur.
1154. We also consider that the rule as currently framed would be difficult to enforce.
1155. Accordingly, notwithstanding the support for this rule in the submissions of Department of Conservation⁶⁰⁵ and Otago Fish and Game Council⁶⁰⁶, we recommend that Rule 24.5.12 be deleted.
1156. Notified Rule 24.5.13 relates to glare. Mr Barr did not identify any submissions specifically opposing or seeking amendment of this rule.
1157. Accordingly, save for renumbering it 24.5.17 and reformatting it consistently with the balance of Part 24.5, we recommend that Rule 24.5.13 be retained unamended.
1158. Notified Rule 24.5.14 relates to informal airports. This rule was supported by D Bromfield and Woodlot Properties Limited⁶⁰⁷.
1159. We have already discussed the submission of Aircraft and Pilot Owners Association New Zealand Inc⁶⁰⁸ and Dalefield Trustee Limited⁶⁰⁹ in the context of notified Rule 24.4.28. As noted in section 3.15 of this report, we do not recommend the substantive amendments those submitters sought to this rule.

⁶⁰⁴ Submission 2540

⁶⁰⁵ Submission 2242

⁶⁰⁶ Submission 2455

⁶⁰⁷ Submission 2276: Opposed by FS2732

⁶⁰⁸ Submission 2663

⁶⁰⁹ Submission 2097

1160. We consider, however, that Rule 24.5.14 requires amendment in two respects. The first relates to the opening words of the rule which states *“informal airports that comply with the following standards shall be permitted activities”*. This is not a standard. It is a description of the activity, and it duplicates recommended Rule 24.4.12. It could also be regarded as inconsistent with recommended Rule 24.4.27 (that applies in the Precinct).
1161. Secondly, Standard (c) reads:
- “Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities.”*
1162. Again, this is not a standard. As we read the intention, it is to carve out the specified activities so that they are not the subject of Standards (a) and (b).
1163. The Decisions Version of Rule 21.10.1 and 21.10.2 was redrafted precisely to avoid any lack of clarity in that regard.
1164. When we discussed the point with Mr Barr on 24 October, he agreed that Rule 24.5.14 needed similarly to be amended. As part of her tabled evidence, Ms Edgley suggested a revision of the rules to address the point, but we consider it can be addressed more simply and directly than by providing a new activity rule (as she suggested).
1165. Like Ms Edgley though, we regard this as a minor change. It is obvious to us that it could not have been intended that emergency aircraft landings, rescues and the like be subject to standards applying to aircraft movements that have the luxury of a choice where to take off and land from.
1166. Accordingly, we recommend that Rule 24.5.14 be renumbered 24.5.18 and amended to read as follows:
- “Informal Airports
Other than in the case of informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities:*
- a. Informal airports shall not exceed a frequency of use of two flights per day;*
- b. Informal airports should be located a minimum distance of 500m from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential dwelling not located on the same site.*
- Advice Note: For the purposes of this Rule a flight includes two aircraft movements i.e. an arrival and a departure.”*
1167. We recommend that the non-compliance status remain full discretionary.
1168. Notified Rule 24.5.15 relates to residential visitor accommodation. Submissions on it have been transferred to Stream 15. The Stream 15 Hearing Panel has recommended separation of the standards applying to the Precinct from those applying in the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone, with the latter having a non-compliance status of Controlled. Our recommended revised

Chapter 24 reflects that recommendation, with new standards 24.5.20 and 24.5.21 respectively.

1169. Notified Rule 24.5.16 relates to homestays and was likewise a matter for the Steam 15 Hearing Panel which has made a similar recommendation. Our recommended revised Chapter 24 therefore shows a new 24.5.22 applying to the Rural Amenity Zone excluding the Precinct, and 24.5.23 applying to the Precinct.
1170. The final rule recommended by Mr Barr in this part of Chapter 24 was a new rule providing standards for fire-fighting, responding to the submission of Fire and Emergency New Zealand⁶¹⁰. This is discussed at some length at section 13 of Mr Barr's Section 42A Report. We did not receive any further evidence or commentary from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and thus, to the extent that Mr Barr recommends rejection of its submissions, we have no basis for taking a different view. We also accept Mr Barr's point that because the non-compliance status proposed restricted discretionary, the standard has limited utility. We do think, however, to the extent that it broadens the matters of discretion, it serves a worthwhile purpose.
1171. Because of the changes we have recommended to rules governing construction of residential buildings, some amendments to Mr Barr's recommended rule are required. We also consider that some reformatting would be beneficial. Accordingly, we recommend a new rule numbered 24.5.19 reading as follows:

"Fire-Fighting Water and Access

Buildings for residential activity that do not have reticulated water supply or where there is insufficient fire-fighting water supplied must provide the following provision for fire-fighting:

- a. A water supply of 20,000 litres and any necessary couplings;*
- b. A hard stand area adjacent to the fire-fighting water supply capable of supporting fire service vehicles;*
- c. Fire-fighting water column connection point within six metres of the hard stand, and 90m of the building;*
- d. Access from the property boundary to the fire-fighting water connection capable of accommodating and supporting Fire Service vehicles.*

Advice Note: Excludes non-habitable accessory buildings."

1172. As above, our recommended non-compliance status is restricted discretionary. The text in the non-compliance status column relating to this rule is recommended to read:

"Discretion is restricted to:

- a. The extent to which SNZ PAS 4509:2008 can be met including the adequacy of the water supply;*
- b. The accessibility of the fire-fighting water connection point for fire service vehicles;*
- c. Whether and the extent to which the building is assessed as low risk."*

⁶¹⁰ Submission 2660

3.17 Part 24.6 – Non-notification of Applications

1173. As notified, this rule listed a series of exceptions to a general principle that applications for restricted discretionary activities should not require written consent and should not be notified or limited-notified. The framing of the rule in this manner appears to have confused many submitters. Morcom et al, for instance, sought alternative relief whereby Rule 24.4.5 would be listed among the applications which are non-notified in Rule 24.6. Given that listing this rule would have the opposite effect to that which the submitters apparently sought, we can only assume that this was an error. Williamson et al likewise sought that Part 24.6 be deleted because it was supposedly meaningless. Mr Barr did not understand the submitters' reasoning, and nor do we. We note also that Mr Vivian, giving evidence for the submitters, agreed with Mr Barr's recommendation that the submissions be rejected.
1174. Morven Ferry et al sought deletion of reference to notified Rule 24.5.5 as a consequence of its submission seeking deletion of provision for identified landscape features outside ONLs and ONFs. We have not recommended acceptance of the primary submission and thus the consequential relief falls away.
1175. We note that Mr Brown gave evidence suggesting that notified Rules 24.5.1, 24.5.3 and 24.5.5 all be deleted on the basis that, in his view, these are all matters between the Council and the applicant and should not involve other parties.
1176. Given the limited range of submissions, as above, we were unclear as to which submissions Mr Brown was relying on when preparing this evidence, but in any event, we consider that he misread what the Plan seeks to achieve. When we asked him about it, he said that applications would require notification if the relevant standards were breached, and it seems to us that is what Part 24.6 provides: it references standards whose non-compliance status is restricted discretionary.
1177. Mr Barr recommended an additional exclusion consequential on his recommendation that notified Rule 24.4.14 be amended to restricted-discretionary status (from full discretionary). We agree with that logic, which applies to our recommended new Rule 24.4.16. Reference to that rule should also be added.
1178. Some of the Crown Investments et al submitters also sought that the initial words of the rule should reference controlled activities, consequent on their primary submissions seeking identification of such. We have not recommended that those primary submissions be accepted, but the fact that our recommended Rule 24.4.6 has controlled activity status suggests to us that the requested amendment should be made.
1179. The only other amendments we recommend are consequential changes to reflect the renumbering in our revised Chapter 24 and a terminology change consequential on the recommended form of Rule 24.5.10.
1180. Accordingly, we recommend that Part 24.6 be amended to read:

"Non-notification of Applications

Any application for a resource consent for controlled or restricted discretionary activities should not require the written consent of any other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified, with the exception of the following:

- a. Rule 24.5.4 Building size;
- b. Rule 24.5.5 Building coverage;
- c. Rule 25.5.6 Setback from internal boundaries;
- d. Rule 24.5.7 Height of buildings;
- e. Rule 24.5.8 Setback from roads;
- f. Rule 24.5.10 Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline or River Cliff Features;
- g. Rule 24.4.16 Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, where the access is onto a State Highway.”

3.18 Part 24.7 – Assessment Matters

1181. Part 24.7 as notified was entitled Assessment Matters – Restricted Discretionary Activities. Donaldson et al sought that the heading to this part of the Act include reference to controlled activities, given the primary relief they sought in relation to buildings located within building platforms. We have not recommended acceptance of that submission, but with our recommending Rule 24.4.6 being a controlled activity, the title needs to change in order to accommodate assessment matters that we will recommend in relation to that rule. Consequential amendments will also be required to 24.7.1 and 24.7.2 which serve as an introduction to the assessment matters that follow.
1182. So far as the heading is concerned, we recommend that it read as we have entitled this section.
1183. Provision 24.7.1 read as notified:
- “In considering whether or not to grant consent or impose conditions on a resource consent, regard should be had to the assessment matters set out in 24.7.3 to 24.7.13.”*
1184. Donaldson et al sought a minor change to insert the word “and” so that this provision would refer to granting of consent “and/or imposing of conditions”. Mr Barr recommended that these submissions be accepted. We concur.
1185. In addition, because of the need to insert assessment matters in relation to Rule 24.4.6, the cross-referencing numbering needs to change.
1186. We therefore recommend that 24.7.1 be amended to read:
- “In considering whether to not to grant consent and/or impose conditions on a resource consent, regard should be had to the assessment matters set out at 24.7.3 to 24.7.14.”*
1187. Rule 24.7.2, as notified read:
- “All proposals for restricted discretionary activities will also be assessed as to whether they are consistent with the relevant objectives and policies for the Zone or Precinct as well as those in Chapters 3 – Strategic Direction; Chapter 4 – Urban Development; Chapter 6 – Landscapes; and Chapter 28 – Natural Hazards.”*
1188. This provision was the subject of a number of submissions including those of Williamson et al, Crown Investments et al and Donaldson et al, who all sought that the reference to the strategic chapters be deleted.

1189. Due to the glitch in preparation of his Section 42A Report on this point, Mr Barr provided internally contradictory recommendations that he sought to clarify in his rebuttal evidence⁶¹¹, saying that in his view the text should be retained but that he did not hold a firm view as to the necessity for doing so.
1190. Both Mr Vivian and Mr Brown gave evidence on this point. Essentially the issue they had with the reference to the strategic chapters is that because of the wide-ranging nature of the matters covered in the objectives and policies of those chapters, this cross reference would effectively render the restrictions in the respective restricted discretionary rules nugatory. Mr Brown compared it to the kind of assessment that one would undertake for a non-complying activity. We consider that the submitters have a point. Depending on one's point of view, having assessment matters that extend more widely than the matters of discretion specified in the relevant rules is either ultra vires or simply ineffective. It is certainly productive of confusion in the application of the rules.
1191. We asked both Mr Brown and Mr Vivian whether the solution was to restrict the matters in the strategic chapters to which regard might be had, to those relevant to the matters of discretion. Both Mr Brown and Mr Vivian agreed that that would resolve the problem.
1192. Logically, the same limitation must apply to reference to objectives and policies in Chapter 24 and in Chapter 28.
1193. Mr Barr also took up that concept and in his reply evidence suggested that reference might simply be made to the *"objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion"*.
1194. We have a problem with that formulation. Provision 24.7.2 as notified cross referenced the objectives and policies of the Rural Amenity Zone, the Precinct, together with those in Chapters 3, 4, 6 and 28. As far as we have identified, no submissions sought a broadening of the matters required to be assessed, only a narrowing. We do not, therefore, think we have scope to accept Mr Barr's recommendation, to the extent that it might allow (indeed require) reference to objectives and policies in other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.
1195. Lastly, because of the inclusion of controlled activities, reference needs to be made to that too.
1196. In summary, therefore, we recommend that provision 24.7.2 be amended to read:
- "All proposals for controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities will also be assessed as to whether they are consistent with the objectives and policies relevant to the identified matters of control or discretion (as applicable) in this Chapter 24, as well as those in Chapters 3 – Strategic Direction, Chapter 4 – Urban Development, Chapter 6 – Landscapes and Rural Character and Chapter 28 – Natural Hazards."*
1197. Logically the assessment matters for controlled activities should be inserted prior to those for restricted discretionary activities. We will come back to the assessment matters we propose

⁶¹¹ At 5.60-5.61

for controlled activities because, in our view, they should be based on those relevant to restricted discretionary activities, and amended as required.

1198. We therefore consider next notified provision 24.7.3 which relates to “*New buildings (and alterations of existing buildings), residential flat, building coverage and building height infringements*”.
1199. Mr Barr noted first a general submission by Peter Dennison and Stephen Grant⁶¹² seeking that the assessment matters be split into three separate sections – buildings, coverage and height encroachments, and residential flats. The rationale for this suggested change was to avoid matters being considered where there was no jurisdiction to do so. The specific example provided was where a building meets the maximum height, then the height-related assessment matters should not be considered.
1200. Mr Barr did not agree. He observed that all of the matters listed under provision 24.7.3 relate to landscape and visual amenity. He emphasised that the need for a robust design-led response to assessing development is required irrespective of whether specific standards might be met.
1201. Mr Barr discussed the possibility that an existing site configuration established through the Operative District Plan, or proximity to landscape features and ONLs and ONFs, and views from public roads, might mean a building platform or building would be prominent from public locations. In that case, he considered that a building proposal might still require careful scrutiny to ensure appropriate outcomes, notwithstanding that it might comply with the bulk and location standards.
1202. We agree with Mr Barr’s analysis on all of these points. As we have endeavoured to make clear, development is not a given within the Precinct, and very much less so within the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone. Nor are the standards provided in order that boxes might be ticked, leading inexorably to a conclusion that consent must be granted.
1203. The interaction between building location and design on the one hand, and maintenance and enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values on the other, means that an integrated assessment is required of all components of a proposal. That is also the answer to the related submission by the same submitters that the size of accessory buildings not be a matter of assessment if coverage and height standards are met. For similar reasons, we agree with Mr Barr’s recommendation that the assessment matters do not need to be separated into those specific to the Precinct, and those relevant to the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone (as sought by Williamson et al). The areas of inquiry are the same (or largely the same). Where they differ (if at all) is in the policy response.
1204. Some members of the Donaldson et al group also sought that the subject matter of 24.7.3. refer to new buildings “*within a residential building platform*”. While that may be the situation, equally it may not. Accordingly, we do not recommend that the assessment criteria be limited to buildings within a building platform.

⁶¹² Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796; See also United Estates Ranch (#2126: Supported by FS2706, FS2745 and FS2791) to similar effect

1205. Mr Barr recommended that 24.7.3 refer to identification of building platforms as an activity to which the assessment matters apply. However, this was consequential on his recommended rule enabling identification of building platforms as a “*land use*”. As above, we have not recommended inclusion of that rule, and therefore the suggested amendment is not required.
1206. Mr Barr also recommended that the heading for the assessment matters be amended to refer to landscape “*character*” and visual amenity. Given the way in which the objectives and policies of Chapter 24 are framed, we agree that this is a desirable amendment for consistency purposes. The heading has no particular weight and therefore we regard it as a minor change within Clause 16(2).
1207. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁶¹³ sought to push the assessment criteria in the opposite direction and describe 24.7.3 as applying to “*all activities*”. Notified assessment matters 24.7.4-27.7.13 provides separate criteria for a range of discrete activities. While, as just discussed, there is a substantial degree of overlap between the assessment criteria within 27.7.3, we think it is helpful to separate out assessment criteria for other activities, to the extent that this is possible. We do not recommend the suggested amendment.
1208. Slopehill Properties Ltd⁶¹⁴ sought that the assessment matters be significantly pruned, with a clear focus on the matters identified in Schedule 24.8. Once again, its submission was not supported by expert evidence. As we will discuss in the context of the assessment matters in Chapter 27, Schedule 24.8 is necessarily pitched at a high level. The assessment matters are deliberately much more detailed, in our view, appropriately so.
1209. Moving to the detail of 27.7.3, Mr Barr noted the submissions of Donaldson et al seeking deletion of reference to location within 24.7.3(a) and (b) on the basis that in their requested rules, location has been defined through identification of the building platform. Mr Barr recommended rejection of those submissions on the basis that he was recommending building platforms for residential activity be enabled through a land use consent.
1210. We have not recommended acceptance of Mr Barr’s suggested new rule in that regard, but we do not think it follows that location is thereby irrelevant. Even where a building platform has been defined, that does not mean that as part of an integrated design-led process, some locations within the building platform will not better achieve the objectives and policies of the Precinct and/or the broader Rural Amenity Zone than others. In addition, there are many rules to which these assessment criteria apply that do not assume prior identification of a building platform.
1211. Mr Barr recommended a minor amendment to a reference in the notified assessment matter 24.7.3(a) so that it would refer to landscape character and visual amenity “*values*” rather than landscape, character and visual amenity “*qualities*”. Again, we regard this as an issue of consistency of terminology rather than a substantive issue. We therefore agree with Mr Barr and recommend this as a minor amendment in terms of Clause 16(2), along with renumbering so that the revised provision will be 24.7.5(a).

⁶¹³ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

⁶¹⁴ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

1212. Turning to assessment matter 24.7.3(b), this is framed as:

“The extent to which the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complement the existing landscape character and visual amenity values, including consideration of”

1213. Then follows some 11 discrete matters. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust suggests that a new matter be added to this list being *“The use of LID infrastructure, its integration in the landscape and contribution to the natural character or biodiversity values”*.

1214. While the Partially Operative RPS 2019 encourages the use of low impact design techniques⁶¹⁵, the specific amendment sought by the submitter falls more naturally into the assessment criteria related to infrastructure (notified provision 24.7.4). We will return to discuss it in that context.

1215. The existing 6th matter contained in the list under 24.7.3(b) is:

“The retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns”.

1216. The 8th point listed is:

“Planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.8.”

1217. Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Inc⁶¹⁶ sought that a specific exclusion be inserted in both points so that consideration of restoration and planting not include trees and plants *“with wilding potential”*.

1218. Mr Barr suggested that this submission might better be addressed by inclusion of a new 24.7.3(j) worded as follows:

“The merit of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees in all instances except where this would have significant landscape or visual amenity adverse effects, and their replacement with non-wilding species.”

1219. The submitter did not appear and provide evidence in support of its submission on these points.

1220. The first point to make is that we do not consider it is necessary to qualify the 8th subpoint of 24.7.3(b). We cannot conceive of a situation where wilding species would be considered *“appropriate”* given the terms of Chapter 34.

1221. We support inclusion of an additional assessment criterion, but we consider that it needs to reflect the policy we have recommended on the subject (24.2.4.9) that encourages the

⁶¹⁵ Refer Policy 4.5.4

⁶¹⁶ Submission 2190: Supported by FS2746

removal of wild and exotic trees at the time of development. We do not think it necessary to add reference to landscape or visual amenity effects from removal of such trees. The consideration of those issues is implicit within an instruction to consider the merits of removal of wilding trees. Similarly, potential replacement would necessarily be considered when assessing the merits of removal.

1222. In summary, and taking account of the renumbering required to accommodate the new assessment criteria that we will discuss shortly, we recommend a new 24.7.5(i) be inserted worded as follows:

“The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development”.

1223. Dennison/Grant⁶¹⁷ and United Estates Ranch⁶¹⁸ also sought amendments to the 6th point quoted above; so that enhancement of existing vegetation of landform patterns is considered along with the extent to which the proposal will achieve the patterns anticipated by the rules and in the context of the amenity and character elements set out Schedule 24.8.

1224. We consider that these matters are already addressed by other matters listed under 24.7.3(b) and that the amendments suggested are not obviously required. The submitters provided no evidence that would suggest otherwise.

1225. Assessment matter 24.7.3(c) as notified read:

“The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the proposed development in a manner that delivers optimal landscape character and visual amenity outcomes.”

1226. X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust⁶¹⁹ together with Morven Ferry et al sought that rather than referring to delivery of optimal outcomes, this criterion should relate to maintenance and enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity.

1227. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of that submission. We agree that the alternative language suggested is more appropriate in this context, but that reference should be to landscape character and visual amenity values given the way in which the relevant objectives and policies in Chapter 24 are framed.

1228. For the reasons discussed in section 2.7, however, we think that maintenance and enhancement should be framed as alternatives.

1229. Lastly, we consider that some amendment is required to explain how covenants and conditions can be *“integrated”* into a development. Logically, it must be through their incorporation into the conditions governing a development. We recommend that be made clear, to avoid unintentionally watering down the existing wording.

⁶¹⁷ Submission 2301

⁶¹⁸ Submission 2126: Supported by FS2706, FS2745 and FS2791

⁶¹⁹ Submission 2619: Opposed by FS2710

1230. We therefore suggest that this assessment matter be amended to read:

“The extent to which existing conditions governing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the proposed development so as to ensure that landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained and enhanced.”

1231. As notified, assessment matter 24.7.3(d) read:

“The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity from public places and neighbouring properties.”

1232. Mr Barr noted Morven Ferry et al as having sought that the reference to neighbouring properties be deleted. The submissions suggested that views from neighbouring properties should not be a general matter of assessment, but should be identified as relevant in specific instances where the amenity of neighbouring properties might be affected. The example was given of internal setbacks.

1233. Mr Barr considered that the submission raised a relevant matter in terms of the extent to which Council might consider views from neighbouring properties, and potential inconsistency with the extent to which restricted discretionary resource consent applications are directed to be non-notified under Part 24.6. Given the latter, Mr Barr felt that reference to neighbouring properties in this assessment criterion might provide neighbours of adjoining properties with a false expectation that they could be considered an effected person to a resource consent application.

1234. Having said that, Mr Barr was of the view that it was important that the scope of consideration on applications be broader than just related to views from public places. He recommended that the specific reference to neighbouring properties be deleted, but that the assessment matter be reframed more generally to read:

“The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape and from public places.”

1235. We share Mr Barr’s view that assessment of visual amenity effects are not limited to effects from public places. However, equally, submitters seeking assurance that views from private property will be safeguarded⁶²⁰ have pushed the relevance of such effects too far.

1236. Accordingly, we agree with the intent underlying Mr Barr’s recommended amendment, but we consider that visual amenity values in public places deserve some prioritisation.

1237. Accordingly, we recommend that what will now be 24.7.4(d) read:

“The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape, particularly from public places.”

1238. Assessment matter 24.7.3(e) read as notified:

⁶²⁰ See e.g. the submission of Hunter Leece and Anne Kobienia (#2122)

“Whether clustering of buildings would offer a better solution for maintaining a sense of openness and spaciousness, or the integration of development with existing landform and vegetation patterns.”

1239. Morven Ferry et al sought two amendments to this assessment matter. The first is to introduce reference to varied allotment sizes in subdivision design and the second to refer to lifestyle development patterns.
1240. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of this submission given retention of a 6000m² minimum allotment size. We agree that it is implicit in retention of both a minimum lot size and a minimum average lot size in the Precinct that varied allotment sizes are envisaged, if not encouraged.
1241. We are less sure about the suggested reference to *“lifestyle patterns”*. It seems to us that this is coded language for the pattern of settlement and that is what the assessment matter should say.
1242. Mr Barr recommended a slight alteration of the language to talk about varied densities of development, which we think is an improvement.
1243. We also wonder about reference to a *“better solution”* without identifying the alternative; better than what? Dennison/Grant⁶²¹ and United Estates Ranch Ltd⁶²² raised a related point. They sought the reference to openness and spaciousness be qualified so that it only applied where that is already the case, or the Plan seeks it as an outcome.
1244. We infer from the evidence we heard that the counterpoint is what was described to us as a *“cookie-cutter”* subdivision design with standardised allotment sizes and spacing between buildings. While the language is similar, we think this is a different issue to that addressed by recommended Policy 24.2.1.11, and so the qualification sought in the submissions is not required. However, we think that an amended wording might better capture the underlying concepts. We recommend the following rewording:

“Whether clustering of buildings or varied densities in development areas would better maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness, or better integrate development with existing landform, vegetation or settlement patterns.”

1245. Assessment matter 24.7.3(g) as notified read:

“The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of the appropriate setback from such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.”

⁶²¹ Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796

⁶²² Submission 2126: Supported by FS2706, FS2745 and FS2791

1246. Morven Ferry sought that the reference to “*features, elements and patterns*” be amended to refer to “*outstanding features, elements and patterns*” and that the language in the second sentence be slightly amended to refer to “*an appropriate setback*”.
1247. Mr Barr did not support the suggested amendments. We agree. The focus of this assessment criterion is effects on features, elements and patterns of the landscape outside ONLs and ONFs that have consequential effects on the ONL and ONF in question. It is consistent with recommended Policy 24.2.1.5 as currently framed and we do not recommend any change to it from that notified, save to renumber it 24.3.4(g).
1248. Assessment matter 24.7.3(h) as notified read:
- “The extent to which development adversely affects other identified landscape features as identified on the planning maps, and in particular the visual amenity values of those features in views from public places outside of the Precinct.”*
1249. Mr Barr noted the submission of X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust⁶²³ that sought it be deleted on the basis of the lack of clear direction in the objectives and policies regarding the identified landscape features.
1250. Mr Barr supported retention of this assessment matter as being implemented through varied Policy 24.2.1.5.
1251. We have recommended amendment to that policy to delete reference to the Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features. Our reasoning in that regard suggests to us that the significance of those features is better addressed in the assessment matters with reference to the setbacks required with reference to them. We therefore recommend that our renumbered assessment matter 24.7.7 incorporate reference to them.
1252. It follows that, in our view, notified assessment matter 24.7.3(h) should be deleted, as sought by the submitter.
1253. Assessment matter 24.7.3(i) as notified read:
- “Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds and consent notices.”*
1254. Morven Ferry et al sought that the two identified mechanisms to support mitigation should be expressed as alternatives (“*bonds or consent notices*”).
1255. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of that submission as either or both mechanisms might be appropriate in a particular case.
1256. We agree with that reasoning. Accordingly, we recommend that renumbered assessment matter 24.7.4(h) read as follows:

⁶²³ Submission 2619: Supported by FS2770; Opposed by FS2712

“Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds or covenants.”

1257. Finally in relation to notified 24.7.3, Mr Barr recommended an additional assessment matter that was the subject of a recommendation from Ms Gilbert. In the context of her discussion of the submissions of Millbrook Country Club⁶²⁴, Ms Gilbert recommended assessment matters refer to ‘no build areas’. Mr Barr drew on an assessment matter in Chapter 21 to formulate a proposed assessment matter worded:

“Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through open space covenants.”

1258. Acknowledging that the Millbrook submission did not seek this particular relief, Mr Barr referred us to a number of submissions⁶²⁵ that opposed the Precinct on the basis that the densities are too high and will result in unsatisfactory landscape and amenity outcomes.

1259. Those submissions provide scope and we think that there is merit in Mr Barr’s recommendation, but that it would benefit from expansion as to what is meant by an “open space covenant”.

1260. Accordingly, we recommend a new assessment matter numbered 24.7.5(j) worded:

“Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.”

1261. Lastly, we should note the submission of Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁶²⁶ that sought an additional assessment matter related to indigenous biodiversity. This formed part of a package of relief that Mr Barr discussed at section 12 of his Section 42A Report. He concluded that the assessment criteria regarding indigenous biodiversity were appropriate. In the absence of evidence from the submitter, we do not have the basis to come to a different view.

1262. Those provisions of notified Provision 27.7.3 that have not been discussed were not the subject of submission and we recommend they be retained unamended, save for consequential renumbering.

1263. The second set of assessment matters that was provided in the notified version of Part 24.7 was stated to relate to “servicing, hazards, infrastructure and access”. On the face of the matter, the heading should be expanded and amended to reflect the content of this subpart. Accordingly, we recommend that it read:

“Servicing, fire-fighting water, natural hazards, infrastructure and access.”

⁶²⁴ Submission 2295

⁶²⁵ Submissions 2135, 2472, 2515, 2578 and 2579

⁶²⁶ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

1264. The only submission that we have noted on this set of assessment matters is that of the Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁶²⁷ that sought insertion of a new assessment matter worded:

“The extent to which the proposal integrates the principals [sic] of Low Impact Development and enhances biodiversity values.”

1265. This submission needs to be considered in the light of the similar relief the submitter sought in relation to notified provision 24.7.3, discussed above, and which was more clearly targeted towards Low Impact Design Infrastructure.

1266. To the extent that the suggested additional assessment matter incorporates biodiversity values, we refer to and rely on the reasoning in Mr Barr’s Section 42A Report discussed above.

1267. Mr Barr did not, however, discuss whether an additional assessment matter might be inserted related to low impact design infrastructure.

1268. Given the provisions of the Partially Operative RPS 2019 encouraging its use, we believe that this is appropriate. Low impact design is closely related to minimisation of environmental effects, which are addressed in notified provisions 27.7.4(a). We therefore suggest that that provision be amended to read:

“The extent to which the proposal provides for appropriate on-site wastewater disposal and water supply. Use of low impact design techniques and the provision of shared infrastructure servicing to more than one property is preferred in order to minimise environmental effects.”

1269. As a result of the insertion of additional assessment matters that we will discuss shortly, this will be numbered 24.7.6(a). Notified provisions 24.7.4(b)-(d) were not the subject of submission and accordingly, we recommend they be retained unamended, save for consequential renumbering.

1270. Turning therefore to assessment matters for the single controlled activity rule we have recommended (24.4.6), we recommend a new table be inserted entitled Assessment Matters – Controlled Activities with two subsections, being 24.7.3 and 27.7.4. We further recommend that provision 27.7.3 be entitled *“The construction of buildings for residential activity under Rule 24.4.6”*. The substantive content of this provision should be copied over from recommended provision 24.7.5 that we have just discussed.

1271. Provision 24.7.4 we recommend be entitled *“Infrastructure and Access”*, with two assessment matters, being a copy of recommended assessment matters 24.7.6(a) and (b).

1272. The fact that this rule relates to building within an existing building platform means that provision for fire-fighting and consideration of natural hazards will already have been undertaken.

1273. Notified provision 24.7.5 relates to non-residential activities.

⁶²⁷ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

1274. Mr Barr drew our attention to an NZTA submission⁶²⁸ seeking that the final assessment matter in this provision be amended to read *“Access that maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network.”*
1275. While Mr Barr agreed with that suggested wording, and we accept that the existing assessment matter (reading *“Acceptable access and safety”*) is inadequate, our recommendations in relation to Policies 24.2.1 and 24.2.4 suggest that provision 24.7.5 should be amended to read:
“Access that maintains the safety and efficiency of the roading and trail network.”
1276. The balance of notified provision 24.7.5 is not the subject of submission. Accordingly, we recommend that it be retained unamended save for renumbering the entire provision 24.7.7.
1277. Notified provision 24.7.6 related to boundary and road setbacks. Mr Barr recommended that this be expanded to include the setback rules he proposed for the Queenstown Trail without amending the substance of the assessment matters. We agree with that recommendation and would add reference to the Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features, consequent on our recommended deletion of the assessment matter notified as 24.7.3(h). As a result, renumbered provision 24.7.8 would be headed:
“Setback from Boundaries, Queenstown Trail, Roads and Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features.”
1278. In the absence of any submissions on the substance of notified provision 24.7.6, we recommend it remain unchanged.
1279. There was no provision notified as 24.7.7.
1280. Notified provision 24.7.8 related to setbacks from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals. It does not appear to have been the subject of any submission and save for consequential renumbering so that it would appear as 24.7.9, we recommend it be retained unamended.
1281. Notified provision 24.7.9 related to the setback of buildings from water bodies. The sole amendment to it recommended by Mr Barr was to broaden the focus of the first assessment matter to *“the maintenance of enhancement of biodiversity values”*, responding to the submission of Otago Fish & Game Council⁶²⁹.
1282. The suggested change is consistent with the amendment we have recommended to Rule 24.5.12.
1283. We note that Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁶³⁰ sought that this provision referred to maintenance, enhancement and protection of indigenous biodiversity values. We do not recommend that suggested change for the reasons discussed in section 2.7 of this report. Accordingly, save for the amendment discussed above to assessment matter (a), and for

⁶²⁸ Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by FS2765 and FS2766

⁶²⁹ Submission 2455: Opposed by FS2746

⁶³⁰ Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

consequential renumbering as 27.7.10, we recommend that notified provision 24.7.9 be retained unamended.

1284. Notified provisions 24.7.10-27.7.12 related to roadside stalls, retail sales and glare respectively. We have not identified any submissions that sought changes to these provisions and accordingly, save for their consequential renumbering as provisions 24.7.11-14 respectively, we recommend they be retained unamended.

1285. Notified provision 24.7.13 relates to clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation over 4m² in height. Mr Barr recommended an additional assessment matter on this provision, responding to the submission of Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Inc⁶³¹.

1286. The relief sought by the submitter was a new assessment matter worded:

“Whether the exotic vegetation is a tree or plant with wilding potential and the benefits of removing such planting.”

1287. Mr Barr suggested an assessment matter consistent with the new provision he recommended for 24.7.3 discussed above.

1288. For much the same reasons as discussed in that context, we recommend simplification of the wording so that a new assessment matter is added to renumbered provision 24.7.14 worded:

“The merit of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees.”

1289. Wakatipu Reforestation Trust⁶³² sought replacement of this assessment matter, consequential on its submission seeking expression of Rule 24.4.29 to cover indigenous vegetation. We have recommended rejection of that submission. It follows that we recommend in all other respects that the balance of notified assessment matter 27.7.13 remain unamended. For similar reasons, we do not recommend a new assessment matter for indigenous vegetation enhancement, protection and maintenance, as sought by the Trust.

1290. We have reviewed Parts 24.3.-24.7 both provision by provision and collectively. We consider that these parts are the most appropriate means to achieve the objectives of Chapter 24 given the options open to us.

3.19 Schedule 24.8 – Landscape and Character Units

1291. As notified, this Schedule contained a map of the landscape character units (LCUs) dividing the rural areas of the Wakatipu Basin into 25 units, followed by a description of each unit which included a statement regarding its capability to absorb additional development on a scale between low and high.

1292. We note at the outset that submissions seeking changes to the boundaries of particular LCUs are addressed in the mapping reports that accompany this Report.

⁶³¹ Submission 2190: Supported by FS2746

⁶³² Submission 2293: Opposed by FS2746

1293. Mr Barr drew our attention to a number of general submissions on Schedule 24.8.
1294. Bagrie et al sought that Schedule 24.8 be amended to provide assessment matters.
1295. Mr Barr responded that the descriptions of each LCU were not intended to be assessment criteria or to enunciate the desired outcome. Rather, the LCUs identify features and values within each LCU to assist with application of the assessment matters in Part 24.7 and consideration as to whether the policies are being achieved. He recommended rejection of the submission.
1296. The Bagrie et al submissions did not provide detail as to how Schedule 24.8 might be converted into a series of assessment matters and none of the planning witnesses we heard from undertook a comprehensive analysis that would have supported such a change.
1297. Even if we had been provided with the evidential materials to enable us to take this submission forward, we would have been concerned about the natural justice implications of such a radical change to the approach in Chapter 24, given the inability of interested parties to assess the implications of that change and to provide their input.
1298. As it is, we have no basis to disagree with Mr Barr's recommendation that this submission not be accepted.
1299. Next, Mr Barr noted a submission by NZTA⁶³³ who sought that the description of LCU10 (Ladies Mile) is amended to acknowledge that there is a transportation infrastructure capacity issue at the State Highway 6 Shotover River bridge and that the capacity to absorb additional development in this area is "low". We have discussed the issues underlying this submission in Section 2.9 of this Report.
1300. Mr Barr did not recommend acceptance of this submission. In his view, while the LCU descriptions identify infrastructure features, these descriptions provide context as to the extent to which this infrastructure influences the landscape character and visual amenity within the respective LCU. In Mr Barr's view⁶³⁴, infrastructure items should not be identified as a landscape constraint. Rather, such constraints should be addressed through other provisions.
1301. Transpower New Zealand Limited⁶³⁵ submitted that additional text should be inserted into LCU18 (Morven Eastern Foothills) and LCU35 (Shotover Country) to recognise the presence of and constraints forwarded by the National Grid. Mr Barr did not recommend acceptance of that submission either, for much the same reasons.
1302. When NZTA appeared before us, its counsel, Ms McIndoe, advised that the agency agreed with the position expressed in the Section 42A Report.

⁶³³ Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760; Opposed by FS2765 and FS2766

⁶³⁴ Refer Section 42A Report at 32.11

⁶³⁵ Submission 2442

1303. We likewise agree. The descriptions of LCUs serve a purpose that is related to maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values. We agree with Mr Barr that to the extent that other considerations create constraints on development, this needs to be addressed independently of Schedule 24.8. We have a particular concern that were we to embark on amendments such as those suggested in the NZTA and Transpower submissions, there is a very real risk that we would not have the evidence to list all relevant constraints, but the inference that would inevitably be drawn from listing some constraints would be that the Schedule was complete.
1304. Williamson et al sought that the LCU map be retained, but updated to exclude those areas not the subject of Chapter 24.
1305. Mr Barr recommended acceptance of this submission in part. At paragraph 32.13 and 32.14 of his Section 42A Report, he expressed the view that for those LCUs that are partly Rural Amenity Zone and partly some other zone (e.g. the Rural Zone) it would be misleading if the LCU map included only that part of the landscape character unit that is the subject of Chapter 24. However, he identified that two LCUs (LCU16 (Bendemeer) and LCU25 (Shotover Country Margins) might be removed in their entirety, because the land is zoned Bendemeer Special Zone⁶³⁶ and Rural Zone⁶³⁷ respectively. Mr Vivian, giving evidence for Williamson et al, agreed with that suggestion, as do we. If no land covered by Chapter 24 is within an LCU, it is in the same category as the ONLs and ONFs that appear as holes in the LCU map. We consider the same approach should be taken to it. As a result, the descriptions for those two LCUs should likewise be deleted.
1306. Queenstown Trails Trust⁶³⁸ sought that the LCU descriptions be updated to include all trails and public recreation areas (including those that have been approved but not yet formed). Ms Gilbert expressed concern in her Evidence in Chief⁶³⁹ that as the trail network is progressively enhanced, the LCU descriptions will inevitably be out of date. She considered that the assessment criteria together with the requirement to consider how a new development integrates with existing trails will adequately address effects that are not specifically referenced in Schedule 24.8.
1307. Mr Barr agreed with that position, as do we. We consider that the incorporation of trails into Schedule 24.8 would need to be undertaken with considerable care given that a significant proportion of the trail network is not in fact a “trail” as defined. In addition, the ability to consider landscape character and visual amenity effects from “trails” as defined is limited at best, calling into question the usefulness of showing them on maps intended to assist assessment of landscape character and visual amenity effects.
1308. Accordingly, we recommend that the Trails Trust submission not be accepted.
1309. Along with seeking specific amendments to Schedule 24.8, Slopehill Properties Limited⁶⁴⁰ submitted that Schedule 24.8 should be more robustly tested by a range of experts and locals

⁶³⁶ Operative District Plan Part 12

⁶³⁷ Proposed District Plan Chapter 21

⁶³⁸ Submission 2575

⁶³⁹ At 72.6

⁶⁴⁰ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

and amended accordingly. It also sought that significant amenity landscape values should only be identified as such if they are articulated and founded on strong support and directives from the locals.

1310. While some aspects of amenity and landscape character require consideration of the values local residents place on their environment, this district generally, and the Wakatipu Basin in particular, are well known for the number of visitors they attract, both from other parts of New Zealand and from offshore. The economic benefits those visitors bring to the district are undoubted⁶⁴¹ and the values those visitors enjoy in the environment are in our view, worthy of recognition. This translates in practice to a recognition of the importance of views from local vantage points on the Crown Range Road, particularly the top of the zig-zag and Coronet Peak, together with the principal thoroughfares travelled by visitors to the district, including the State Highway, Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and Malaghans Road.
1311. To the extent that the Slopehill Properties submission is a coded attack on the authors of the WB Landscape Study for not being “*locals*”, we regard one of the strengths of that study as being its objectivity. The authors took a fresh look at a series of issues that have proven difficult to manage. We have already commented on the comprehensiveness of that review in comparison to the more site-specific evidence we had from other landscape experts⁶⁴². In our view, the authors were assisted by a lack of historic “*baggage*”. That is not to say the experts we heard who have spent much of their professional lives looking at landscapes in the Wakatipu Basin did not have valuable insights that have assisted us, but we do not consider the WB Landscape Study and/or Ms Gilbert’s evidence can be disparaged or downgraded on the kind of generalised basis stated in this submission.
1312. We recommend it be rejected.
1313. In section 3.5 of this report, we discussed a submission by Williamson et al that Objective 24.2.5 needed to acknowledge that the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct will change over time. As we have noted in our discussion of that submission, Mr Barr gave evidence that the objective already contemplates landscape change. We did not recommend an amendment to the objective to respond to this submission, but we did discuss with Ms Gilbert whether, at least in one respect, the descriptions of the LCUs in Schedule 24.8 would be overtaken by changes anticipated by the District Plan. This was in the Precinct areas where, to the extent the rules of Chapter 24 contain density standards higher than currently exists, it must be anticipated that the description of lot sizes within the relevant LCU will change over the life of the Plan.
1314. In his reply evidence⁶⁴³, Mr Barr also drew our attention to the submission of Dalefield Trustee Limited⁶⁴⁴ that sought to draw a link between the assessment matters in Proposed Rule 27.7.6.2 and the environmental characteristics and visual amenity values listed as important to be maintained and achieved in each LCU in Schedule 24.8.

⁶⁴¹ Refer Stage 1 Report 3 at section 1.9

⁶⁴² See Section 2.3 above

⁶⁴³ At 11.43

⁶⁴⁴ Submission 2097

1315. As a consequence of these submissions, Mr Barr recommended amendments to the text of the descriptions for LCUs 2, 4-9 (inclusive), 12, 14 and 21. Although there are some variations, the suggested amendment to the description of settlement patterns in LCU2 (Fitzpatrick Basin) is typical. The new text suggested new text reads:

“The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.”

1316. Mr Barr’s reply version of Chapter 24 also suggested amendments to the description of environment characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced to provide greater specificity regarding exactly what values are anticipated to change. The recommended amendments in this case are necessarily specific to each LCU.

1317. We regard the suggested amendments as an improvement to the text in a manner that responds to the submissions noted above in all but two cases. The first exception is in LCU4 where two hanging headings have been inserted into the description of environmental characteristics and visual amenity values. These do not appear to assist and we do not recommend their inclusion. The second exception is in relation to the suggested amendment to LCU8: Speargrass Flat. As discussed in Report 18.5 we have recommended a down zoning of land notified as Precinct in this LCU. Accordingly, the suggested amendment to the *“settlement patterns”* section of the description is not required.

1318. Turning to the more specific amendments suggested and starting with LCU8, this was the subject of submissions by Boxer Hills Trust⁶⁴⁵, Waterfall Park Developments Limited⁶⁴⁶ and by Wakatipu Equities Limited⁶⁴⁷. The Waterfall Park Developments submission is non-specific as to the particular amendments sought to be made to Schedule 24.8.

1319. It seeks that LCU8 be modified *“to reflect the landscape characteristics of the submitters and surrounding land owners sites”*. The evidence for the submitter did not particularise the relief sought other than to suggest (in the expert evidence of Mr Skelton) that the boundary between LCU8 and LCU12 where it adjoins the Waterfall Park Developments site be shifted north if that site is zoned anything other than Rural Amenity.

1320. As discussed in Report 18.5, we recommend that the Waterfall Park Development site be zoned Rural Amenity and accordingly, we need take Mr Skelton’s suggestion no further.

1321. Like Waterfall Park Developments, the submission of Wakatipu Equities was generally framed (seeking that LCU8 *“reflect the ability of the Submitter’s land to absorb the effects of future rural living subdivision and development”*) and we were left to infer what amendments that might actually require from Mr Skelton’s evidence on the submission. We note in that regard his description of the LCU8 portion of the Wakatipu Equities as being highly visible from Speargrass Flat Road⁶⁴⁸. Mr Skelton described the bulk of Speargrass Flat as maintaining a rural and open character with the northern slopes mostly pastoral, while the southern slopes

⁶⁴⁵ Submission 2385: Supported by FS2784

⁶⁴⁶ Submission 2389

⁶⁴⁷ Submission 2479

⁶⁴⁸ S Skelton, EIC at paragraph 16

have a moderate degree of naturalness. In his view, the eastern portion of the LCU is heavily influenced by the rural residential character of the Operative District Plan North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone. He also considered that a Precinct Zoning across much of the site adjacent to Speargrass Flat Road would not be appropriate. However, he saw potential for some sensitive residential development to occur within this part of the site.

1322. Mr Skelton's evidence did not immediately suggest to us any specific amendments to LCU8 and given the lack of specificity in the submission, we do not think that we can take it any further.
1323. The submission of Boxer Hills Trust, however, suggested a series of amendments to the text related to LCU8 as follows:
- a. In the description of the boundaries of the LCU, add reference to the Hills Golf Course;
 - b. In the description of land use, amend the current description insofar as it refers to "*sparingly scattered rural residential lots*" to delete the word "*sparingly*";
 - c. In the description of settlement patterns, delete the description of consented but unbuilt platforms, and the typical lot sizes being over 50ha;
 - d. In the description of proximity to key routes, note that part of the area is adjacent to Speargrass Flat/Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road;
 - e. In the description of visibility/prominence, add a note that the escarpment confining the LCU to the north blocks some views from that direction;
 - f. In the description of naturalness, delete the comment that built development is of relatively limited levels and add reference to rural land use having modified land cover to one of low naturalness associated with vegetation;
 - g. In the description of sense of place, reverse the order so rather than saying that it is predominantly a working rural landscape with scattered residential development, describe a position where it is predominantly rural residential with subservient rural landscape. Also delete the role of Speargrass Flat LCU reading as a 'breathing space' between other LCUs;
 - h. In the discussion of potential landscape issues, delete the initial comment regarding vulnerability to 'development creep';
 - i. In the discussion of potential landscape opportunities and benefits from development, delete reference to potential for development on larger-scaled lots and the potential to consolidate the existing rural residential 'node';
 - j. In the subparagraph describing environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced, delete the reference to the LCU being a 'foil' for the more intensively developed rural residential areas nearby;
 - k. Amend the description of the capability to absorb additional development to be high everywhere, but especially round the edges of LCU12 (rather than low other than in that area).
1324. In Mr Barr's revised version of LCU8 annexed to his Section 42A Report, he recommended the amendments summarised in (d) and (e) above based on Ms Gilbert's input.
1325. The landscape evidence for the submitter did not address this aspect of Boxer Hills Trust evidence. Mr Brown's planning evidence for the submitter supported most but not all of the amendments sought in the submission. The exceptions that Mr Brown did not support were the points summarised in (f), (h), (i) and (j) above. In addition, Mr Brown proposed very much more limited amendments to the "*sense of place*" description, suggesting only that the word

“working” be deleted from the description of a *“working rural landscape character”* and that the description of rural residential sprawl be amended make it clear that this is occurring to the west of the existing Lake Hayes Rural Residential Area.

1326. The grounds for the suggested changes to LCU8 in Mr Brown’s evidence appear to be a cut and paste from the submission, and therefore do not add anything to it.

1327. Working through the requested amendments:

- a. While the Hills Golf Course lies to the north of part of the LCU, as we understand it, the LCU boundary is at the ridgeline crest, with the golf course further north. We think, therefore, that the description is correct as it is and requires no amendment;
- b. Whether rural residential lots are sparsely scattered or not is a question of fact. The non-specific way in which Mr Brown’s evidence was presented does not provide us with a clear basis to conclude that the existing description is incorrect. We do not recommend that it be amended;
- c. As discussed above, the description of settlement patterns at present is unlikely to change materially given the recommended zoning in Report 18.5. We therefore recommend the existing text remain unaltered;
- d. We accept the factual correction sought in this submission and supported by Council staff is required. Accordingly, we recommend that the text describing the LCU’s proximity to key routes be amended to read:

“Located away from a key vehicular route. Part of the area is adjacent to Speargrass Flat Road, Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.”

- e. We accept the revision sought in the submission and supported by Council staff. As a result, we recommend that the description of visibility/prominence be amended to read:

“The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible from the public road network in the elevated hills to the north and south, although the escarpment confining the character area to the north blocks some views from the north.”

- f. Given that this suggested change was not supported by Mr Brown, we consider we need take this matter no further;
- g. Again, given Mr Brown’s evidence, we think that we can discount most of the changes sought. As to whether the character is one of a working rural landscape or just a rural landscape, this is a question of fact. While we heard evidence that the character of the Wakatipu Basin generally is no longer predominantly one of a working rural landscape, we had no evidence that this particular part of the Basin has ceased to be a *“working”* rural landscape given the way Mr Brown’s evidence was presented. Accordingly, we do not support that amendment. As regards the suggested clarification regarding the direction of sprawl, our own observation suggests that Mr Brown’s point is fair. Accordingly, we suggest that the final sentence of this description be amended to read:

“To the eastern end of the unit, there is the perception of the Lakes Hayes Rural Residential area sprawling west into Speargrass Flat.”

We recommend that the balance of the description remain as notified.

- h. Given Mr Brown's lack of support for this suggested amendment, we need take the point no further;
- i. Although Mr Brown did not support the suggested amendments, our recommendations as to zoning of the land within this LCU would support acceptance of this submission. Accordingly, we recommend that the description be amended to read:

"Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography".

- j. Given Mr Brown's absence of support for the suggested amendment, we do not recommend deletion of reference to the LCU being a "foil" for development. We do consider, however, that taking on board the landscape evidence we heard in particular from Ms Hadley, there is a need to expand this description to distinguish more clearly between the central and western portions of LCU8 on the one hand, and the eastern portion on the other. The role of the LCU as a "foil" and the importance of views from Speargrass Flat Road to the hillsides and escarpments on either side arises in relation to the former. Similarly, integration of buildings arises in relation to the latter. The western end also has other characteristics worthy of noting. In Report 18.5, we note in particular the view from the Queenstown Trail southward over the currently open rural land north of Lake Hayes. Further west again, on Hogans Gully Road, we consider views to the hill/escarpment landforms, and the boarder landscape context are worthy of note. Although these are not the characteristics we suspect Waterfall Park Developments had in mind, that submission provides scope for the changes to identify such additional characteristics. Accordingly, we recommend that the description of environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced be amended to read as follows:

"Central and western portions of LCU8

Sense of openness and spaciousness as a "foil" for the more intensively developed rural residential areas nearby.

Maintenance of unobstructed rural views from Speargrass Flat Road to the largely undeveloped hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south.

Eastern portion of LCU8

Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting.

Maintenance of a spacious and open outlook in views from Queenstown Trail and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, including the southbound views as one descends Christine's Hill.

Maintenance of openness in views from Hogans Gully Road to the backdropping hill/escarpment landforms and broader ONL mountain context."

- k. Turning to absorption capacity, the evidence did not support greater recognition of the scope to absorb development Mr Brown suggested. Rather the contrary. We consider that there is an inconsistency in the recognition of landscape sensitivity and vulnerability to development creep in this LCU, and the suggestion that capacity to absorb development is high at the margins of LCU12. In Report 18.5, we disagree with Ms Gilbert's view that expansion of the existing North Lake Hayes rural residential area is inevitable and recommend rezoning to reflect that. Consistent with that view, we recommend that the

absorption capacity be amended to “low” throughout this LCU. As for the previous subsection, the Waterfall Park Developments submission provides scope for this change.

1328. Save as discussed above, we recommend that the balance of the description of LCU8 be retained as notified.
1329. Turning to LCU11 (Slopehill Foothills), Slopehill Properties Limited⁶⁴⁹ sought a number of changes to the descriptions as follows:
- a. Under vegetation patterns, add reference to “*indigenous wetland and canopy plantings*”;
 - b. Amend the description of the character unit boundaries on its western side to read: “*Toe of the Slope Hill Foothills near the 380AMSL contour*”;
 - c. Amend the land use description to add reference to “*rural lifestyle*”;
 - d. Under settlement patterns, delete reference to Environment Court history and detail as to range of lot sizes;
 - e. Under proximity to key routes, note that the LCU is near Lower Shotover Road;
 - f. Under visibility/prominence, amend the first sentence to refer just to the western edge of the unit as being visually prominent, add reference to variability in visibility across the landscape and to visibility to elevated areas around the Basin;
 - g. In relation to views, amend reference to the western portion of the unit to refer to the western “*edge*”, and add reference to views of the Slope Hill ONL from public corridors through the unit;
 - h. In relation to complexity, add reference to vegetation and settlement patterning;
 - i. In relation to sense of place, add reference to rural residential landscape being well maintained and high quality, add reference to rural lifestyle landscape, add a description of elements creating a complex pattern of memorable places and well framed views to the surrounding ONLs and creating a distinct hidden landscape character. Delete reference to elevated portions being near its limit and to low lying stream valley area to the east providing a foil for more intensive rural residential landscape on the elevated slopes surrounding;
 - j. In relation to potential landscape issues and constraints, delete reference to DoC ownership and to Environment Court history, add reference to importance of proximate open views to Slope Hill;
 - k. In the category labelled potential landscape opportunities and benefits as notified, add reference to ecological opportunities in the subject matter column. In the second column, add reference to wetland restoration potential and to clustered development as an alternative to subdivision;
 - l. In relation to environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced, add reference to retention of existing open and approximate views to Slopehill;
 - m. Delete row of table related to capacity to absorb additional development.
1330. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr did not recommend any amendments to the description of LCU11.
1331. The submission was supported by expert landscape evidence from Mr Stephen Skelton and expert planning evidence from Mr Farrell. While Mr Skelton confirmed he supported the detailed amendments to the LCU11 description in the Slopehill Properties submission, his

⁶⁴⁹ Submission 2584: Supported by FS2719

evidence was not presented to us in the form of a commentary on those requested changes. We were left to infer connections between his evidence and those specific items of relief. Mr Farrell's evidence was similarly general in approach, relying on Mr Skelton's expert commentary.

1332. Clearly, many of the amendments sought to LCU11 reflect Mr Skelton's evidence that the boundary between LCU11 and LCU9 (Hawthorn Triangle) should be moved east to a ridge around the 400m contour. This issue is discussed in Report 18.5. Suffice it to say that given our conclusion in that report that the LCU boundary should not change, we can put those amendments to one side.
1333. Mr Skelton also disagreed with Ms Gilbert's view that LCU11 (and especially the land within the Wakatipu Equities site), has a low ability to absorb change and/or that the development on the Wakatipu Equities site would be highly visible and have significant adverse landscape and visual effects. As is discussed in greater detail in Report 18.5, Mr Skelton supported provision for additional development on the Wakatipu Equities site, albeit at a lower density than envisaged within the Precinct. He also identified scope for significant ecological enhancement opportunities across riparian areas within the landscape. He referred to kettle lakes and overland flow paths across LCU11 as having a high potential to display a higher level of nature conservation value and to more legibly display the landscape's forms and purposes.
1334. Ms Gilbert responded to Mr Skelton's evidence in rebuttal commenting:
- a. She considered there was a variable degree of visibility across the Wakatipu Equities land;
 - b. While both the Wakatipu Equities and the Slopehill Properties land are currently relatively well screened, much of that screening effect relies on vegetation on neighbouring properties;
 - c. Photographic evidence she provided demonstrated the highly variable degree of exposure and containment typical of much of LCU11;
 - d. The potential prominence of rural residential development on the Wakatipu Equities land from the Threepwood area together with the existing visibility of established rural residential development along Slopehill Road, the Queenstown Trail and Threepwood itself runs the risk of tipping the balance to a position where landscape character is dominated by rural residential development, undermining its role as a buffer between the intensive rural living development at Hawthorn Triangle and the northern end of Lake Hayes.
1335. With that evidence in mind, we make the following observations regarding the detailed amendments sought to LCU11:
- a. Mr Skelton's evidence did not, as far as we could identify, provide specific support for the suggested amendment to the description of vegetation patterns, and consequently we do not recommend that amendment;
 - b. The suggested amendment reflects Mr Skelton's evidence regarding the LCU11 boundary with LCU9 (although it identifies a different contour as the boundary). Given the conclusion in Report 18.5, we do not recommend this amendment be made;
 - c. The submission appears to draw a distinction between rural residential and rural lifestyle development, presumably based on the lower density of the latter in the rules of the Operative District Plan and the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1). That is not a distinction Mr Skelton drew in his evidence, which consistently referred to residential development. We do not recommend the suggested amendment.

- d. We did not identify any commentary in Mr Skelton’s evidence distinguishing older and new rural residential development that would support the suggested deletion of the adjective “*considerably*”. Although not mentioned by Mr Skelton (or Mr Farrell), we think the reference to Environment Court history is out of place and should be deleted, as sought. Mr Skelton did not comment on the detailed lot sizes, or explain why they should be deleted. We do not recommend any change to that aspect of LCU11.
- e. Neither Mr Farrell nor Mr Skelton commented on the extent to which Lower Shotover Road might be considered a popular vehicle route so as to provide a basis for the suggested amendment;
- f. The suggested amendments to the first sentence of this description reflect Mr Skelton’s evidence on the boundary of this LCU. As above, we need not consider it further. The evidence of both Mr Skelton and Ms Gilbert would, however, support addition of commentary as to the variability of visibility across the LCU. While Mr Skelton provides evidence of views from LCU11 up to Coronet Peak (suggesting visibility in the opposite direction), he does not directly comment on the extent of visibility from elevated areas in the manner the submission seeks to record, and so we do not recommend that change;
- g. Mr Skelton’s evidence supports the fact that there are important views of Slope Hill from within the LCU, albeit the evidence is limited as to the extent of those views other than at one specific location on Slopehill Road. We consider some reference to those views is appropriate. The suggestion that the first sentence of the description of views refer to the western edge is, once again, related to the boundary issue referred to above;
- h. Mr Skelton does not directly comment on the contribution settlement patterning makes to the complexity of the LCU. Adding reference to vegetation, as sought, would merely duplicate the existing second sentence. We do not recommend that the complexity description be altered.
- i. The suggested amendment to the sense of place description seeks to make the same distinction between rural residential and rural lifestyle landscapes as is discussed above. Mr Skelton did not comment on how well maintained the residential elements of the landscape are so as to provide a basis for comment on that. While not inconsistent with his evidence, Mr Skelton’s evidence likewise does not provide a basis for the balance of the additional text sought to be added under this heading. Mr Skelton’s evidence would, however, support the statements in the text that Slopehill Properties submission seeks to delete regarding areas of greater sensitivity within the LCU;
- j. As regards potential landscape issues and constraints, we did not identify specific support in the submitter’s evidence for any aspect of the relief in relation to this item. The exception is the suggested inclusion of reference to the importance of currently open views to Slope Hill⁶⁵⁰. Deletion of reference to views of the western slopes appears to be associated with the suggested shift in the LCU boundary discussed above;
- k. In relation to the suggested addition of reference to ecological opportunities, we do not support altering the table in this manner, for much the same reasons that we have recommended rejection of the NZTA and Transpower submissions as above. Schedule 24.8 seeks to provide information that will assist implementation of policies related to landscape character and visual amenity. As regards the suggested amendments to the text, once again, Mr Skelton’s evidence does not provide specific support for the suggested amendments and we therefore do not recommend they be made;

⁶⁵⁰ Refer Skelton Evidence in Chief at paragraph 33

- l. Mr Skelton’s evidence supported emphasis being placed on existing open views to Slope Hill. He describes one such view as being of particularly high value and as such it should be protected from the effects of further subdivision and development. We not do, however, think it is necessary to refer to those views as “*proximate*”. The location of the LCU means that the hill is necessarily nearby from all relevant locations.
- m. While Mr Skelton expresses disagreement with Ms Gilbert’s view that the LCU has a low capability to absorb additional development, his evidence provides no basis for deletion of all reference to absorption capability. Indeed, given its relevance to the objectives and policies of Chapter 24, we think that it is not desirable that it be deleted from this particular LCU, or generally. As regards what is recorded as the absorption capability, clearly there is a disagreement in the landscape evidence we heard. However, it seems to us that the very fact that Mr Skelton supports, in effect, no go areas, along with a reduced scale of development on the Wakatipu Equities site provides some support for Ms Gilbert’s concerns about the area having reached a tipping point.

1336. In summary, therefore we recommend the following amendments to the LCU11 Table:

- a. Amend the description of settlement patterns to delete the words “*Extensive Environment Court history*”;
- b. Insert a new sentence at the commencement of the visibility/prominence description: “*Visibility varies across the landscape unit.*”
- c. Add on the end of the second sentence of the views description “*..., as well as open views of the nearby Slope Hill ONF from some public locations*”;
- d. Amend the potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development description to add: “*Importance of existing open views to Slope Hill*”;
- e. Add to the environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced description: “*Retention of existing open views to Slope Hill*”.

In all other respects we recommend that LCU11 be retained as notified.

1337. Turning to LCU13 (Lake Hayes Slopes), this was the subject of submissions by the Donaldson group et al who sought:

- a. Amend the description of settlement patterns to record that landscaping is generally established and young, and add greater detail regarding typical lot sizes;
- b. Amend the description of sense of place to state only that the rural residential character results from legacy zonings and consents;
- c. In relation to potential landscape issues and constraints, delete reference to location being exposed, qualify visibility from key scenic routes, qualify the reference to absence of vegetation, delete reference to risk of perception of development sprawl and add reference to it being an established rural living area that is highly modified as a result of the legacy zonings and consents;
- d. In relation to the potential landscape opportunities and benefits, add reference to subdivision complementing existing rural living environment;
- e. Amend the capability to absorb additional development from “*low*” to “*high*” or “*moderately high*”.

1338. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr did not recommend any change to LCU13.

1339. The submissions on LCU 13 were supported by the expert landscape evidence of Mr Ben Espie who provided a point by point commentary on the suggested amendments in his evidence in chief.
1340. Ms Gilbert's response to Mr Espie in rebuttal is principally directed at Mr Espie's support for up-zoning to Precinct of land that was formerly zoned rural residential or rural lifestyle pursuant to the Operative District Plan. Mr Espie considered that those areas have a high absorption capacity due to the extent of existing development. Ms Gilbert disagreed on the basis that the existing development has been unsympathetic and additional development will exacerbate the adverse effects resulting from development.
1341. The zoning issue is addressed in our Report 18.6. Our conclusion there was that the existing development has had unsatisfactory landscape effects, leaving little or no room for additional development. Put another way, even if Mr Espie is correct and infill development will not make much of a difference, in our view, any exacerbation of the existing position is unacceptable.
1342. Turning to the specific amendments sought in the submission we make the following observations:
- a. The issue to us around the extent of existing landscaping is whether, as the landscaping matures, that position will improve. Mr Espie compared the Dalefield area as an established rural living area where landscaping provides for shelter and privacy. Ms Gilbert noted the sloping topography and the limited scope to mitigate effects if lot sizes are as small as 4000m². For present purposes, describing the pattern of settlement, there does not seem to be any dispute that newer dwellings are both larger scaled and currently very exposed. We recommend that is what the text should say. As regards lot sizes, we do not consider it says anything to record that lot sizes are in line with legacy zonings and consents. That will be the situation throughout the Wakatipu Basin. Given Mr Espie's confirmation that many sites are indeed between 4000m² and 2 hectares, we think that further detail could usually be supplied.
 - b. In relation to sense of place, Mr Espie does not appear to disagree with the description in the text as notified (namely that the area displays a relatively unsympathetic rural residential character that reads as development sprawl up the hillside). We do not see there being any value in recording that this has occurred as a result of former District Plan zonings and consents. Once again, whatever the situation, this will have been the result of former zonings and consents. We also consider that there is value in recording the exceptions to that description. In summary, we do not recommend an amendment to the sense of place description;
 - c. As regards potential landscape issues and constraints, Mr Espie's description was that the constraints essentially stem from visibility⁶⁵¹. As such, we think that there is merit in the point underlying some of the suggested amendments, but equally, the point is pushed too far in some cases. Hence, while not all of the LCU is exposed, based on the evidence we heard, clearly some of it is, and we consider that the description should say that. Equally, the submitter is correct, and the absence of vegetation is an issue in only part of the LCU, as demonstrated by the fact that the description of settlement patterns indicates that older dwellings are well integrated with vegetation. Likewise, we consider that a key

⁶⁵¹ B Espie, Evidence in Chief at 4.3(v)

landscape issue and constraint is created by the high level of modification already. We do not accept the suggested deletion of reference to exacerbating the perception of development sprawl is an issue. Given the common ground as between Mr Espie and Ms Gilbert on the unsympathetic nature of existing development, we think that inference readily follows. The suggestion that reference be made to visibility from “parts” of key scenic routes, while literally correct, is rather beside the point. However, some clarification might assist.

- d. While Mr Espie agreed with the suggested amendment, his focus appeared to be much more on the potential for infill development filling out existing developed areas than subdivision of larger lots. Confirming that position, Mr Espie suggested categorising the elevated sites as having a low capacity to absorb additional development. In the circumstances, we do not recommend any change to this description.
- e. As above, Mr Espie suggested that absorption capability be divided with existing developed areas on the lower slopes to the east of Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and on the existing developed area above the State Highway on the south side of Morven Hill should be categorised as “high”, with the balance of the LCU categorised as “low”. As discussed in Report 18.6, we prefer Ms Gilbert’s evidence that the extent and adverse effects from the existing development leave little or no capability to absorb further development.

1343. In summary, therefore, we recommend that:

- a. The last two sentences of the settlement patterns description be revised to read:

“Newer dwellings larger-scaled and generally very exposed with landscaping not providing material mitigation as at 2018.

Typical lot sizes: Almost all of the lots under 10ha with many lots down to around 4000m².”

- b. The potential landscape issues and constraints description be amended to read:

“Elevated and in many parts exposed location that is highly visible from the surrounding area, including from key scenic routes.

Steep topography. Absence of vegetation in some areas.

Highly modified rural living area with a risk of exacerbating perception of development sprawl.”

- c. Save as above, LCU13 be retained unamended.

1344. Ann Hamilton⁶⁵² sought that the development status of LCU17 (Morven Ferry) be rejected. The submission was unsupported by expert landscape evidence and therefore, to the extent that it relates to the text of Schedule 24.8 as opposed to the zoning of the Hamilton property, we recommend it be rejected.

1345. Turning to LCU18 (Morven Eastern Foothills), Morven Ferry Limited⁶⁵³ and Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE/ME Bunn & LA Green⁶⁵⁴ sought amendments to this LCU as follows:

⁶⁵² Submission 2261

⁶⁵³ Submission 2449: Supported by FS2734 and FS2749

⁶⁵⁴ Submission 2509: Supported by FS2734 and FS2743

- a. Amend the description of landform patterns to note that approximately half the area made up of flat alluvial terrace landform;
- b. Amend the hydrology description to include reference to the irrigation race;
- c. Amend settlement pattern description to add reference to dispersal of dwellings along pond edges and to vary the description of typical lot sizes, providing more detail on a range of smaller size lots;
- d. Delete reference to walkway/cycleway route as a potential landscape issue and constraint, qualify the description of sensitivity to additional development by the words "*in a general sense*";
- e. Amend the description of potential landscape opportunities and benefits to be more definite about the potential to absorb additional development;
- f. Amend the capability to absorb additional development to "*moderate-low*" from "*low*".

1346. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr did not recommend any changes to this LCU.

1347. Mr Espie gave expert landscape evidence on the matters raised in these submissions, but his primary focus was on the aspect of the submissions related to rezoning land owned by the submitters that is considered in Report 18.8. Mr Espie expressly recorded in his Evidence in Chief⁶⁵⁵ that he had only been asked to consider the landscape and visual effects of the proposed areas of zoning that the submissions sought and had not considered the various other changes to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan sought in the submissions. We noted one specific reference to potential changes to Schedule 24.8 in Mr Espie's evidence: he supported an amendment to the description of the capability to absorb additional development as moderate-low for reasons set out in more detail in his evidence, mainly related to a comparison with the adjacent LCU17.

1348. Unsurprisingly, Ms Mellso's rebuttal evidence for Council responding to Mr Espie was similarly focussed on the rezoning proposal and the ability of the land to absorb that proposal.

1349. As a result, we have limited material from which to conclude that any amendment to LCU18 is appropriate.

1350. More specifically:

- a. We did not identify any evidence that would enable us to add comment regarding the extent of presence of alluvial terrace landforms forming part of the LCU;
- b. While we noted the presence of an irrigation race during the course of our site visits, Schedule 24.8 has not generally recorded the presence of irrigation races. It would be inconsistent to identify an irrigation race at this particular location;
- c. We had no evidence of the location of dwellings in relation to pond edges and we did not observe dwellings being located next to ponds during our site visit. The other changes requested to the settlement patterns description appear to be issues of emphasis. Again, we did not identify any evidence that would support the suggested changes and we decline to recommend them;
- d. Although not specifically addressed in evidence, the suggested deletion of reference to a popular walkway/cycleway route is consistent with both legal submissions and evidence we heard that insofar as the Queenstown Trail traverses the LCU, it is a "*trail*" as defined

⁶⁵⁵ At paragraph 4.1

and accordingly not a “public place” for the purposes of assessment of the effects of development. While we discussed with counsel at the hearing whether, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan, section 7 of the Act might require consideration of amenity values from trails, that issue now needs to be considered in the light of the Court of Appeal’s decision in *RJ Davidson Family Trust v Marlborough District Council*⁶⁵⁶, which in our view, supports the submitters’ argument that the walkway/cycleway should not be taken into account insofar as it is a “trail”. More problematically though, not all of the walkway/cycleway is in that category. The information supplied to us by the submitter under cover of Counsel’s memorandum dated 26 July 2018 indicates that while that part of the Queenstown Trail located to the west of Morven Ferry Road is a “trail”, the part of the Trail to the east of Morven Ferry Road is variously on public road and Crown land and accordingly is not a trail as defined. The upshot is that some additional comment is required, but it would not be appropriate to delete all reference to the walkway/cycleway route. We do not think adding the words “in a general sense” to that description would add materially to its clarity;

- e. As for the last point, given our conclusion in Report 18.8 that one part of the LCU is suitable for up-zoning to Precinct, some amendment is justified in our view;
- f. As regards the capability to absorb additional development, Mr Espie’s reasoning was based on a comparison with the adjacent LCU. As Ms Gilbert made it clear when she introduced the WB Landscape Study process, apportionment of these weightings reflected a scale across the entire Basin. To conclude that this particular classification was incorrect would have required, in our view, a similar broad-scale analysis. Even comparing LCU17, as Mr Espie accepted, the foothills of LCU18 are less developed and more natural than LCU17. That accords with our own observation. We also noted its visibility from a popular public view for tourists adjacent to Chain Bay 4 on the Crown Range Road. We agree with Mr Espie that the particular characteristics of the LCU west of Morven Ferry Road provide opportunities for well-placed development, but looked at as a whole, we consider the LCU is correctly categorised as having a low absorption capability.

1351. Accordingly, we recommend the following amendments to LCU18:

- a. Amend the description of potential landscape issues and constraints to read:

“The visibility of the unit from public roads and vantage points and from parts of the Queenstown Trail located on Crown land, its very close proximity to ONLs and ONFs, together with the role of the area as a transition between the mountain ONL and the lower-lying and more ‘developed’ river terrace to the north and east, makes it sensitive to additional development”.

- b. Amend the description of potential landscape opportunities and benefits to read:

“Hummocky landform on western side of Morven Ferry Road, and vegetation patterns on eastern side of Morven Ferry Road provide some potential to absorb additional development within the unit.”

⁶⁵⁶ [2018] NZCA 316

1352. We record also the submission of Anthony Ward⁶⁵⁷ that sought that LCU18 be amended “*to show the Land can absorb the effects of further rural living subdivision and development*”.
1353. The submission is not specific as to how precisely this should be done, and Mr Ward did not appear at the hearing to elucidate.
1354. We consider that this suggested amendment will also address Mr Ward’s submission, at least in part.
1355. BSTGT Limited ⁶⁵⁸ sought that LCU20 (Crown Terrace) be amended “*so as to not unduly preclude or disenable land use, subdivision or development within the landscape unit where the effects of such activities can be appropriately managed.*” This submitter appeared through counsel at the hearing. Counsel’s submissions, however, were focussed on a different aspect of Chapter 24 and provided no input as to what if any amendments were sought to LCU20.
1356. LCU20 is assessed in Schedule 24.8 as having a very low capability to absorb additional development. While, on the face of the matter, that assessment has the potential to make it difficult to undertake land use, subdivision or development, that is an expert landscape assessment which will not unduly preclude or disenable development whose effects can be appropriately managed (to use the wording of the submission).
1357. Accordingly, we do not recommend any change to LCU20.
1358. Trojan Helmet Limited⁶⁵⁹ sought deletion of LCU22 from Schedule 24.8 consequent on the new zone the submitter sought for the land. As discussed in Report 18.7, we do not recommend that relief be accepted. Accordingly, we need to consider the alternative relief in the submission. The submitter noted that it generally supported the LCU22 description subject to specific changes, as follows:
- a. Delete reference to consented but unbuilt platforms and the description of typical lot sizes in the settlement patterns description;
 - b. Amend the visibility/prominence description to qualify the description of visibility and prominence from the western edge of Arrowtown;
 - c. In the description of views, amend use of the word “*area*” to substitute “*unit*” and note that the Arrow South Special Zone appears in the foreground of most views from western Arrowtown;
 - d. Amend the current sense of place description to delete reference to golf courses containing the western and southern edges of Arrowtown;
 - e. In the description of potential landscape issues and constraints, delete reference to limited further capability for development as a result of private golf course and recent resource consent processes, and qualify the description of the potential for development to compromise the land pattern;
 - f. In the description of potential landscape opportunities and benefits, add reference to the potential for development to be accommodated to a reasonably high level in the golf

⁶⁵⁷ Submission 2244

⁶⁵⁸ Submission 2487: Supported by FS2782

⁶⁵⁹ Submission 2387: Supported by FS2701, FS2716, FS2733 and FS2769

- course landscape and to the ability of the landform and vegetation to absorb well sited buildings. Delete reference to potential for subdivision as a result of the size of lots;
- g. In the description of environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced, amend the first sentence so it is more specifically related to views from Arrowtown and adjacent roads.
1359. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr recommended the amendment sought to the visibility/prominence description as above, but did not recommend any other changes to LCU22.
1360. The expert landscape evidence of Ms Pflüger for the submitter did not explicitly reference the amendments sought in the submission to Schedule 24.8, being much more focussed on the submitter's proposal for a new development zone on the land. However, from the case that was advanced in support of the submitter's primary relief the rationale for the suggested changes is reasonably obvious in most cases.
1361. Addressing each point in turn:
- a. Counsel for the submitter, Ms Wolt, confirmed to us that the current position is that with two dwellings having been built and other dwelling sites overtaken by development of a 9 hole golf course, there are now 10 unimplemented dwelling consents that will lapse in 2019⁶⁶⁰ if not implemented in the meantime. Given the imminent lapse of those consents, we tend to agree that there is little point in noting their existence: either they will be utilised in the short term or they will lapse (more likely the latter in view of the scale of the development plans presented to us).
 - b. The visibility analysis evidence presented by Mr Tyler supports the amendment suggested under the visibility/prominence description. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr likewise support the suggested amendment and we agree that it is appropriate.
 - c. We agree that it is more appropriate to refer to the "unit", rather than the "area". The suggested reference to the visibility of the Arrow South Special Zone is, in our view overstated. Ms Pflüger provided us with two site context photographs from the elevated parts of western Arrowtown, one of which had the Arrow South Special Zone in the foreground, and one of which did not. Having said that, we think that some reference to the expansion of Arrowtown and its impact on views from the existing developed area of Arrowtown is justified;
 - d. We did not note evidence that would suggest that the existing text related to "sense of place" is inappropriate. The suggested amendment fails to describe the role of the golf courses in contributing to sense of place. We do not recommend that the existing text be changed;
 - e. The submitter obviously has plans for further development, but we think the existing text is factually incorrect: the resource consents for further residential subdivision and development held by the submitter have a no further subdivision covenant, suggesting limited scope for further development. That said, we consider that some clarification might be warranted. We consider it unnecessary to qualify the reference to adverse effects from accessways and large-scale buildings. They are already stated to be "potential" effects;

⁶⁶⁰ The copy of the relevant consents (RM081223 and RM081224) subsequently supplied to us indicates the expiry date is 4 June 2019

- f. We consider that the reference to further development sought needs to be qualified. The evidence we heard suggested that there is potential for a resort development on the site. Ms Gilbert described it as a “*good candidate*” for that use. The suggested addition of reference to the ability to absorb well-sited buildings is effectively expanding and clarifying the existing text referring to the integration potential of landform patterns. We think that some expansion of that text is justified.
- g. We do not understand the rationale for deleting reference to a potential for subdivision. The consent that has already been granted would support the existing text.
- h. While we agree that a reference to buildings being “*visually discreet*” might warrant clarification, we had no clear evidence as to what might be substituted. The visual amenity evidence of Ms Pflüger presenting us with view from Feehley’s Hill would suggest that the views from Arrowtown and adjacent roads are not the sole focus. We do not recommend that the existing text be amended.

1362. For these reasons, we recommend the following amendments to LCU22:

- a. Under settlement patterns delete reference to consented but unbuilt platforms and amend the final sentence to read:

“Typical lot sizes – one large lot of approximately 100ha, a number of smaller lots”;

- b. Under visibility/prominence, amend the second sentence to read:

“The relatively close proximity and (reasonably) similar elevation means that part of the unit is prominent in the outlook while the hummocky terrain limits visibility to other parts.”

- c. Under views, substitute “*unit*” for “*area*” in the first two sentences. Add a new sentence prior to the final sentence worded:

“The Arrowtown South Special Zone appears in the foreground of views west from the southern end of Cotter Avenue”.

- d. Amend the first sentence of the description of potential landscape issues and constraints to read:

“Private golf courses and previous resource consent processes suggest limited scope for residential development.”

- e. Amend the potential opportunities and benefits description to read:

*“Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (due to landform and, to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns).
 Golf course landscape potentially suited to resort development.
 Landform pattern creates potential to integrate well sited buildings into the landscape;
 Riparian restoration potential;
 Integration of walkways/cycleways;
 Close proximity to Arrowtown;
 Large-scaled lots suggest some potential for subdivision.”*

1363. Save as recommended above, we recommend LCU22 remain as notified.

1364. Turning to LCU24 (Arrowtown South) this was the subject of two submissions. First, that of Roger Monk⁶⁶¹ sought:
- a. Delete from the sense of place description the following sentence:

“However, this ‘greenbelt’ effect, together with legibility of the escarpment as a robust defensible edge to Arrowtown has been significantly compromised by the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent and sizeable part of the unit.”
 - b. In the potential landscape opportunities and benefits description, substitute “Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village” for “Queenstown Country Club”.
1365. Boxer Hills Trust⁶⁶² also sought additional detailed changes to LCU24 as follows:
- a. Under Land Uses, refer to residential uses;
 - b. Under settlement patterns, amend to refer to the Arrow South Special Zone and add reference to rural residential land being anticipated south of McDonnell Road;
 - c. Under visibility/prominence, delete reference to relative elevations;
 - d. Under views, add reference to the visibility of the Arrowsouth Special Zone;
 - e. Under potential landscape opportunities and benefits, substitute reference to the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village as per Mr Monk’s submission.
1366. Ms Gilbert and Mr Barr did not recommend any amendment to LCU24.
1367. Although Mr Monk appeared at the hearing both in his own capacity and on behalf of the Morven Residents Association⁶⁶³, he did not address the particular points related to Schedule 24.8 in his submission.
1368. Ms Pflüger gave evidence for Boxer Hills Trust and commented on LCU24 as part of her evidence. She considered the description of the LCU as being generally accurate in terms of the anticipated visual effects of consented development. However, she expressed the view that development within the Arrow South Special Zone will lead to a blurring/extension of the Urban Growth boundary along McDonnell Road.
1369. Ms Pflüger also commented that the description of visibility and prominence is in her words “*somewhat incorrect*” as the Arrowtown Escarpment is elevated in comparison to McDonnell Road.
1370. Addressing first Mr Monk’s requested deletion of reference to the effect of the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village on the sense of place provided by the LCU, the expert landscape and planning evidence we heard did not support deletion of the existing description. Far from it. There appeared to be a strong consensus that the approval of the SHA and construction of the retirement village (which was underway at the time of our hearing) had indeed compromised the concept of a defensible edge to Arrowtown. The only question was the

⁶⁶¹ Submission 2281: Supported by FS2769, FS2795 and FS2796

⁶⁶² Submission 2386: Supported by FS2769

⁶⁶³ Submission 2469

extent to which this had occurred and its implications for potential development on other sites within the unit. Ms Pflüger, for instance, described it as the first and deepest cut. Mr Stephen Skelton, giving evidence for Waterfall Park Developments Limited, described the horse as having bolted. Mr Langman gave evidence that the retirement village had compromised both the UGB and the defensibility of the urban boundary of Arrowtown. By contrast, and somewhat less pessimistically, Ms Mellsop's expert landscape evidence for Council was that the retirement village was an isolated anomaly of urban development. Suffice it to say that considerably more could have been written as to the implications of the retirement village, but we consider that there is no basis to delete the existing discussion.

1371. By contrast, Mr Monk (and Boxer Hills Trust) were clearly correct and the reference in the potential landscape opportunities and benefits section to the Queenstown Country Club is a typographical error. It should refer to the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village.
1372. As regards the balance of the Boxer Hills Trust submission points, the suggested amendment to the land use description to incorporate reference to residential development was not the subject of specific evidence, as far as we could see, and our interpretation of the LCU map is that the residential area within the Arrowtown South Special Zone is outside the LCU. Accordingly, we do not recommend that that aspect of LCU24 be amended.
1373. As regards reference to the Special Zone in the settlement patterns description, the correct name is "*Arrowtown South Special Zone*". We recommend that that is what is referred to.
1374. As regards the suggested inclusion of reference to rural residential development being anticipated south of McDonnell Road, we think the specificity of the suggested amendment goes too far. While this is the relief that Boxer Hills Trust sought for its land and, as per Report 18.7 we have recommended that it be granted in part, it does not apply to other sites on McDonnell Road. However, we think that it is untenable not to acknowledge the implications of the retirement village for the development pattern on the south side of McDonnell Road.
1375. Turning to the description of visibility/prominence, Ms Pflüger's evidence supports the suggested amendment. During our site visits, we observed the difference in elevation. To say that the elevations are reasonably similar is rather a stretch.
1376. We think that reference might be made to the Arrowtown South Special Zone in the views section, but not in the manner Boxer Hills Trust have suggested. The special zone will not be as visible as the retirement village. Nor will it be visible from the same vantage points. We think a discrete sentence is required.
1377. In terms of the potential landscape issues and constraints, based on the evidence we heard, we think that the deletion sought by Boxer Hills Trust would go too far but equally, the existing text is untenable given the acknowledged effect of the retirement village and our recommendations regarding Precinct development in this area. We consider that further amendments are required.
1378. In summary, we recommend that LCU24 be amended in the following respects:
 - a. In the settlement patterns description, amend the first sentence to commence:

"The Arrowtown South Special Zone anticipates...".

- b. Add a sentence on the end:

“The Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village will have implications for future settlement patterns for the land around it south and west of McDonnell Road.”

- c. In the visibility/prominence description, delete the words *“and (reasonably) similar higher elevation”* from the second sentence.
- d. In the potential landscape issues and constraints description, amend the text to read as follows:

*“Extent to which the unit can continue to operate as a ‘greenbelt’ to Arrowtown.
Role of the escarpment as an edge to the village;
Ensuring urban residential development is constrained within defensible boundaries and does not sprawl westwards and southwards in an uncontrolled manner across ‘more rural’ areas.”*

- e. Amend the potential landscape opportunities and benefits description to substitute *“Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village”* for *“Queenstown Country Club”*.

1379. Otherwise, we recommend that Schedule 24.8 remain as notified.

1380. Summarising our conclusions, we consider that for the reasons we have discussed, the revised version of Schedule 24.8 is the most appropriate manner to achieve the objectives of Chapter 24 given the alternatives open to us.

4. CONSEQUENTIAL VARIATIONS

4.1 Variation to Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Chapter 22

1381. As part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1), variations were notified to the Stage 1 Chapter 22: Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle. These variations were consequential in nature, following rezoning of land under Chapter 24 that was formerly the subject of rules in Chapter 22.

1382. More specifically:

- a. Two paragraphs were deleted from Part 22.1 Zone Purpose. Those paragraphs referred to the Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) Zone at Dalefield and the Rural Lifestyle Zoned land in and adjacent to the ‘Hawthorn Triangle’;
- b. Provision 22.3.2.9 was amended to delete reference to tables related to the Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer Zones at Dalefield and the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-zone. Consequential amendments were made to other table numbers;
- c. Rule 22.5.4.3 related to the Rural Residential Zone at the north of Lake Hayes was deleted;
- d. Table 3 incorporating Rules 22.5.14 to 22.5.18 that related to the Rural Residential Deferred Buffer Zones were deleted;
- e. Table 6 incorporating Rules 22.5.33 to 22.5.37 related to the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-zone were deleted;
- f. A concept development plan previously located at Provision 22.7.2 for the Rural Residential Ferry Hill Sub-zone was deleted.

1383. Mr Barr reported in his Section 42A Report⁶⁶⁴ that he had not identified any submissions specifically on these provisions. That was also our observation. There are submissions on aspects of Chapter 22, but those submissions related to provisions not the subject of variation and are accordingly out of scope.

1384. To the extent that the provisions the subject of variation are addressed by more general submissions seeking rejection of the variation and substitution of either the Operative District Plan or the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1), those submissions have been addressed in section 2.4 of this Report. Accordingly, we recommend that the variations to Chapter 22 provisions notified as part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) and summarised above be confirmed save for a minor change: to fit within the numbering of the decisions version of Chapter 22, the variation to Provision 22.3.2.10 should in fact be to Provision 22.3.2.9, and reference needs to be added to the Rural Residential Zone at Camp Hill to properly fit into that part of the Plan.

4.2 Variation to definition of Site – Chapter 2

1385. The Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) included a variation deleting the existing Stage 1 definition of “site” and substituting a new definition. The key aspect of the varied definition is that a statement that formerly recorded that a site included the airspace above the land and that, in a situation where what would otherwise be one site is divided by a zone boundary or the District boundary, separate sites are thereby created, was deleted. The ambit of the site in unit title and cross lease developments was also expanded.

1386. The sole submission on the Stage 1 definition was from Paterson Pitts⁶⁶⁵ that sought the definition refer to the Unit Title Act 2010 or any replacement thereof.

1387. When the varied definition was notified, Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)⁶⁶⁶ opposed Part (c) of the definition⁶⁶⁷ and the removal of Part 4 (iii)(b) of the previous Stage 1 definition⁶⁶⁸. The submitter stated that it was not clear what the implications of these changes was and how removing clarification over split zonings will affect subdivision of land (and minimum lot sizes over land with dual zoning). The submission sought that the reasoning for these aspects of the definition be clarified.

1388. Arcadian Triangle Limited⁶⁶⁹ expressed concerns about the revised definition questioning whether:

- a. Removal of the air space from the definitions had been thought through;
- b. Removal of the provisions relating to a site being crossed by a zone boundary or a district boundary had been fully thought through;
- c. The changes related to unit titles would have what is assumed to be the desired outcome.

1389. The revised definition was also the subject of a submission from Federated Farmers⁶⁷⁰ supporting the proposed change.

⁶⁶⁴ At Section 33

⁶⁶⁵ Submission 370

⁶⁶⁶ Submission 2457

⁶⁶⁷ Identifying when subsoil and/or airspace form part of a site, as defined

⁶⁶⁸ The part of the definition previously providing for the situation of sites crossed by a zone boundary

⁶⁶⁹ Submission 2504

⁶⁷⁰ Submission 2540

1390. Mr Barr advised that the notified definition is in the same terms as that in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
1391. Mr Barr noted that the zone boundaries had been identified for the landscape reasons and not for the purpose of recognising the existing or approved legal boundaries. He considered it incongruent given the purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone that small areas of land zoned Rural Amenity can be treated as a separate site.
1392. While Mr Barr felt that the recommended revisions to Chapter 24 would address the anomalies thereby created by having such sites, he noted that the revised definition also addressed potential issues arising in other zones.
1393. Mr Barr noted also that this particular aspect of the definition of site had been the subject of comment in Stage 1 Reports.
1394. As regards to the Arcadian Triangle submission regarding airspace, Mr Barr drew to our attention that the definition of “*land*” in the Act includes the airspace above land. Accordingly, in his view, airspace does not need to be specified in the definition.
1395. Addressing these matters in reverse order, we agree with the latter point. Because the definition of “*site*” means an area of land, it necessarily includes the air space above that land. Part (c) of the definition (which Patterson Pitts queried) provides clarification as to when airspace does not fall within the definition of “*site*”.
1396. As regards deletion of the deemed site provision, we consider that creation of a “*site*” as a result of arbitrary divisions of land for reasons that have nothing to do with the requirements of subdivision is fundamentally unsatisfactory. No consideration will have been given to standard subdivision issues such as access and infrastructure. There is a very real potential for such deemed sites to be landlocked, creating issues for their future use.
1397. While Mr Barr recommended provisions that might have addressed the status quo definition, we have recommended provisions facilitating development of sites that do not meet the desired density requirements under Chapter 24 in the knowledge that the revised definition would not arbitrarily create small sites.
1398. In summary, we support the proposed definition in that regard.
1399. Lastly, as regards the submission from Paterson Pitts as part of the Stage 1 process, we note that section 22 of the Interpretation Act 1999 has the effect that if the Unit Titles Act 2010 is replaced, the definition will be taken to refer to the replacement act.
1400. In summary, we do not regard any of the issues that have been raised in submissions regarding the revised definition as being material. Further, for the reasons set out above, we consider that there is good reason to amend the definition in the manner proposed. We recommend that the revised definition be retained as notified, save only to correct the cross reference to

section 37 of the Building Act that (as Mr Barr noted in his reply evidence⁶⁷¹) should refer to section 75 of that Act.

4.3 Variation to Subdivision and Development Chapter 27

1401. The Proposed District Plan (Stage 2) included a number of variations to Chapter 27, which governs subdivision and development and which forms part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1). The notified variations included:
- a. Two new non-complying activity rules in notified Rule 27.4.2 related to the further subdivision of an allotment that has previously been used to calculate the minimum average lot size for subdivision in the Precinct (Rule 27.4.2(g)), the subdivision of an existing or approved residential flat from the primary residential unit and the subdivision of a second residential unit on any allotment in the Rural Amenity Zone or the Precinct (Rule 27.4.2(h));
 - b. A new restricted discretionary activity rule was inserted into Rule 27.4.3 providing for subdivision in the Rural Amenity Zone or the Precinct meeting the density standards in Part 27.5;
 - c. Amendments to Part 27.5 introducing said density standards, being 80 hectares in the Rural Amenity Zone and “6000m²/1.0 ha average” in the Precinct, and deleting the density standards formerly applying in the Rural Lifestyle Deferred A and B, Rural Lifestyle Buffer and Rural Residential Ferry Hill Sub-zone;
 - d. Deleting Objective 27.7.6 and Policy 27.7.6.1 related to the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-Zone;
 - e. Inserting a new restricted discretionary activity rule as Rule 27.7.6.1 governing subdivision in the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct;
 - f. Introducing a new 27.7.6.2 providing assessment matters for the new restricted discretionary activity rule as above;
 - g. Deleting Part 27.8.6, being location specific standards for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-zone;
 - h. Deleting the concept development plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-Zone from Part 27.13.1.
1402. We should note at the outset that the Decisions Version of Chapter 27 was significantly rearranged from the notified version, with the result that the numbering in the variation no longer corresponds with the numbering in the Chapter, either as regards the provisions proposed to be deleted, or the required location of new provisions. To avoid confusion, we will identify at the commencement of our discussion of each set of provisions both the numbering as notified, and the consequential renumbering in the Decisions Version of Chapter 27. Our final recommendations for provisions to be deleted or added will likewise identify both the numbering of the notified provision and its numbering in the Decisions Version.
1403. There were a large number of submissions on the subdivision-related aspects of the variations we heard. Many of those submissions formed part of larger opposition to the underlying principles of Chapter 24 that we have discussed and made recommendations on in Section 2.4 of our report. We do not propose to repeat our discussion of the conclusions we came to there in relation to suggested consequential changes to Chapter 27, but rather to focus this part of our report on submissions specifically directed at aspects of the variations to Chapter 27 summarised above.

⁶⁷¹ At 12.17

1404. Considering first notified Rule 27.4.2(g), the Morcom et al group of submissions sought that this be amended so that the minimum and average size of lots in previous subdivisions would be taken into account.
1405. Morven Ferry et al sought that reference to the minimum lot size be deleted and that additional words be added reading:
- “..., except in the instance that the further subdivision and any prior subdivision together, complies with Rule 27.5.1”.*
1406. Dennison and Grant⁶⁷² sought that this rule not apply to the area zoned North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone under the Operative District Plan or alternatively⁶⁷³ that if dwellings have been approved in accordance with the permitted minimum density, then further subdivision of those units be subject to the same status as any other subdivision (i.e. restricted discretionary as notified).
1407. Mr Barr’s initial reaction (in his Section 42A Report) was not to recommend changes to this rule from the notified version, on the basis that it could result in areas that were set aside as part of the balancing of effects and enabling of development as part of a prior subdivision consent to be developed or subdivided at a subsequent stage. He regarded a non-complying activity consent as appropriate to ensure that there is adequate breadth for decision makers to consider whether the objectives or Chapter 24 would be undermined by a further subdivision.
1408. Mr Barr also recommended rejection of the Morven Ferry et al submission seeking deletion of reference to minimum lot size, regarding that as associated with the submitters’ request to delete minimum lot sizes requirements from both the Precinct and the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone.
1409. This rule was the subject of expert planning evidence from Ms Amanda Leith for D Hamilton and L Hayden⁶⁷⁴. Ms Leith’s evidence was that Rule 27.4.2(g) as notified would result in landowners not being able to subdivide in a staged manner over time. She provided the example of the Hamilton/Hayden block which is over 21 hectares in area. As Ms Leith observed, if it was the subject of an initial subdivision to create a single one hectare lot for legitimate reasons such as housing a family member, any subsequent subdivision would be considered as non-complying. Ms Nicole Sedgley, giving evidence for Dalefield Trustees Limited⁶⁷⁵, drew our attention to the same problem. Ms Sedgley observed that Rule 27.5.21 in the Decisions Version of Chapter 27 goes only part way to addressing the issue because it does not allow for land that has been up-zoned over time.

⁶⁷² Submission 2301: Supported by FS2745, FS2795 and FS2796. See also United Estates Ranch (#2026) to the same effect

⁶⁷³ Although the submission is directed at Rule 27.4.2(h), the subject matter indicates that it relates to the previous rule

⁶⁷⁴ Submission 2422

⁶⁷⁵ Submission 2097

1410. Having reflected on the issue in the light of Ms Leith’s pre-circulated evidence, Mr Barr shifted his position in his rebuttal evidence to one of recommending the amendment sought by Morven Ferry et al be made in order to address the problem Ms Leith had outlined.
1411. We agree with Mr Barr’s recommendation in this regard. While sequential subdivision applications are a potential issue, if the retention of balance lots of a particular size is important to the grant of subdivision, this could be secured by way of consent notice.
1412. The Stream 4 Hearing Panel sought to address the issue with rewording of what is now Rule 27.5.21 but, as Ms Sedgley observed, that particular approach fails to address the situation where density rules have been relaxed over time.
1413. We therefore consider that the wording recommended by Mr Barr is preferable. We do disagree with Mr Barr in one respect though. Mr Barr regarded the suggestion that reference to minimum lot sizes in this rule be deleted as related to the broader submission to delete that requirement from the density standards. We do not think that is necessarily the case. We cannot conceive how an allotment might be used to calculate the minimum lot size for a subdivision. The minimum lot size is not “*calculated*” in any meaningful sense. We note also that the comparable Rule 27.5.21 relates only to average density requirements.
1414. We consider that Mr Barr’s reasoning addresses the Dennison and Grant submission.
1415. The Morcom et al submission would result in the provision being framed more as a policy than a rule and we do not think would be satisfactory.
1416. The last thing that we need to consider is where this rule fits into the restructured Decisions Version of Chapter 27. We agree with Mr Barr’s suggestion that it would fit neatly into Chapter 27 as new Rule 27.5.26. Amendment is also required to the rule because the cross reference is now incorrect; it should be to Rule 27.6.1 as a result of the restructuring of Chapter 27 in the Decisions Version. Accordingly, we recommend that it be worded as follows:
- “The further subdivision of an allotment that has previously been used to calculate the average lot size for subdivision in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, except in the instance that the further subdivision and any prior subdivision, together, complies with Rule 27.6.1.*”
1417. Turning to Notified Rule 27.4.2(h), Mr Barr noted the submission by Morven Ferry et al as having sought deletion of the second part of the rule related to subdivision of a second residential unit.
1418. Mr Barr recommended that this submission might be accepted in part, consequential on his recommendation that multiple residential units might be acceptable if the relevant density standards are achieved⁶⁷⁶, Mr Barr suggested that Notified Rule 27.4.2(h) might be subsumed into Rule 27.5.22 and suggested amended wording for Rule 27.5.22 accordingly.

⁶⁷⁶ At 12.19

1419. We have two problems with that suggestion. Firstly, the varied rule is specific to the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct. Insofar as Rule 27.5.22 applies in other zones, amendments to it are out of scope.
1420. Even more substantively, we think that Mr Barr had the wrong rule. The relevant rule in the Decisions Version is 27.5.23 which relates to the subdivision of a residential flat from a residential unit. The activity status is non-complying.
1421. We think that put alongside that rule, and bearing in mind Mr Barr's reasoning summarised above (with which we agree), the notified Rule 27.4.2(h) is simply unnecessary. Existing Rule 27.5.23 already covers the point.
1422. In summary, we recommend that notified Rule 27.4.2(h) be deleted.
1423. Next, we consider notified Restricted Discretionary Rule 27.4.3(b). We consider it together with the suggested Rule 27.7.6.1. Mr Barr noted submissions by Morven Ferry et al as having sought amendments to these rules in order that subdivision within the Precinct be considered as a controlled activity. We observe that Crown Investments et al, as well as a number of other submitters, made similar submissions.
1424. As Mr Barr noted, the issue of subdivision activity status in rural living zones was the subject of extensive examination in the Stream 4 hearing and the Hearing Panel recommended⁶⁷⁷ that subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential Zones be a Restricted Discretionary Activity. In the Rural Lifestyle Zone, the relevant rule⁶⁷⁸ included discretion over buildings within building platforms in respect of their external appearance, visibility from public places, landscape character and visual amenity. As we have noted earlier, there is no comparable matter of discretion in notified Rule 27.7.6.1.
1425. Counsel for a number of the Crown Investments et al parties sought to persuade us that notwithstanding the recommendations in Report 7, there was no justification for not making subdivision in the Precinct a controlled activity. This argument was put on three alternative premises:
- a. The areas concerned are zoned for further rural living and development;
 - b. The Wakatipu Basin is distinctly different in character to other areas that were the subject of the Hearing Panel's recommendations at Stage 1;
 - c. Restricted discretionary status for rural living subdivision has been appealed.
1426. Addressing each of these points in turn, we have been at pains to emphasise that while rural living and development is anticipated as occurring within the Precinct, not all of the land zoned Precinct will be suitable for that use, because not all of it will be able to absorb development to the requisite standard.

⁶⁷⁷ Report 7, section 2.1

⁶⁷⁸ Decisions Version Rule 27.5.8

1427. The submission that the Wakatipu Basin is distinctly different to other areas fails on the evidence. Mr Ferguson gave evidence for the same parties as counsel was representing, and stated his view as being⁶⁷⁹:

"I consider that there is nothing inherent to the attributes of the Lifestyle Precinct that would distinguish this area from other similar zones such as the rural residential or rural lifestyle Zones such that less onerous activity status for subdivision could be justified."

1428. We agree with that assessment. If anything, we think it is understated. Given Ms Gilbert's evidence, there would be a case for more onerous provisions governing subdivision in the Precinct, compared to Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones outside the Wakatipu Basin.

1429. As to the fact that the recommendations of the Stream 4 Hearing Panel have been appealed, we repeat our observation that it would be inappropriate for us to second guess what conclusions the Environment Court might come to on the appeals before it. For our part, the issues are extensively reviewed in Report 7. We have no reason to come to a different view as regards the appropriate activity status for subdivision in the Precinct.

1430. Mr Barr recommended that Rule 27.4.3(b) and Provision 27.7.6.1 might be collapsed together in the restructured Decisions Version Chapter 27 as new Rule 27.5.9. We agree with that approach.

1431. The only submission we noted on the matters of discretion in notified Rule 27.7.6.1 (now recommended to be 27.5.9) is that of Otago Fish and Game Council⁶⁸⁰ that sought addition of a further matter of discretion being:

"Adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystems services and nature conservation values".

1432. This was said in the submission to align with the objectives and policies in Chapter 24.

1433. Given the terms of recommended Policy 24.2.4.1, the submitter is on strong grounds. It is also relevant, we believe, to note there were no submissions specifically on Policy 24.2.4.1 that sought to query its relevance or qualify its ambit. Mr Barr discussed this addition under the mistaken belief that the submitter sought that it be an additional assessment matter in 27.7.6.2. He did not regard it as appropriate for that purpose. We tend to agree with his reasoning, but we consider that given the terms of policy 24.2.4.1, it should be a matter of discretion.

1434. Accordingly, we recommend that notified Rule 27.7.6.1 be inserted into Chapter 27 as renumbered Rule 27.5.9 as notified except that the matters of discretion should have added to them a new (r):

"Adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values."

⁶⁷⁹ Ferguson Evidence in Chief at 136

⁶⁸⁰ Submission 2455: Opposed by FS2746

1435. As above, given the overlap between the two provisions, notified Rule 27.4.3(b) should be deleted.
1436. The next provision requiring consideration is the notified amendment to Rule 27.5.1.
1437. Considering the submissions on these provisions, we put to one side the submissions seeking fundamental changes to the approach to subdivision that would involve there being no specific minimum density or a specified density that was so much smaller than that proposed as to be an entirely different approach⁶⁸¹.
1438. We also put to one side submissions seeking specified density rules on individual sites or small numbers of sites. We regard such submissions⁶⁸² as effectively being rezoning submissions that need to be treated as such.
1439. Most of the remaining submissions relate to the minimum lot size and minimum average lot size in the Precinct Sub-Zone.
1440. There were a variety of alternatives suggested. Some had a geographical approach such as the group of submissions⁶⁸³ seeking a minimum lot size of 8000m² in the area north of Lake Hayes (rather than 6000m² as notified).
1441. At least one submission⁶⁸⁴ opposed the intensification of development enabled in the Precinct more generally. Another submission⁶⁸⁵ sought an increase of the minimum average density in the Precinct to 4ha, referencing that as being the status quo in the Littles Road area.
1442. Most of the submissions, however, sought smaller minima:
- a. A group of submissions⁶⁸⁶ seeking a minimum of 4000m² in the Precinct;
 - b. Roger Monk⁶⁸⁷ who sought a Precinct average of 4000m²;
 - c. Scott Carran who sought a Precinct average of 8,000m².
1443. A more complex approach was taken by a number of submissions in the Donaldson et al group, together with the Morven Ferry et al group, who sought two sub-zones within the Precinct, an A Zone with a one hectare average and no minimum allotment size and a B Zone with a minimum allotment size of 4000m² or an average lots size of 4000m² with no minimum.
1444. Having reviewed the submissions, Mr Barr recommended that greater flexibility could be achieved by retaining the 6000m² minimum lot size, but providing that non-compliance with it should be a full discretionary activity (non-compliance with the one hectare average would remain non-complying).

⁶⁸¹ E.g. Submitter Eden (#2360) who sought a minimum density of 5 or 10 hectares in the Rural Amenity Zone

⁶⁸² E.g. Donaldson (#2229) and Boxer Hills Trust (#2385 and 2386)

⁶⁸³ Submissions 2189, 2218 and 2596

⁶⁸⁴ Miles Wilson (#2084), See also Hunter Leece and Anna Kobienia (#2122)

⁶⁸⁵ Pete and Kelly Saxton (#2312)

⁶⁸⁶ Submissions 2250, 2252, 2254 and 2303

⁶⁸⁷ Submission 2281: Supported by FS2769, FS2795 and FS27956

1445. We discussed the combination of minimum lot sizes and minimum average lots sizes with Ms Gilbert. She explained that although the WB Landscape study had recommended a 4000m² minimum lot size, case study work post finalisation of the study testing that minimum had produced concerns that it would result in a large lot suburban outcome. Having said that, she had some sympathy with the submitters who were arguing the need for greater flexibility so as to enable a more varied and appropriate landscape outcome. She considered Mr Barr's suggested half way house approach to be helpful.
1446. Exploring further whether a greater difference between the average and the minimum would provide more flexibility, while Ms Gilbert had sympathy with that view, she also expressed caution about the ability of plan users to look at the minimum lot and the minimum average as dictating the subdivision yield irrespective of site circumstances.
1447. We discussed the issue also with Mr Brown, who supported identifying sub-zones within the Precinct with more enabling subdivision standards. He expressed himself as not uncomfortable with Mr Barr's suggested approach. In his view, providing for development at less than 6000m² minimum lot area will drive innovation.
1448. Subdivision standards in this case need to encourage good subdivision design, but to constrain those who would seek to take advantage of any loopholes in the Plan provisions to produce the maximum subdivision yield (and hence economic return).
1449. We consider that Mr Barr's suggested approach strikes a good compromise. It provides a clear signal that the overall outcome (as demonstrated by the minimum average) is the critical thing, and that there is provision for individual lots to be less than 6000m², if this is part of a well-designed subdivision proposal.
1450. We think it is generally undesirable to seek to provide location-based exceptions (or sub-zones as Mr Brown suggested), given the greater focus on maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values in the objectives and policies of Chapter 24 (compared to its predecessors). In situations where there is a case for waiving the standards, that case can be made by resource consent application, in order that it might be considered against those objectives and policies.
1451. As regards the more general submissions that sought either no reduction or no increase in density compared to the status quo, we rely on Ms Gilbert's evidence as to the analysis of different outcomes resulting from different standards being applied and the desirability of the standards specified being generally maintained.
1452. Considering how this outcome might be accommodated within the structure of Chapter 27, Mr Barr suggested a combination of amendments to the table within Decisions Version Rule 27.6.1 and a new zone-specific rule inserted into Section 27.7. Mr Barr did not, however, provide us with wording of such a rule and we think, in any event, the issue is better approached by a new rule in Part 27.5. This is the way in which the Decisions Version of Chapter 27 addresses subdivisions not complying with minimum lot area standards in the Jacks Point Zone and the Coneburn Industrial Zone that default to full discretionary status⁶⁸⁸.

⁶⁸⁸ See Rules 27.5.17 and 27.5.18 respectively

1453. We had no submissions on the suggested deletions from notified Part 27.5 (now 27.6.1). Those changes are simply consequential on replacement of prior zones by the Rural Amenity Zone and Precinct. We agree with the suggested deletions.

1454. Accordingly, we recommend the following amendments:

a. A new Discretionary Activity Rule 27.5.18A inserted into Chapter 27 worded as follows:

“27.5.18A: Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision which does not comply with the minimum net site area specified in Part 27.6 provided that the minimum net site area is not less than 4000m² and the average area of all lots in the subdivision is not less than 1.0ha per lot.”

b. A new Non-complying Activity Rule 27.5.18B inserted into Chapter 27 worded as follows:

“27.5.18B Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision with a minimum net size area less than 4000m² or where the average of lots in the subdivision is less than 1.0ha per lot.”

c. Amend provision 27.6.1 to insert two new rows in relation to the Rural Zone with the result that that part of the table in 27.6.1 would read as follows (changes shown as underlined):

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Rural	Rural	No Minimum
	Gibbston Character	
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u>	<u>80 ha</u>
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	<u>6000m²</u> <u>1.0 ha minimum average</u>

d. Delete the rows from 27.6.1 related to the Rural Lifestyle Deferred A and B Zone, the Rural Lifestyle Buffer Zone and Rural Residential Ferry Hill Subzone provision.

1455. We need deal only briefly with the suggested deletion of notified Objective 27.7.6, notified policies 27.7.6.1, Rules and notified Part 27.8.6 and the Ferry Hill Concept Development Plan in notified Part 27.13.1. In each case, the deletion of the relevant provisions is a consequential effect of the replacement of the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone and the provisions related to it by the zones in Chapter 24. We had no submissions specifically on those provisions and we agree that their deletion follows from acceptance of the general approach taken to zoning of the Wakatipu Basin in Chapter 24. Accordingly, we recommend the deletion of the following provisions:

a. Objective 27.7.6- Ferry Hill Rural Residential Subzone and the policies related to it numbered 27.7.6.1;

b. Rules 27.8.6.1 – 27.8.6.8 inclusive related to the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Subzone;

- c. The Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Subzone numbered 27.13.1.
1456. Finally, we need to address the assessment matters for the new restricted discretionary activity rule discussed above, notified as 27.7.6.2.
1457. Mr Barr noted NZTA⁶⁸⁹ as having sought a new assessment matter requiring consideration of the extent to which cumulative traffic generation will impact on the capacity of the transport network. Mr Barr did not recommend acceptance of the submission because, while an issue, it would only arise from a subdivision that does not comply with the density provisions and is accordingly being considered as a non-complying activity. He reiterated that view in rebuttal⁶⁹⁰, saying that the effects arising from the zoning already contemplated by the Chapter 24 and PDP framework.
1458. Having said that, he did say that in the event we were of the opinion that a number of the rezoning submissions should be accepted, cumulative effects on transport might become more relevant.
1459. That is not the case, but we think that the NZTA submission is misconceived in any event. As Mr MacColl recognised, a consent authority can only consider those matters in respect of which its discretion is reserved. The NZTA submission seeks an additional assessment matter rather than an additional matter to which discretion is reserved. Considered as an assessment matter, the suggested relief is not framed in a form that would be helpful and we cannot currently conceive how it could be redrafted to assist processing of consent applications. In summary, we recommend that NZTA's submission not be accepted in this regard.
1460. Dalefield Trustee Ltd⁶⁹¹ sought that the assessment matters be amended to cross refer the environmental characteristics and visual amenity values identified as important in Schedule 24.8. The submitter observed that those matters are only referred to in the objectives and policies of Chapter 24. The LCU descriptions in Schedule 24.8 are necessarily high level. The assessment matters require consideration of those matters by virtue of the initial reference to objectives and policies in (a). They also refer directly to Schedule 24.8 in (c)(iv), as well as to a wide variety of more detailed matters relevant to landscape character and visual amenity. We do not consider it appropriate that the assessment matters be limited to the matters identified in Schedule 24.8.
1461. Mr Barr noted Morven Ferry et al as having sought that assessment matter (b), which currently tests the extent to which subdivision provides for low impact design that avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the environment be amended to read:

“The extent to which the subdivision provides variation in design that maintains and enhances landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin.”

⁶⁸⁹ Submission 2538: Supported by FS2760, opposed by FS2765 and FS2766

⁶⁹⁰ At 7.7

⁶⁹¹ Submission 2097

1462. Mr Barr recommended rejection of that submission on the basis that the assessment matter relates more generally to overall environmental protection and management and not just on section 7(c) values. We agree. We also note that given the emphasis given to lower impact design in the Partially Operative RPS 2019, as discussed earlier in this Report, some reference to it in the assessment matters is appropriate.
1463. Morven Ferry et al sought that in so far as assessment matter (c) includes consideration of the retention of existing vegetation of landform patterns as part of the broader consideration of buildings, ancillary elements and landscape treatment, it be amended to refer to compatibility with existing vegetation and landform patterns.
1464. Mr Barr did not recommend that suggested change on the basis that compatibility issues were addressed by other assessment matters. Given our recommendations regarding rejection of other submissions seeking to delete or qualify provision for retention of existing vegetation in the policies and rules of Chapter 24, we agree with Mr Barr's reasoning.
1465. Morven Ferry et al sought also amendment of assessment matter (f). As notified, that assessment matter read:
- "Whether clustering of future buildings would offer a better solution for maintaining a sense of openness and spaciousness, or the integration of development with existing landform and vegetation patterns."*
1466. Morven Ferry et al sought that the assessment refer to variation of lot sizes rather than clustering of buildings.
1467. Mr Barr agreed that the suggested variation was helpful, but he considered that as with the comparable assessment matter in Chapter 24, both the clustering of buildings and varied lot sizes needed to be considered.
1468. In the reply version of his evidence, Mr Barr suggested reference to lifestyle patterns at the end of this assessment matter. As with the comparable assessment matter in Chapter 24, we consider that the reference point is more appropriately to settlement patterns than lifestyle patterns.
1469. Otherwise, we agree with Mr Barr's reasoning, and therefore recommend that this assessment matter should read:
- "Whether the clustering of future buildings or varied allotment sizes in subdivision design would offer a better solution for maintaining a sense of openness and spaciousness, or the integration of development with existing landform and vegetation or settlement patterns."*
1470. Mr Barr also recommended acceptance of a grammatical change suggested by Morven Ferry et al to assessment matter (g) so that consideration would be of "an" appropriate setback from ONLs and ONFs. We likewise agree that this is a better grammatical fit.
1471. Mr Barr also recommended consequential changes as follows:
- a. Amend Assessment matter (a) to read:

“The extent to which the proposal is consistent with objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion.”

- b. Amend assessment matter (h) to refer to Escarpment Ridgeline and River Cliff Features rather than *“identified landscape features”*;
- c. Add a new assessment matter:

“Whether the proposed subdivision provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through open space covenants or consent notices.”

- d. Add an additional assessment matter:
“Considering the benefits of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees and their replacement with non-wilding species in all instances, except where this would have significant landscape or visual amenity visual effects.”

1472. We agree with the first two suggested changes. They are clearly consequential on other recommendations we have made. As regards the two new assessment matters, consistency with our recommendations in relation to Proposed Rule 24.7.3 suggests that they be reworded as follows:

“Whether the proposed subdivision provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants or consent notices requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity”; and

“The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.”

1473. We consider that two further changes are required to these assessment matters. Mr Barr recommended amendments to Assessment Matter (d), consequential on changes to the similarly worded assessment matter in Part 24.7. We agree and recommend parallel changes to those we have recommended in Part 24.7.

1474. We also recommend a minor change to assessment matter (c)(vii) to explain more clearly how development controls might be incorporated – logically it can only be through incorporation of controls addressing the matters listed. Our suggested revised chapter attached reflects the suggested amendment.

1475. Mr Barr recommended that the assessment matters notified as 27.7.6.2 be relocated in Part 27.9. We agree. We consider that they would fit neatly within the structure of Chapter 27 (Decisions Version) as a new Rule 22.9.3.3, with consequential changes to reflect the structuring of the provisions in Part 27.9.

1476. The assessment criteria are lengthy and so we note merely that our suggested revised Rule 27.7.6.2(now 27.9.3.3) is as shown in the attached clean version of the variation as recommended

1477. Before leaving Chapter 27, we should note the submission of Pete and Kelly Saxton⁶⁹² that affected parties should have the right to submit on any proposed subdivision applications.
1478. The variations before us did not include amendments to the notification provisions in Chapter 27. In addition, the provisions of the Act now constrain the extent to which subdivision applications can be notified⁶⁹³. For both of these reasons, we do not have the ability to grant the relief sought by the submitters.
1479. We find therefore that the amended provisions we have recommended to be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed District Plan, given the alternatives open to us.

4.4 Variation to Noise Chapter 36

1480. The Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) included a variation to Chapter 36 to insert noise standards for the Rural Amenity Zone and for the Precinct.
1481. In his Section 42A Report⁶⁹⁴, Mr Barr noted that he had not identified any submissions on the variation to Chapter 36.
1482. Notwithstanding that, in his reply evidence⁶⁹⁵, Mr Barr recommended amendments to the variation he identified as being consequential on the outcome of the decisions on submissions to land that was notified in Stage 1 as Rural Zone, Rural Residential Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone. The suggested amendments were to add reference to the Rural Amenity Zone in Rule 36.4.5 and to state that the point of assessment for noise in the Rural Amenity Zone is any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.
1483. Consideration of Mr Barr's recommendations raises questions regarding the form in which the variation to Chapter 36 was notified. The relevant text at the point the variation was notified was the notified version of Chapter 36 that formed part of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1). The variation stated clearly that the relevant changes were "underlined text for additions and strike through text for deletions". In those terms, the only changes to the notified Chapter 36 text were the addition of the words "*Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone*" and "*Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct*" into a table related to Rule 36.5.1. However, three aspects of the balance of the table contained in the notified form of the variation did not match the corresponding provisions in the underlying Chapter (as notified). The first was in the overall heading of the table. This is recorded correctly in one place as "*Table 2: General Standards*". The table itself, however, has the heading "*Standard*". Second, the column in which zones are listed in the Table has the heading "*Zones sound is received in*" whereas in the notified table, the column heading is "*Activity or sound source*". Third, the second column in the table entitled Assessment Location has the description "*Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit*" in relation to Rule 36.5.1, whereas the Table in the variation has "*Any point within any site*".

⁶⁹² Submission 2312

⁶⁹³ Refer section 95A

⁶⁹⁴ At Section 36

⁶⁹⁵ At 12.21-12.22

1484. The Decisions Version of Table 2 in Chapter 36 has no material changes from the notified version although that too appears to be an error. The Hearing Panel's Report 8 records a recommendation⁶⁹⁶ that the second column of the table should be headed "*Zones sound is received in*". That would, of course, correspond with how the Chapter 36 variation was notified, but this recommendation was not implemented in the Decisions Version of the actual Chapter, apparently in error. This was not appealed, so the only way it will now be corrected is by way of variation should the Council deem that appropriate.
1485. The differences in the headings are not particularly material. The Stage 1 Hearing Panel described its recommended change to the column heading as a minor change in terms of Clause 16(2), and we would not disagree. The difference in the location of the measurement of noise, however, is a substantive issue. A noise standard measured at every point within a site, especially a large site, is a significantly greater restriction on the activities on the property than is a noise standard just measured at the notional boundary of any residential unit.
1486. Mr Barr suggested that this might be addressed by way of consequential change in his reply evidence. While it would be more consistent with the logic of the Decisions Version of Chapter 36 if noise levels at the Precinct were measured at any point on the site (that being the approach for other rural living zones) and noise levels for the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone were measured at the notional boundary of any residential unit (that being the approach in the Rural Zone), in the absence of any submissions on the point, we do not consider that we have scope to align the Chapter 36 variation with the Decisions Version in that manner.
1487. Mr Barr likewise recommended consequential amendments to Rule 36.4.5 to add reference to the Rural Amenity Zone. That Rule makes sound from farming and forestry activities and bird scaring devices other than sound from stationary motors and stationary equipment a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the noise standards. We cannot see how adding reference to the Rural Amenity Zone in that rule could be seen as a consequential outcome of any decisions we are recommending.
1488. We note that with recommended Rule 24.4.2 providing that farming activities are permitted in the Rural Amenity Zone (including the Precinct), those activities can continue as they relate to emission of noise provided the noise standards in Part 36.5 are met (by virtue of Provision 36.3.2.3 (Decisions Version)). Accordingly, we do not think the suggested change is necessary, even if we had scope to recommend it.
1489. Stepping back, the variation states clearly that the only change proposed to Table 2 of Chapter 36 is to insert reference to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct in the second column of the table, as it relates to Rule 36.5.1. No submissions have sought to change that, and we therefore recommend that exactly that amendment be made to the Decisions Version of Chapter 36. We find that this is the most appropriate provision to achieve the objectives of the Proposed District Plan, given the alternatives open to us.
1490. If that has consequences that the Council (perhaps with the benefit of hindsight) does not intend, then we recommend that it consider a variation.

⁶⁹⁶ At paragraph 603

1491. In summary, therefore, we recommend that the following change be made to the Decisions Version of Chapter 36 (Additions in Underline).

General Standards					
	Activity or sound source	Assessment location	Time	Noise limits	Non-Compliance Status
36.5.1	Rural (Note: refer Rule 36.5.14 for noise received in the Rural Zone from the Airport Zone -Queenstown Gibbston Character Zone Airport Zone – Wanaka <u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u> <u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit	0800h to 2000h	50 dB <small>L_{Aeq}(15 min)</small>	NC
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB <small>L_{Aeq}(15 min)</small> 75 dB <small>L_AF_{max}</small>	NC

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1492. For the reasons set out above, we recommend to the Council that:

- a. Chapter 24 be adopted as amended by our recommendations, as set out in Appendix 1;
- b. Chapters 2, 22, 27 and 36 of the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1) be varied as shown in Appendix 2;
- c. The submissions and further submissions on the contents of Chapter 24 and the variations to Chapters 2, 22, 27 and 36 be accepted, accepted in part or rejected as set out in the tables attached in Appendix 3;
- d. The submissions lodged on Stage 1 of the District Plan considered by the Stream 14 Hearing Panel be accepted, accepted in part or rejected as set out in the tables attached in Appendix 4.

1493. We recommend to the Stream 15 Hearing Panel that the submissions and further submissions heard in this hearing stream in relation to the variation to Stage 1 Chapter 6 be accepted, accepted in part or rejected as set out in the tables attached in Appendix 5.

1494. In the course of our report, we have recommended that Council consider promulgating variations to the text of the matters before us.

1495. We draw the Council’s attention to the discussion related to:

- a. Recommended Policy 24.2.2.1⁶⁹⁷;
- b. Recommended Policy 24.2.3.2⁶⁹⁸;
- c. The definition of “*residential flat*”⁶⁹⁹;
- d. Recommended Rule 24.4.9⁷⁰⁰;
- e. Recommended Policy 24.5.11⁷⁰¹;

⁶⁹⁷ See paragraph [622] above

⁶⁹⁸ See paragraph [659] above

⁶⁹⁹ See paragraph [924] above

⁷⁰⁰ See paragraph [930] above

⁷⁰¹ See paragraph [1125] above

f. Recommended Rule 36.5.1⁷⁰².

1496. Lastly, we draw the Council's attention to the need to insert the date of decisions into Policy 24.2.1.10 and Rules 24.4.6 and 24.5.1.4 before the Council's final decisions are released.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent, Chair
Dated: 15 February 2019

⁷⁰² See paragraph [1490] above

Appendix 1: Chapter 24 as Recommended

24. Wakatipu Basin

24.1 Zone Purpose

This chapter applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Rural Amenity Zone) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (Precinct). The purpose of the Zone is to maintain and enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin. Schedule 24.8 divides the Wakatipu Basin into 23 Landscape Character Units. The Landscape Character Units are a tool to assist identification of the particular landscape character and amenity values sought to be maintained and enhanced. Controls on the location, nature and visual effects of buildings are used to provide a flexible and design led response to those values.

The purpose of defining the Precinct is to identify areas within the broader Rural Amenity Zone that have the potential to absorb rural living and other development, while still achieving the overall purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone. The balance of the Rural Amenity Zone is less enabling of development, while still providing for a range of activities suitable for a rural environment.

While the Rural Amenity Zone does not contain Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes, it is a distinctive and high amenity value landscape located adjacent to, or nearby to, Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. There are no specific setback rules for development adjacent to Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes. However, all buildings except small farm buildings and subdivision require resource consent to ensure that inappropriate buildings and/or subdivision does not occur adjacent to those features and landscapes. Buildings and development in the Zone and the Precinct are required to be set back from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps, to maintain the distinctive and high amenity landscapes of the Wakatipu Basin.

24.2 Objectives and Policies

Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4 and related policies apply to the Precinct and to the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone. Objective 24.2.5 and related policies apply to the Precinct only.

24.2.1 Objective - Landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone are maintained or enhanced.

Policies

- 24.2.1.1 Require an 80 hectare minimum net site area be maintained within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone outside of the Precinct.
- 24.2.1.2 Ensure subdivision and development is designed (including accessways, services, utilities and building platforms) to minimise inappropriate modification to the natural landform.
- 24.2.1.3 Ensure that subdivision and development maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units.
- 24.2.1.4 Maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Rural Amenity Zone including the Precinct and surrounding landscape context by:

- a. controlling the colour, scale, form, coverage, location (including setbacks from boundaries) and height of buildings and associated infrastructure, vegetation and landscape elements;
 - b. setting development back from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps.
- 24.2.1.5 Require all buildings to be located and designed so that they do not compromise the landscape and amenity values and the natural character of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes that are either adjacent to the building or where the building is in the foreground of views from a public road or reserve of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.
- 24.2.1.6 Provide for farming, commercial, community, recreation and tourism related activities that rely on the rural land resource, subject to maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.
- 24.2.1.7 Locate, design operate and maintain regionally significant infrastructure so as to seek to avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, while acknowledging that location constraints and/or the nature of the infrastructure may mean that this is not possible in all cases.
- 24.2.1.8 In cases where it is demonstrated that regionally significant infrastructure cannot avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, such adverse effects shall be minimised.
- 24.2.1.9 Control earthworks and vegetation clearance to minimise adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values.
- 24.2.1.10 Enable residential activity within building platforms created prior to [insert date decision notified] subject to achieving appropriate standards.
- 24.2.1.11 Provide for activities, whose built form is subservient to natural landscape elements and that, in areas Schedule 24.8 identifies as having a sense of openness and spaciousness, maintain those qualities.
- 24.2.1.12 Manage lighting so that it does not cause adverse glare to other properties, roads, public places or degrade views of the night sky.
- 24.2.1.13 Have regard to the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of Tangata Whenua in the manner directed in Chapter 5: Tangata Whenua.

24.2.2 Objective – Non-residential activities maintain and enhance amenity values.

Policies

- 24.2.2.1 Ensure traffic, noise and the scale and intensity of non-residential activities do not have an adverse impact on landscape character and amenity values that is more than minor, or affect the safe and efficient operation of the roading and trail network or access to public places.
- 24.2.2.2 Restrict the type and intensity of non-residential activities to those which are compatible in relation to generated effects (e.g. traffic, noise, and hours of operation) with surrounding uses and the natural environment.
- 24.2.2.3 Ensure non-residential activities other than farming, with the potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects, are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.

24.2.2.4 Ensure informal airports are located, operated and managed to maintain the surrounding rural amenity.

24.2.3 Objective – Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated where rural living opportunities, visitor and tourism activities, community and recreation activities occur.

Policies

24.2.3.1 Ensure informal airports are not compromised by the establishment of incompatible activities.

24.2.3.2 Ensure reverse sensitivity effects on rural living and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated.

24.2.3.3 Support productive farming activities such as agriculture, horticulture and viticulture in the Zone by ensuring that reverse sensitivity issues do not constrain productive activities.

24.2.3.4 Ensure non-farming activities with potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.

24.2.4 Objective – Subdivision and development, and use of land, maintains or enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure.

Policies

24.2.4.1 Avoid adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.

24.2.4.2 Restrict the scale, intensity and location of subdivision, development and use of land in the Lake Hayes catchment, unless it can occur consistently with improvement to water quality in the catchment.

24.2.4.3 Provide for improved public access to, and the maintenance and enhancement of, the margins of waterbodies including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes.

24.2.4.4 Provide adequate firefighting water and emergency vehicle access to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response.

24.2.4.5 Ensure development has regard to servicing and infrastructure costs that are not met by the developer.

24.2.4.6 Facilitate the provision of walkway and cycleway networks and encourage opportunities for the provision of bridle path networks.

24.2.4.7 Ensure traffic generated by non-residential development does not individually or cumulatively compromise road safety or efficiency.

24.2.4.8 Encourage the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.

24.2.4.9 Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability.

24.2.5 Objective – Rural living opportunities in the Precinct are enabled, provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.

Objective 24.2.5 and policies 24.2.5.1 to 24.2.5.6 apply to the Precinct only. In the event of a conflict between Objective 24.2.5 and Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4, Objective 24.2.5 prevails.

Policies

- 24.2.5.1 Provide for rural living, subdivision, development and use of land where it maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units.
- 24.2.5.2 Promote design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development that maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall.
- 24.2.5.3 Provide for non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation, and commercial recreation activities while ensuring these are appropriately located and of a scale and intensity that ensures that the amenity, quality and character of the Precinct is retained.
- 24.2.5.4 Implement minimum and average lot size standards in conjunction with standards controlling building size, location and external appearance, so that the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, as identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units, are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development.
- 24.2.5.5 Maintain a defensible edge between areas of rural living in the Precinct and the balance of the Zone.
- 24.2.5.6 Retain vegetation that contributes to landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, provided it does not present a high risk of wilding spread.

24.3 Other Provisions and Rules

24.3.1 District Wide

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters.

1 Introduction	2 Definitions	3 Strategic Direction
4 Urban Development	5 Tangata Whenua	6 Landscapes
25 Earthworks	26 Historic Heritage	27 Subdivision
28 Natural Hazards	29 Transport	30 Energy and Utilities
31 Signs	32 Protected Trees	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity
34 Wilding Exotic Trees	35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings	36 Noise

37 Designations	Planning Maps	
-----------------	---------------	--

24.3.2 Interpreting and Applying the Rules

24.3.2.1 A permitted activity must comply with all of the rules (in this case of Chapter 24) and any relevant district wide rules.

24.3.2.2 The surface of lakes and rivers are zoned Rural.

24.3.2.3 Guiding Principle: Previous Approvals

- a. Requirements relating to building platforms and conditions of consents, including landscaping or other visual mitigation, that are registered on a site’s computer freehold register as part of a resource consent approval by the Council are considered by the Council to remain relevant and will remain binding unless altered or cancelled.
- b. Applicants may apply to alter or cancel any conditions of an existing resource consent as a component of an application for resource consent for development. Whether it may be appropriate for the Council to maintain, or to alter or cancel these conditions shall be assessed against the extent to which a resource consent application accords with the objectives and provisions of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (as applicable).

24.3.2.4 These abbreviations for the class of activity status are used in the following tables. Any activity which is not permitted (P) or prohibited (PR) requires resource consent.

P	Permitted	RD	Restricted Discretionary
D	Discretionary	NC	Non-Complying
PR	Prohibited		

24.3.2.5 The Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct is a sub-zone of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and all rules in Table 24.1 apply to the Precinct. Where specific rules and standards are identified for the Precinct in Tables 24.2 and 24.3, these prevail over the Rural Amenity Zone rules in Table 24.1.

24.3.2.6 All activities, including any listed permitted activities are subject to the rules and standards contained in Tables 24.1 to 24.3.

24.3.3 Advice Notes

24.3.3.1 Clarifications of the meaning of root protection zone, minor trimming of a hedgerow, minor trimming and significant trimming are provided in Chapter 2 – Definitions.

24.3.3.2 On-site wastewater treatment is subject to the Otago Regional Plan: Water. In particular, Rule 12.A.1.4 of the Otago Regional Plan: Water requires that within the Lakes Hayes Catchment all on-site wastewater treatment systems are operated in accordance with a resource consent obtained from the Otago Regional Council.

24.4 Rules – Activities

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.1	Any activity not listed in Tables 24.1 and 24.2.	NC
24.4.2	Farming activity.	P
	Residential activities and buildings	
24.4.3	The use of land or buildings for residential activity except as otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 and Table 24.2 and subject to the standards in Table 24.3.	P
24.4.4	The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity.	P
24.4.5	The construction of buildings for a residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area and attached to the residential unit.	P
24.4.6	The construction of buildings for residential activity that are located within a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register before [insert date of decision]. Control is reserved over: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity values; c. Access; d. Infrastructure; e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).	C
24.4.7	The construction of buildings for residential activity that are not provided for in Rule 24.4.5 or 24.4.6 and are not contrary to Rule 24.4.8. Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity values; c. Access; d. Infrastructure; e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed); f. Natural hazards.	RD
24.4.8	The construction of buildings for residential activity outside a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register on a site where there is such a building platform.	NC
	Non-residential activities and buildings	

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.9	Farm buildings.	P
24.4.10	Roadside stall buildings.	P
24.4.11	Home occupation.	P
24.4.12	Informal airports.	P
24.4.13	Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site.	P
24.4.14	Commercial recreational activities that are undertaken on land, outdoors and involve not more than 12 persons in any one group.	P
24.4.15	Residential visitor accommodation and homestays.	P
24.4.16	Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site where the access is onto a State Highway. Discretion is restricted to: a. Access to, and safety of, the transport network; b. On-site parking.	RD
24.4.17	Industrial activities directly associated with wineries and underground cellars within a vineyard. Discretion is restricted to: a. Noise; b. Access and parking; c. Traffic generation; d. Odour; e. Hours of operation; f. Waste treatment and disposal.	RD
24.4.18	The construction and alteration of buildings for non-residential activities, not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1. Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity; c. Access; d. Natural hazards; e. Infrastructure; f. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).	RD
24.4.19	Commercial recreational activities that are undertaken on land, outdoors and involve more than 12 persons in any one group.	D

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.20	Cafes and restaurants.	D
24.4.21	Visitor accommodation.	D
24.4.22	Community activities.	D
24.4.23	Any commercial or Industrial activity not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 including those associated with farming.	NC
24.4.24	Panelbeating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motorbody building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956 except where such activities are undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or as a permitted home occupation.	NC

	Table 24.2: Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	Activity Status
	Residential activities	
24.4.25	Residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by no more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6, and is not contrary to Rule 24.4.8. Note: Residential flats attached to the principal residential unit are covered by Rule 24.4.5.	D
24.4.26	Residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6, and is not contrary to Rule 24.4.8..	NC
	Non-residential activities	
24.4.27	Informal airports.	D
24.4.28	Panelbeating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibreglassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motorbody building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956 except where such activities are undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or as a permitted home occupation.	PR
	Clearance of exotic vegetation	
24.4.29	Clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation that is of a height greater than 4 metres. Discretion is restricted to: a. The extent of clearance; b. Trimming and works within the root protection zone; c. Replacement planting.	RD

--	--	--

24.5 Rules - Standards

The following standards apply to all activities.

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
24.5.1	Residential Density	
24.5.1.1	For sites with a net site area of 1 hectare or less and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per site.	NC
24.5.1.2.	For sites with a net site area greater than 1 hectare and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, no more than one residential unit per hectare on average of the net site area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.	NC
24.5.1.3	Where Rule 24.5.1.1 or Rule 24.5.1.2 applies, all residential units (including residential flats) must be located within the area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.	NC
24.5.1.4	Any site in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone located wholly outside the Precinct in respect of which the Computer Freehold Register for the site was issued before [insert date of plan decisions] and with an area less than 80 hectares, a maximum of one residential unit per site.	NC
24.5.1.5	For that part of all other sites in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone wholly located outside of the Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per 80 hectares net site area.	NC
24.5.2	Alterations to buildings for residential activities not located within a building platform Alterations to a building not located within a building platform must not increase the	RD Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity;

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	ground floor area by more than 30% in any ten year period.	c. External appearance; d. Infrastructure.
24.5.3	<p>Building Material and Colours</p> <p>Any building and its alteration, including shipping containers that remain on site for more than six months, are subject to the following:</p> <p>All exterior surfaces* must be coloured in the range of browns, greens or greys including;</p> <p>24.5.3.1 Pre-painted steel and all roofs must have a light reflectance value not greater than 20%; and</p> <p>24.5.3.2 All other exterior surface** finishes, except for schist, must have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p>* Excludes soffits, windows and skylights (but not glass balustrades).</p> <p>** Includes cladding and built landscaping that cannot be measured by way of light reflectance value but is deemed by the Council to be suitably recessive and have the same effect as achieving a light reflectance value of 30%.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity; c. External appearance; d. Visual prominence from both public places and private locations.</p>
24.5.4	<p>Building Size</p> <p>Where a residential building is constructed within a building platform under Rule 24.4.6, the ground floor area of all buildings must not exceed 500m².</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity;</p>
24.5.5	<p>Building coverage</p> <p>The ground floor area of all buildings not subject to Rule 24.5.4 must not exceed 15% of net site area, or 500m² ground floor area, whichever is the lesser.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity.</p>
24.5.6	<p>Setback from internal boundaries</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from internal boundaries shall be 10m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Building location, character, scale and form.</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. External appearance including materials and colours. c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.7	Height of buildings	
24.5.7.1	The maximum height of buildings shall be 6m.	<p>RD</p> <p>For buildings with a height greater than 6m and no more than 8m, discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form including the pitch of roofs; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed). <p>Note: 24.5.7.2 applies to buildings with a height greater than 8m.</p>
24.5.7.2	The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.	NC
24.5.8	<p>Setback from roads</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be 75m in the Precinct and 20m elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
24.5.9	<p>Setback from the Queenstown Trail</p> <p>Any building shall be located a minimum of 75m from the boundary of any identified Queenstown Trail Setback as shown on the planning maps.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including material and colours; c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.10	<p>Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features</p> <p>Any building or accessway shall be located a minimum of 50m from the boundary of any Escarpment, Ridgeline or River Cliff Feature shown on the planning maps.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.11	<p>Setback from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals</p> <p>The minimum setback from boundaries for any building whose primary purpose is to house animals shall be 30m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open space, rural living character and amenity; b. Privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties and public places;

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
		<p>c. Reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties including odour and noise;</p> <p>d. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).</p>
24.5.12	<p>Setback of buildings from waterbodies</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from the bed of a wetland, river or lake shall be 30m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <p>a. Biodiversity values;</p> <p>b. Natural Hazards;</p> <p>c. Visual and recreational amenity values;</p> <p>d. Landscape and natural character;</p> <p>e. Open space.</p>
24.5.13	<p>Farm buildings</p> <p>a. The maximum gross floor area of any farm building shall be 50m².</p> <p>b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys (except soffits).</p> <p>c. Pre-painted steel and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%.</p> <p>d. All other surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Building location, character, scale and form;</p> <p>b. External appearance including materials and colours; and</p> <p>c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).</p>
24.5.14	<p>Home occupations</p> <p>a. The maximum net floor area of home occupation activities shall be 150m².</p> <p>b. No goods materials or equipment shall be stored outside a building.</p> <p>c. All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any goods or articles shall be carried out within a building.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. The nature, scale and intensity of the activity;</p> <p>b. Visual amenity from neighbouring properties and public places;</p> <p>c. Noise, odour and dust;</p> <p>d. Access, safety and transportation.</p>
24.5.15	<p>Roadside stalls</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maximum ground floor area shall be 5m². b. Stalls shall not be higher than 2.0m from ground level. c. The minimum sight distance along the road from the stall or stall access shall be 250m. d. The minimum distance of the stall or stall access from an intersection shall be 100m; and, the stall shall not be located on the legal road reserve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Access and safety; d. Parking.
24.5.16	<p>Retail Sales</p> <p>The maximum gross floor area of buildings shall be 25m² for retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Access safety and transportation effects; d. Parking, access and safety.
24.5.17	<p>Glare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All fixed exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjacent roads and sites. b. Activities on any site shall not result in more than a 3 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light to any other site, measured at any point within the boundary of the other site. c. There shall be no upward light spill. 	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lighting location and number of lights; b. Proximity to roads, public places and neighbours; c. Height and direction of lights; d. Lux levels.
24.5.18	<p>Informal airports</p> <p>Other than in the case of informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Informal airports shall not exceed a frequency of use of 2 flights per day; 	<p>D</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<p>b. Informal airports shall be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential dwelling not located on the same site;</p> <p>Advice note: For the purpose of this rule a flight includes two aircraft movements i.e. an arrival and a departure.</p>	
24.5.19	<p>Firefighting water and access</p> <p>Buildings for residential activity that do not have reticulated water supply or where there is insufficient fire-fighting water supply must provide the following provision for firefighting:</p> <p>a. A water supply of 20,000 litres and any necessary couplings;</p> <p>b. A hardstand area adjacent to the firefighting water supply capable of supporting fire service vehicles;</p> <p>c. Firefighting water connection point within 6m of the hardstand, and 90m of the building;</p> <p>d. Access from the property boundary to the firefighting water connection capable of accommodating and supporting fire service vehicles.</p> <p>Advice note: excludes non-habitable accessory buildings.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. the extent to which SNZ PAS 4509: 2008 can be met including the adequacy of the water supply;</p> <p>b. the accessibility of the firefighting water connection point for fire service vehicles;</p> <p>c. whether and the extent to which the building is assessed as a low fire risk.</p>
24.5.20	<p>Residential visitor accommodation</p> <p>Residential visitor accommodation – Excluding the Lifestyle Precinct</p> <p>24.5.20.1 Must not exceed a cumulative total of 90 nights occupation by paying guests on a site per 12 month period.</p> <p>24.5.20.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Residential Visitor Accommodation activity.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <p>a. The scale of the activity, including the number of guests per night and the number guest nights the activity operates in a 12 month period;</p> <p>b. The management of noise, rubbish and outdoor activities;</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<p>24.5.20.3 Up to date records of the Residential Visitor Accommodation activity must be kept, including a record of the date and duration of guest stays and the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>24.5.20.4 Smoke alarms must be provided in accordance with clause 5 of the Residential Tenancies (Smoke Alarms and Insulation) Regulations 2016.</p> <p>Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.20.1 to 24.5.20.4.</p>	<p>c. The compliance of the residential unit with the Building Code as at the date of the consent;</p> <p>d. Health and safety provisions in relation to guests;</p> <p>e. Guest management and complaints procedures;</p> <p>f. The keeping of records of RVA use, and availability of records for Council inspection; and</p> <p>g. Monitoring requirements, including imposition of an annual monitoring charge.</p>
24.5.21	<p>Residential visitor accommodation – Lifestyle Precinct only</p> <p>24.5.21.1 Must not exceed a cumulative total of 90 nights occupation by paying guests on a site per 12 month period.</p> <p>24.5.21.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Residential Visitor Accommodation activity.</p> <p>24.5.21.3 Up to date records of the Residential Visitor Accommodation activity must be kept, including a record of the date and duration of guest stays and the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>24.5.21.4 Smoke alarms must be provided in accordance with clause 5 of the Residential Tenancies (Smoke Alarms and Insulation) Regulations 2016.</p>	D

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.21.1 to 24.5.21.4	
24.5.22	<p>Homestay</p> <p>Homestay– Excluding the Lifestyle Precinct</p> <p>24.5.22.1 Must not exceed 5 paying guests on a site per night.</p> <p>24.5.22.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Homestay activity.</p> <p>24.5.22.3 Up to date records of the Homestay activity must be kept, including a record of the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.22.1 to 24.5.22.3.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <p>a. The scale of the activity, including the number of guests per night and the number guest nights the activity operates in a 12 month period;</p> <p>b. The management of noise, rubbish and outdoor activities;</p> <p>c. The keeping of records of Homestay use, and availability of records for Council inspection; and</p> <p>d. Monitoring requirements, including imposition of an annual monitoring charge.</p>
24.5.23	<p>Homestay – Lifestyle Precinct only</p> <p>24.5.23.1 Must not exceed 5 paying guests on a site per night.</p> <p>24.5.23.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Homestay activity.</p> <p>24.5.23.3 Up to date records of the Homestay activity must be kept, including a record of the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p>	<p>D</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.23.1 to 24.5.23.3.	

24.6 Non-notification of applications

Any application for resource consent for controlled or restricted discretionary activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified, with the exception of the following:

- a. Rule 24.5.4 Building Size.
- b. Rule 24.5.5 Building coverage.
- c. Rule 24.5.6 Setback from internal boundaries.
- d. Rule 24.5.7 Height of buildings.
- e. Rule 24.5.8 Setback from roads.
- f. Rule 24.5.10 Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline or River Cliff Feature.
- g. Rule 24.4.16 Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, where the access is onto a State Highway.

24.7 Assessment Matters

24.7.1 In considering whether or not to grant consent and/or impose conditions on a resource consent, regard shall be had to the assessment matters set out at 24.7.3 to 24.7.15.

24.7.2 All proposals for controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities will also be assessed as to whether they are consistent with the objectives and policies relevant to the identified matters of control or discretion (as applicable) in this Chapter 24 as well as those in Chapters 3 - Strategic Direction; Chapter 4 - Urban Development, Chapter 6 - Landscapes and Chapter 28 - Natural Hazards..

I

	Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities
24.7.3	<p>The construction of buildings for residential activity:</p> <p>Landscape character and visual amenity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the location, form, scale, design and finished materials including colours of the building(s) adequately responds to the identified landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the landscape character units set out in Schedule 24.9 – Landscape Character Units and the criteria set out below.

	Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities
	<p>b. The extent to which the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complement the existing landscape character and visual amenity values, including consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. building height; ii. building colours and materials; iii. building coverage; iv. design, size and location of accessory buildings; v. the design and location of landform modification, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed planting; vi. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns; vii. earth mounding and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways; viii. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.9 - Landscape Character Units; ix. riparian restoration planting; x. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement; and xi. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths. <p>c. The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the proposed development in a manner that maintains or enhances landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape, particularly from public places.</p> <p>e. Whether clustering of buildings or varied densities of the development areas would better maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness, or better integrate development development with existing landform and vegetation or settlement patterns.</p> <p>f. Where a residential flat is not located adjacent to the residential unit, the extent to which this could give rise to sprawl of buildings and cumulative effects.</p> <p>g. The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of the appropriate setback from such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.</p> <p>h. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds or covenants.</p> <p>i. The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.</p> <p>j. Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.</p>
24.7.4	Infrastructure and access

Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities	
	<p>a. The extent to which the proposal provides for adequate on-site wastewater disposal and water supply. The provision of shared infrastructure servicing to more than one property is preferred in order to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the proposed access utilises an existing access or provides for a common access in order to reduce visual and environmental effects, including traffic safety, minimising earthworks and vegetation removal.</p>


Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
24.7.5	<p>New buildings (and alterations to existing buildings) including farm buildings and residential flats; and infringements of the standards for building coverage, building size, building material and colours, and building height:</p> <p>Landscape character and visual amenity</p> <p>a. Whether the location, form, scale, design and finished materials including colours of the building(s) adequately responds to the identified landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the landscape character units set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units and the criteria set out below.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complement the existing landscape character and visual amenity values, including consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. building height; ii. building colours and materials; iii. building coverage; iv. design, size and location of accessory buildings; v. the design and location of landform modification, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed planting; vi. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns; vii. earth mounding and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways; viii. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units; ix. riparian restoration planting; x. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement; and xi. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths. <p>c. The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the conditions governing the proposed development so as to ensure that landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced in a manner that maintains or enhances landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape, particularly from public places.</p>

	Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities
	<p>e. Whether clustering of buildings or varied densities of the development areas would better maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness, or better integrate development with existing landform and vegetation or settlement patterns.</p> <p>f. Where a residential flat is not located adjacent to the residential unit, the extent to which this could give rise to sprawl of buildings and cumulative effects.</p> <p>g. The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of the appropriate setback from such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.</p> <p>h. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds or covenants.</p> <p>i. The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.</p> <p>j. Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.</p>
24.7.6	<p>Servicing, firefighting water, natural hazards, infrastructure and access</p> <p>a. The extent to which the proposal provides for adequate on-site wastewater disposal and water supply. The provision of shared infrastructure servicing to more than one property is preferred in order to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the proposed access utilises an existing access or provides for a common access in order to reduce visual and environmental effects, including traffic safety, minimising earthworks and vegetation removal.</p> <p>c. Whether adequate provision is made for firefighting activities and provision for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the objectives and policies set out in Chapter 28, Natural Hazards, are achieved.</p>
24.7.7	<p>Non-residential activities</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <p>a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the amenity and character of the surrounding area including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape character unit.</p> <p>b. Adequate visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places.</p> <p>c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust.</p> <p>d. Access that maintains the safety and efficiency of the roading and trail network.</p>
24.7.8	<p>Setback from boundaries, Queenstown Trail, roads and Escarpments, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p>

Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance of landscape character and visual amenity including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape unit. b. The maintenance of views to the surrounding mountain context. c. Adequate privacy, outlook and amenity for adjoining properties.
24.7.9	<p>Setback from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance of landscape character and visual amenity including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape character unit. b. Minimisation of adverse odour, dust and/or noise effects on any neighbouring properties.
24.7.10	<p>Setback of buildings from waterbodies</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance or enhancement of biodiversity values. b. The maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the landscape character unit that the proposal falls into. c. The maintenance or enhancement of open space. d. Mitigation to manage any adverse effects of the location of the building including consideration of whether the waterbody is subject to flooding or natural hazards.
24.7.11	<p>Roadside stalls</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the surrounding landscape character and visual amenity values. b. Preservation of visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places. c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust. d. Adequate parking, access safety and avoids adverse transportation effects.
24.7.12	<p>Retail sales</p> <p>Whether the proposal ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the surrounding landscape character and visual amenity values. b. Preservation of visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places. c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust. d. Adequate parking, access safety and avoids adverse transportation effects.

Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
24.7.13	<p>Glare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The effects on adjacent roads and neighbouring sites. b. The extent of likely visual dominance from light fixtures, poles and lux levels. c. The nature and extent of any effects on character and amenity, including the night sky. d. The nature and extent of any effects on privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties. e. Whether there will be any reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties.
24.7.14	<p>Clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation over 4m in height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The degree to which the vegetation contributes to the landscape character and visual amenity values, and the extent to which the clearance or significant trimming would reduce those values. b. The potential for buildings and development to become more visually prominent. c. The merits of any proposed mitigation or replacement plantings. d. The effects on the health and structural stability of the vegetation. e. The merit of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees.

24.8 Schedule 24.8 Landscape Character Units



Acronyms used in Schedule 24.8

ONF	Outstanding Natural Feature	ONL WB	Outstanding Natural Landscape Wakatipu Basin
ONL	Outstanding Natural Landscape	SHA	Special Housing Area
LCU	Landscape Character Unit	Ha	Hectare (10,000m ²)
PDP	Proposed District Plan	DoC	Department of Conservation
SH	State Highway	QLDC	Queenstown Lakes District Council

1: Malaghans Valley

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Landform patterns	Relatively open and gently-rolling valley framed by mountain range (Coronet Peak) to the north (outside the LCU), and steeply sloping hillslopes and escarpment faces that define the northern edges of the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield and the Wharehuanui Hills, to the south (within the LCU).
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and shade trees in places. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings and farm buildings. Patches of scrub and remnant riparian vegetation in gullies. Exotic pasture grasses dominant.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams and overland flow paths draining from the mountain range to the north and the hillslopes to the south. Farm ponds in places.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Coronet Peak ONL (WB) to the north and the roche moutonnée ONF (part of Millbrook: LCU 11).
Character Unit boundaries	North: ONL which corresponds to the toe of the mountain range / study area boundary. East: Millbrook Special Zone, Meadow Park West Special Zone. South: Ridgeline crest of hillslopes and escarpments to the south. West: Study area boundary/ONL boundary.
Land use	Predominantly in pastoral land use with pockets of rural residential evident.

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Settlement patterns	<p>Rural residential development tends to be scattered along the elevated hillslopes that enjoy a northern aspect and frame the south side of the unit, and around the Malaghans Road – Dalefield Road intersection.</p> <p>Relatively limited number of consented platforms (given size of LCU) throughout the southern hillslopes and also throughout the valley flats on the north side of the road at the eastern end of the unit (20).</p> <p>Typical lots size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly 100-500ha. • Some smaller lots at either end of the unit, generally between 10-50ha in size. • Pockets of smaller lots (<4ha and 4-10ha) around the Dalefield Road, Coronet View and the Lower Shotover Road intersections.
Proximity to key route	Malaghans Road comprises an important scenic route between Queenstown and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	<p>No walkways, cycleways etc. through the area.</p> <p>Walkways and scenic roads throughout mountainsides immediately to the north (Coronet Peak Road, etc.).</p>
Infrastructure features	<p>No reticulated sewer or water.</p> <p>Limited stormwater reticulation.</p>
Visibility/prominence	The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible in views from Malaghans Road, Coronet Peak Road and the walkways to the north.
Views	<p>Key views relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the dramatic open vistas from Malaghans Road (scenic route) of the mountain range to the north; • views out over the unit from the scenic roads and walkways to the north; and, • the attractive, more rural and open vistas across the pastoral valley to the escarpments and hillslopes to the south.
Enclosure/openness	<p>Generally, the landscape unit exhibits a relatively high degree of openness with the landform features on either side providing a strong sense of containment to the valley.</p> <p>In places, plantings provide a localised sense of containment.</p>
Complexity	<p>The hillslopes and escarpment faces to the south of Malaghans Road display a reasonably high degree of complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.</p> <p>The valley floor lacks complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.</p>
Coherence	<p>The relatively simple and legible valley landform pattern, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence.</p> <p>Gully vegetation patterning throughout the hillslopes to the south serves to reinforce the landscape's legibility.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Naturalness	The unit exhibits a relatively high perception of naturalness as a consequence of its predominantly open and pastoral character combined with its proximity to the vastly scaled and relatively undeveloped ONL to the north. In the main, dwellings tend to be well integrated by plantings and or relatively modest, serving to reduce their prominence.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a predominantly working rural landscape character with pockets of (mostly) sympathetic rural residential development evident in places. The valley also serves as an important 'breathing space' between Queenstown and Arrowtown and reads as a sensitive landscape 'transition' to the neighbouring ONL.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open, exposed and 'undeveloped' nature of the unit, in addition to its importance as a scenic route, providing a buffer between Queenstown and Arrowtown, and as a transition to the ONL, makes it highly sensitive to additional development.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Potential integration of walkway/cycleway etc. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of openness and spaciousness associated with predominantly pastoral landscape. Subservience of buildings within the overall unit. Dramatic views from Malaghans Road to the mountain range. Highly attractive rural views from Malaghans Road to the Wharehuanui hillslopes and escarpment faces. Impression of the area as a buffer between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Impression of the area as a sympathetic transition between the wider basin and the surrounding mountain ONL.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very low.

2: Fitzpatrick Basin

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Landform patterns	Generally south east / east facing basin landform framed by moderately to steeply sloping hills to the north and west, and a more gently undulating hill system throughout the south (adjoining the steep cliff and terraces framing the Shotover River - LCU 3).
Vegetation patterns	Fragmented and small pockets of woodlot plantings, exotic shelterbelts (in places) and exotic amenity plantings throughout rural residential lots. Mature evergreen vegetation along the Shotover River margins to the south and eastern edges. Pasture grasses and weed species dominate larger lots. Scrub / weeds in gullies throughout northern portion of the unit in particular.
Hydrology	Limited network of streams and overland flow paths draining to the Shotover River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins ONL Wakatipu Basin on its western and southern edges.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest. East: Vegetated stream boundary/cadastral pattern. South: Crest of Shotover River cliff/terrace margins. West: ONL/study area boundary.
Land use	Rural lifestyle/hobby farming type uses with rural residential evident. Larger lots appear to be relatively unproductive (e.g. extensive gorse etc. evident).
Settlement patterns	Numerous existing dwellings are evident throughout the Fitzpatrick Basin. Buildings variably contained by vegetation. Buildings and platforms typically located throughout the basin floor, the undulating hill system in the southern portion, or along the southern edges to enjoy views of the Shotover River and ONL backdrop. Several consented but unbuilt platforms (25) with many clustered. Typical lot size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> generally 20-50ha lots on the north side of Littles Road; smaller lots on the south side (<4ha and 4-10ha) with some larger lots (10-20ha). The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road).
Heritage features	One heritage building / feature identified in PDP.

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Recreation features	No walkways, cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water main through part of central area.
Visibility/prominence	The relatively contained landform pattern, in conjunction with the mature evergreen plantings along the Shotover River margins, means that the unit is not particularly prominent in views from the wider basin study area. It is however visible from Tucker Beach (LCU 4). The extensive plantings throughout Dalefield mean that whilst the unit is visible in places, it is not prominent. The area is also visible from the mountain tracks to the north, however the diminishing influences of distance / relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the view from the mountain tracks to the north, in which the unit reads as part of a broad swathe of relatively low lying undulating land that extends in a west- east direction across the basin; the view from Tucker Beach (LCU 4), in which the unit reads as a more open area backdropped by the visually complex and relatively intensively inhabited Dalefield slopes. From within the unit, there are attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting. The southern margins enjoy views of the Shotover River (ONL).
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness throughout the basin. The northern portion is generally more open, with the southern area reading as more enclosed as a consequence of vegetation and localised landform patterns.
Complexity	The undulating hill system, together with its associated vegetation patterns throughout the southern portion of the landscape unit, contributes complexity in this part of the basin.
Coherence	Vegetation patterns do not generally reinforce the landform patterns (excepting scrub and weeds in gully areas). The relatively fragmented vegetation, settlement and land use patterns results in a landscape of limited coherence.
Naturalness	Generally a relatively low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development (both built and consented but unbuilt).
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a predominantly rural residential landscape that, together with the adjacent Dalefield landscape character unit, forms a discrete enclave, apart from the balance of the Wakatipu Basin study area.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open and exposed nature of the northern and central portion of the unit, albeit with the exposure effectively confined to the Fitzpatrick Basin and Dalefield catchment (i.e. not the wider Wakatipu Basin landscape). Elevated and southern aspect of the north portion. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for adverse cumulative effects.

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Visually contained nature of the location (in terms of the wider Wakatipu Basin landscape). Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Riparian restoration potential. Weed management potential. Potential integration of walkways/cycleways etc. Close proximity to Queenstown.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting. Avoiding built development on the elevated northern slopes that frame the unit. Avoiding built development on the Shotover River cliff/terrace (and ONL) edges. Maintaining the low 'public profile' of the unit with respect to the wider landscape of the Wakatipu Basin. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Littles Road and the north western and eastern ends of Fitzpatrick Road (that are currently relatively open in character) to the surrounding ONL mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	High.

3: Shotover River Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	3: Shotover River Terrace
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terraces edged by steep hill slopes to the north and river cliffs to the south.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and scrub throughout the steep river cliffs (outside of the LCU). Scattered shade trees and scrub in places, with mown grass and grazed areas evident.
Hydrology	One stream crosses the terrace draining to the Shotover River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjacent ONL (WB) of the Shotover River and mountain landform (Sugar Loaf) to the south.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest defining Fitzpatrick Basin LCU. East: Ridgeline crest defining Fitzpatrick Basin LCU. South: Shotover River vegetation-clad cliffs. West: ONL / study area boundary.
Land use	Rural residential and rural lifestyle use (hobby farming etc.). DoC land along southern edge of unit.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings and platforms positioned to enjoy highly attractive views of Shotover River and the ONL mountain backdrop. A limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms (3). Limited access via a private road from Littles Road. Typical lot sizes: mix of lots < 4ha and 4-10ha.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road).
Heritage features	No features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area. DoC land.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer. Limited reticulated water / stormwater in places.
Visibility/prominence	The containment of the hill slopes to the north means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the elevated landform to the south, and parts of the Tucker Beach LCU. Overall, the unit is not prominent within the wider basin landscape.
Views	The unit affords attractive mid-range views along the river, and to the Sugar Loaf and Ferry Hill ONL backdrop.

Landscape Character Unit	3: Shotover River Terrace
Enclosure/openness	A moderate sense of openness within the unit as a consequence of the limited vegetation patterns. Overall, the large-scale landforms framing the local area (particularly to the south) contribute a sense of containment.
Complexity	Steep slopes between the terrace and Fitzpatrick Basin provide localised complexity in places.
Coherence	Generally, a relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of varying landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A moderate sense of naturalness as a consequence of the landform separation of this area from the neighbouring Fitzpatrick Basin, its proximity to the Shotover and its aspect adjacent an undeveloped ONL area on the opposite side of the river.
Sense of Place	Generally the unit reads as a discrete rural residential area that is strongly connected to the Shotover River and the undeveloped ONL area to the south.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open and exposed nature of the unit, within an extremely high value landscape context dominated by ONLs, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change. Southern aspect. A very private landscape with virtually no public access. Generally relatively small-scaled lots.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Contained nature of location. Riparian restoration potential. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways etc. associated with riverscape.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of (relative) remoteness and connection with the riverscape and surrounding mountains.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

4: Tucker Beach

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terraces edged and interspersed by steep hill slopes with steep river cliffs along northern edge.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and scrub throughout the steep river cliffs (outside of the LCU) and hill slopes. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Scattered shade trees and scrub in places, with mown grass and grazed areas evident.
Hydrology	The streams drain from Ferry Hill/Lake Johnson environs into the unit.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjacent ONL (WB) of the Shotover River and mountain landform (Ferry Hill environs) to the south.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Shotover River vegetation clad cliffs/ONL. East: Quail Rise urban area. South: ONL/study area boundary. West: ONL/study area boundary.
Land use	Rural residential with some working rural uses evident throughout the land at the western end of the unit. A substantial portion of the undeveloped land at the western end of the unit is in DoC ownership.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings and platforms positioned to enjoy highly attractive views of Shotover River and the ONL mountain backdrop. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (20). Typical lot size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • central and eastern end of the unit < 4ha (with the odd larger lot: 20-50ha); • western end of the unit: over 500ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement pattern in the central and eastern end of the Unit.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a dead - end road.
Heritage features	No buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area. Substantial DoC reserve land within the central / western portion of the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water and (some) stormwater / sewer throughout central and western end of the unit. Western end- no reticulated services.

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Visibility/prominence	The containment of the hill slopes to the south means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the river terraces to the south, and the upper reaches of Fitzpatrick Basin / Dalefield. The lower lying central and northern portions of the unit and the interior of the flat terraces in the western portion of the unit are not prominent within the wider basin landscape. The elevated hill slopes along the south edge of the unit are locally prominent.
Views	The unit affords attractive mid-range views along the river, and to the wider ONL mountain and hill context.
Enclosure/openness	A varying sense of openness within the unit as a consequence of vegetation patterns. Overall, the large-scale landforms framing the local area (particularly to the south) contribute a sense of containment.
Complexity	Steep slopes and plantings provide localised complexity in places.
Coherence	A relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of varying landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A moderate sense of naturalness throughout the western end of the unit as a consequence of the limited level of built development, its proximity to the Shotover and its position adjacent an undeveloped ONL area. The central and eastern end of the unit is considerably more developed and therefore has a lower perception of naturalness. Reinforced by the close proximity of Quail Rise.
Sense of Place	Generally the unit reads as a part of the Shotover River margins with a continuous sleeve of rural living as one moves westwards away from Quail Rise towards the DoC Reserve.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open, exposed and undeveloped nature of the western portion of the unit, within an extremely high value landscape context dominated by ONLs and including a substantial DoC Reserve, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change. Absence of defensible boundaries to existing rural residential and urban zones in the vicinity, make the central and eastern portions of the unit in particular, vulnerable to development creep. Visibility of the development throughout the elevated slopes along the southern edge of the unit.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Relatively contained nature of location. Riparian restoration potential. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways etc. associated with riverscape. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Integrating effect of existing development context throughout eastern end of the unit in particular. Easy topography along central and northern portion of the unit. Close proximity of urban infrastructure.

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Sense of (relative) remoteness and connection with the riverscape and surrounding mountains at the western end of the unit. Integration of buildings, accessways and earthworks via planting.</p> <p>Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Tucker Beach Road to the Shotover River corridor and surrounding ONL mountain context. Maintaining a sense of openness throughout the elevated land between the Lifestyle Precinct and adjacent ONL (to the south).</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	Low (at western end) Moderate-High (throughout central and eastern end of the unit)

5: Dalefield

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Landform patterns	South-west facing hillside that effectively frames the eastern side of the Fitzpatrick Basin.
Vegetation patterns	<p>Extensive patterning of exotic shelterbelts, hedgerows and exotic amenity plantings around dwellings.</p> <p>Some exotic woodlots.</p> <p>Mix of grazed and mown grass.</p>
Hydrology	Two streams drain across the unit to the Shotover. Third stream drains eastwards to the Wharehuanui Hills LCU.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has longer-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	<p>North: Ridgeline crest defining Malaghans Valley LCU.</p> <p>East: Dalefield Road, vegetation and cadastral patterns.</p> <p>South: study area boundary/ONL.</p> <p>West: Vegetation and cadastral patterns.</p>
Land use	Rural lifestyle/hobby farming and rural residential land uses dominate.
Settlement patterns	<p>Dwellings scattered throughout the entire unit.</p> <p>Very few consented yet unbuilt platforms (6).</p> <p>Typical lot sizes: predominantly <4ha with some 4-10ha.</p> <p>The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road) and Dalefield Road itself.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	Despite the elevated hillslope location, the extensive vegetation throughout Dalefield means that development within the area is generally well screened/integrated. That said, the area is visible from the mountain tracks to the north however the diminishing influences of distance/relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting (above or framed by vegetation). The unit is visible from the neighbouring Fitzpatrick Basin (Landscape Character Unit 2) and from the river terraces and ONL mountain slopes (Sugar Loaf and Ferry Hill) on the south side of the Shotover River (i.e. Tucker Beach: LCU 4 environs).
Enclosure/openness	A high level of enclosure and containment as a consequence of the vegetation patterning.
Complexity	The extensive vegetation patterns contribute a high degree of complexity.
Coherence	The coherence of the extensive vegetation patterns is compromised by the varied planting characters evident throughout individual lots.
Naturalness	Generally a relatively low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development. Whilst many buildings are well integrated by plantings (and therefore visually discreet), the varied and complex patterning of the plantings reinforces the lot arrangement.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a well-established and reasonably intensively-inhabited leafy rural residential landscape.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Very few larger-scaled lots. Existing platform and lot arrangement together with the vegetation patterning is likely to make it very difficult to locate new building platforms.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (primarily due to vegetation patterning). Riparian planting potential. Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Unobtrusiveness of buildings and their integration via planting. Retention of existing vegetation patterns. Maintaining a sense of openness from Littles Road and/or Dalefield Road where there are existing views available out over ONLs including the Shotover River and/or to the surrounding mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, vegetation and lot patterns.)

6: Wharehuanui Hills

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills, and remnant kettle lakes. Many of the latter have been converted into amenity pond features.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and shade trees throughout pastoral areas. Exotic shelterbelts and park-like amenity plantings throughout rural residential lots with native vegetation to pond and watercourse margins. Patches of scrub in gullies. Mix of grazed and mown grass.
Hydrology	Numerous pond and wetland areas together with short watercourses and overland flow paths.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has open, longer-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest defining Malaghans Valley LCU. East: Millbrook Structure Plan area. South: Ridgeline crest defining Speargrass Flat LCU. West: Dalefield Road.

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Land use	A mix of rural and rural residential land uses evident.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings are located clear of wet areas, positioned to enjoy long-range mountain views and sited to optimise the screening/privacy benefits of the localised hummock landform patterning and vegetation patterns. Relatively few consented but unbuilt platforms (9). Typical lot sizes: predominantly 20-50ha lots with pockets of 4-10ha and < 4ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located away from key vehicular route, i.e. accessed via a dead-end road (Mooney Road) or via long driveways off Speargrass Flat Road, Dalefield Road or Lower Shotover Road.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and hummocky character of the central portion of the unit is not particularly prominent in terms of the wider basin landscape. The hills and escarpments along the north and south edges of the unit are however highly visible from the surrounding lower lying areas (noting that these areas have been included in the adjacent Landscape Character Units i.e. LCU1 and LCU 8). The area is visible from the (ONL) mountain tracks to the north however the diminishing influences of distance/relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting. The containment of localised hummocks means that few dwellings within the unit are visible from the surrounding area (excepting the more distant areas at a higher elevation). In views from the mountain tracks to the north, the unit reads as part of a broad swathe of relatively low lying undulating land that extends in a west - east direction across the basin.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and containment. Smaller lots tend to exhibit a more enclosed and contained character as a consequence of vegetation patterns. The hummocky landform pattern also serves to create a sense of containment.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex landscape as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. The configuration of smaller lots and their associated boundary plantings adds to the complexity.

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Coherence	Vegetation patterns generally do not reinforce landform features (excepting pond and stream plantings), which results in the perception of a landscape lacking coherence. This is reinforced by the varying character of plantings evident on individual properties and the wide range of architectural styles evident.
Naturalness	Generally, a limited perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development evident, and the relatively contrived (albeit in the main, attractive) character of plantings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a rural residential landscape in which buildings are reasonably well integrated by landform and vegetation. Whilst larger more 'rural' lots are evident, overall the amenity plantings throughout tend to contribute a parkland rather than a working rural landscape impression.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Poor drainage/wet areas. Potential visibility of development along the north and south ridgeline edges of the unit. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Relatively visually discreet nature of the majority of the unit (due to landform and, to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Integration potential of landform pattern. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Riparian restoration potential. Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from the ridgeline crests to the north and south edges of the unit. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Mooney Road to the surrounding ONL mountain context. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from new internal roads to the surrounding ONL mountain context. Avoidance of built development on the elevated slopes that frame the north western portion of the Mooney Road 'basin' (and which serves to separate the LCU 6 from LCU 23 Millbrook).
Capability to absorb additional development	High except for the eastern end of the LCU where it adjoins LCU 23 Millbrook Low at the eastern end of the LCU where it adjoins LCU 23 Millbrook

7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terrace edged by steep vegetation-clad river cliffs to the west.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and weeds throughout steep river cliffs (outside of LCU). Scattered exotic shade trees, shelterbelts and amenity plantings around buildings. Mix of grazed and mown grass.
Hydrology	No streams, ponds or wetlands evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Western boundary adjoins Shotover River ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: the toe of the Wharehuanui / Dalefield hill slopes, vegetation / cadastral patterning. East: Domain Road, the Hawthorn Triangle hedging and Lower Shotover Road. South: SH6 cutting. West: Shotover River ONL.
Land use	Rural residential and rural lifestyle/hobby farming uses dominate. Some tourist accommodation.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings are located to enjoy close-range views of the Shotover River corridor and wider mountain views. Several consented but unbuilt platforms along the south and north end of Domain Road (8 in total). Dwellings accessed from Spence Road (towards the south end of the unit) generally well integrated by plantings. Typical lot sizes: predominantly < 4ha or 4-10ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	The southern end of the unit is close to SH6, a key route between Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cardrona, the Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP, including the Old Shotover River Bridge at the southern end of the unit.
Recreation features	A council walkway/cycleway runs along the western edge of the south portion of the unit (i.e. along the Shotover). This forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride' route.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in north and central parts of the unit.

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Visibility/prominence	The dense plantings associated with the Hawthorn Triangle to the east means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the elevated hills to the east (Slope Hill ONF environs), Quail Rise/LCU4 to the west and Lower Shotover Road to the east. The area is generally not visible from SH6 (highway in substantial cutting), although is visible in part from the Shotover Bridge.
Views	The unit affords highly attractive views of the Shotover corridor and ONL mountain backdrop beyond. The unit is of importance in views from the river corridor, the walkway/cycleway route, Quail Rise, the highway Shotover Bridge (in part) and the Old Shotover River Bridge.
Enclosure/openness	There is a variable sense of enclosure throughout the unit as a consequence of vegetation patterns. The central portion of the unit is generally more open in character.
Complexity	The terrace landform patterning, together with the limited vegetation patterning throughout the central portion of the unit, results in a relatively low level of complexity. The more varied topography and vegetation in the north and south makes these areas more complex.
Coherence	A relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of the variance between landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A limited sense of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development, the proximity of the southern part of the unit to SH6, and the proximity to development within LCU 4 (Tucker Beach) and the Quail Rise Structure Plan Area. This is countered to a degree by the scale and undeveloped character of the Shotover River corridor in very close proximity.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a part of the river 'fringe', distinct from the densely-planted and inhabited units of Dalefield and the Hawthorn Triangle (to the north and east respectively), and the more open and elevated landscape associated with Slope Hill to the east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open and exposed nature of the central portion of the unit, within a high value landscape context, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. The relatively close proximity of visible urban development (Quail Rise) to the southern portion of the unit and proximity of the intensively developed Hawthorn Triangle to the east suggests a reduced sensitivity. The complex patterning of vegetation throughout this portion of the unit also serves to reduce its sensitivity. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for adverse cumulative effects.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Close proximity to Queenstown. 'Developed' context. Easy topography.

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Connection with riverscape. Set back of buildings from river cliff/ONL edges. Integration of buildings with plantings. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Domain Road to the Shotover River corridor and surrounding ONL mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-High

8: Speargrass Flat

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Landform patterns	Relatively open pastoral flat framed by the south-facing slopes of the Wharehuanui Hills to the north, and the steep margins of the Slope Hill 'Foothills' to the south.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and patches of mixed scrubland in gullies. Isolated bush fragment to eastern end. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	A series of watercourses and overland flow paths drain southwards across Speargrass Flat from the Wharehuanui Hills to Lake Hayes.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has open longer-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: ridgeline crest, Millbrook Structure Plan area. East: crest of hill slopes, Lake Hayes Rural Residential landuse pattern/cadastral boundaries, Speargrass Flat Road. South: ridgeline crest, Hawthorn Triangle hedging. West: vegetation patterns/stream.
Land use	Predominantly pastoral land use with sparsely scattered rural residential lots.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings tend to be well separated and framed by plantings, or set into localised landform patterns. Generally dwellings are located on the flat land adjacent the road although a very limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms located on elevated hill slopes to the south (that enjoy northern aspect). Overall very few consented but unbuilt platforms (3). Typical lot sizes: the majority of lots are over 50ha.

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Proximity to key route	Located away from a key vehicular route. Part of the area is adjacent to Speargrass Flat Road, Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Speargrass Flat Road is identified as a Council walkway/cycleway. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in places.
Visibility/prominence	The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible from the public road network and the elevated hills to the north and south, although the escarpment confining the character unit to the north blocks some views from the north.
Views	Key views relate to the open and spacious pastoral outlook from Speargrass Flat Road (including the walkway/cycleway route) across to the escarpment faces and hillslopes flanking the valley, backdropped by mountains.
Enclosure/openness	The landform features to the north and south providing a strong sense of containment to the relatively open valley landscape.
Complexity	The hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south display a reasonably high degree of complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. The valley floor itself displays a relatively low level of complexity as a consequence of its open and flat nature.
Coherence	The relatively simple and legible bold valley landform pattern, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence. Gully vegetation patterning serves to reinforce the landscape legibility in places.
Naturalness	The area displays a reasonable degree of naturalness as a consequence of the relatively limited level of built development evident.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a predominantly working rural landscape character with scattered and for the most part, relatively subservient rural residential development evident in places. Whilst Hawthorn Triangle and Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCUs form part of the valley landscape, their quite different character as a consequence of relatively intensive rural residential development sets them apart from the Speargrass Flat LCU, with the latter effectively reading as 'breathing space' between the two. To the eastern end of the unit, there is the perception of the Lakes Hayes Rural Residential area sprawling west into Speargrass Flat.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of a robust edge to the Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCU makes Speargrass Flat vulnerable to 'development creep'. Open character, in combination with walkway / cycleway, makes it sensitive to landscape change.

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p><i>Central and western portion of LCU 8</i></p> <p>Sense of openness and spaciousness as a 'foil' for the more intensively developed rural residential areas nearby. Maintenance of unobstructed rural views from Speargrass Flat Road to the largely undeveloped hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south.</p> <p><i>Eastern portion of LCU 8</i></p> <p>Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting. Maintenance of a spacious and open outlook in views from the Queenstown Trail and Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road, including the southbound view as one descends Christine's Hill. Maintenance of openness in views from Hogans Gully Road to the backdropping hill /escarpment landforms and broader ONL mountain context.</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	Low.

9: Hawthorn Triangle

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terrace landform. Localised (man-made) mounding within the triangle to assist the integration of dwellings and provide privacy.
Vegetation patterns	Tall hawthorn hedging around almost all three sides of the triangle. Elsewhere exotic shelterbelt plantings. Extensive parkland and amenity plantings within the triangle. Mown grass.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Hydrology	Sporadic amenity ponds and truncated streams.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has mid and longer-range views above the hedging and tree plantings to the ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Speargrass Flat Road and shelterbelt/hawthorn hedging. East/South: Domain Road and hawthorn hedging. West/South: Lower Shotover Road and hawthorn hedging.
Land use	Rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Densely configured arrangement of consistently high value rural residential dwellings. Dwellings set into mounding and a planted parkland character. A high number of consented but unbuilt platforms (43). Evidence of a high degree of consistency in terms of building development controls (height, colours, fencing, etc.) Overall a distinctly large-lot suburban character. Typical lot sizes: predominantly under 4ha. Largest lots in the 4-10ha range. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located away from a key vehicular route.
Heritage features	One heritage building / feature identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A council walkway / cycleway runs along the south portion of Domain Road edging the triangle, then dog-legs through the unit, emerging to run along the north end of the Lower Shotover Road bordering the triangle. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in several locations.
Visibility/prominence	The dense evergreen hedging around the unit's edges serve to screen views into the area from the surrounding road network and properties. The quite distinctive patterning of the triangle as a consequence of its shape, reinforced by the vegetation patterns and contrasting density of development in comparison to the surrounds, makes it a distinctive element in views from the elevated surrounds.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Views	Key views relate to the strongly framed corridor views along the roads bordering the triangle. In many places, the roadside plantings serve to block views from the road to the surrounding mountain context. Other key views relate to the elevated views from Slope Hill environs to the east and the views from the walkway/cycleway route that passes through the unit.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a strong sense of enclosure as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	The extensive plantings throughout the unit contribute a relatively high degree of complexity. The frequency of buildings and to a lesser degree, mounding adds to this complexity.
Coherence	The relatively limited palette of species and application of (what would appear to be) relatively consistent building development controls (building height, building colours, fencing, etc.) suggests a reasonable degree of coherence. However, the very flat topography and perimeter screen limits an appreciation of this coherence from the roads and landscape around the unit (excepting elevated vantage points).
Naturalness	The unit exhibits a low degree of naturalness as a consequence of the density of existing rural residential development and the relatively contrived character of much of the plantings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the Triangle displays a large-lot suburban parkland character. The tall, linear and dense perimeter plantings serve to screen road (and potentially, private property) views of the wider mountain setting of the Basin and contrast with the more varied planting patterns evident elsewhere in the Basin. This planting does, however, significantly diminish an awareness of the density of development within the triangle from the immediate surrounds (excepting elevated areas).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Very few larger-scaled lots. Existing platform and lot arrangement, together with mounding and vegetation patterns (which may be covenanted), may physically constrain additional development. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for 'internal' adverse cumulative effects (i.e. effects within the triangle).
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	The enclosed and screened nature of the area suggests the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider Basin landscape. Close proximity to Queenstown. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Integration of buildings via appropriately-scaled mounding, planting, and the application of a consistent series of building development controls addressing such matters as building height, coverage, colours/materials, fencing, paving, etc.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, mounding, and vegetation patterns.)

10: Ladies Mile

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Landform patterns	Largely flat alluvial river terrace landform spanning between the Shotover River and Lake Hayes. Adjacent the waterbodies at either end, the terrace is stepped.
Vegetation patterns	A fragmented patterning of exotic shelterbelts and scattered exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Exotic river terrace, lake and river margin vegetation. Horticultural plantings in places.
Hydrology	No ponds and wetlands evident. A very short length of stream on the north side of Ladies Mile Highway.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	North boundary adjoins the Slope Hill ONF (WB). East boundary adjoins Lake Hayes ONF and west boundary adjoins the Shotover River ONL(WB). Longer range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Slope Hill ONF, cadastral boundary. East: Lake Hayes ONF. South: Shotover Country, Queenstown Country Club SHA, Lake Hayes Estate. West: Shotover River, Lower Shotover Road.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential with rural uses evident. A large scale retirement village (Queenstown Country Club SHA) has been recently consented on the south side of Ladies Mile Highway (unbuilt). Urban development to the south of the LCU set on lower lying terraces (Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country).
Settlement patterns	Dwellings tend to be set well back from the busy highway. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms evident (36). A quite dense large-lot suburban pattern associated with the rural residential development in places, although the set back from the highway means that there is a limited awareness from the road (McDowell Drive environs). The SHA extends from Lakes Hayes Estate into the river terrace landform associated with Ladies Mile and serves to sever the south side of the LCU into two. The SHA buildings are set back 75m from the highway edge and fronted by orchard, parkland tree plantings and grazing land. Building heights within the SHA that coincide with Ladies Mile LCU range from one storey to three storey. Typical lot sizes: predominance of lots are less than 10ha with 3 lots in the 20-50ha range and 3 over 10ha (albeit straddling the adjacent ONL).

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Proximity to key route	SH6 passes through the centre of the LCU and comprises a key vehicular route between Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cardrona, Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Approximately seven heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A Council walkway / cycleway route along the eastern end of the unit linking Lake Hayes Estate with the Lake Hayes circuit. Forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Commuter Ride'. (NB cycleway runs from the Shotover Bridge along the river edge south of Lake Hayes Estate etc. to link with the Commuter Ride).
Infrastructure features	No reticulated services within the area however adjacent fully serviced urban development (Shotover Country, Lakes Hayes Estate) and reasonable to expect that the Queenstown Country Club SHA within the unit will be fully serviced.
Visibility/prominence	The unit is, for the most part, highly visible from SH6 and the Field Access Road up the Remarkables to the south. The lower-lying character and large-scale cut slopes adjacent the highway at the western end of the LCU means that this western portion (south of SH6) is relatively visually discreet.
Views	Key views relate to the open and relatively uncluttered views from SH6 southwards across the open and predominantly pastoral LCU to the dramatic mountain sequence framing the south side of the basin and Lake Wakatipu, and northwards to Slope Hill. The dramatic character of the views together with their marked contrast with the outlook afforded from SH6 further to the west (i.e. Frankton Flats) make them highly memorable. It is acknowledged that the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA will significantly alter this impression. The LCU also affords highly attractive vistas out across Lake Hayes. In more elevated views, the area also forms a distinctive green swathe, contrasting with the urban development of Shotover Country, Lake Hayes Estate immediately to the south and the approved SHA (unbuilt) on the terrace.
Enclosure/openness	The unit itself displays a relatively open character framed by Slope Hill to the north and the Remarkables Range to the south. To the south, plantings throughout the terrace faces edging the lower-lying urban areas of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country provide low-level and reasonably distant containment. This will be disrupted by the plantings and buildings associated with the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA which will effectively sever the south side of the LCU into two separate areas.
Complexity	The limited extent of planting and relatively uniform topography contributes a low level of complexity throughout the LCU (excepting the SHA area).
Coherence	The flat topography and fragmented vegetation patterns suggests a low level of coherence. This is countered to a degree by the relatively consistently open and pastoral character of the majority of the unit (excepting the SHA).
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of its proximity to the busy state highway (SH6), the distinctly urban character of the SHA consented in the area, and an awareness (albeit limited) at the eastern end of the LCU of the Lake Hayes Estate urban development.

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Sense of Place	<p>Generally, Ladies Mile reads as a critical part of the 'green' entrance to Queenstown. The care that has been taken to ensure that both rural residential and urban development in the vicinity is not visible from the road reinforces the role of this unit as a spacious green entrance.</p> <p>This has however been significantly compromised by the Queenstown Country Club SHA retirement village development which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent, central and sizeable part of the LCU.</p> <p>The LCU also functions as an important 'breathing space' between the urban development of Frankton Flats to the west (and Queenstown proper beyond) and the ribbon development and rural residential 'node' associated with Lake Hayes to the east. Again it is acknowledged that the character of development associated with the Queenstown Country Club SHA significantly compromises this impression.</p>
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	<p>Role of the unit as a 'green' entrance to Queenstown.</p> <p>The function of the LCU as an important scenic route and its proximity to ONFs.</p> <p>Role of the area as a 'breathing space' between the urban area to the west and the relatively consistent and intensive patterning of rural residential development associated with Lake Hayes to the east.</p>
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	<p>The discreet nature of the western end of the unit makes it more suited to absorbing change.</p> <p>Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision whilst retaining generous setback from SH6.</p> <p>Close proximity to Queenstown.</p> <p>Close proximity to urban infrastructure.</p> <p>Urbanising effects of the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA suggest a tolerance for (sensitive) urban development.</p> <p>Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways.</p> <p>Riparian restoration potential (limited).</p>
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Sense of a spacious, green entrance to Queenstown.</p> <p>Views from SH6 to the surrounding mountain / hill / lake context.</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	High

11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Landform patterns	Elevated and complex patterning of hills ranging from moderate to steeply sloping in places. Elevated hummock pattern throughout central portion with remnant kettle lakes.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts, woodlots, remnant gully vegetation, and exotic amenity plantings around older rural residential dwellings. Predominantly grazed grass although smaller lots tends to be mown.
Hydrology	Numerous streams, ponds and localised wet areas.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Slope Hill/Lake Hayes ONF.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest. East: Ridgeline crest/ONF. South: Toe of Slope Hill ONF. West: Lower Shotover Road.
Land use	Mix of rural and rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings generally located to enjoy long-range basin and mountain views. Older rural residential development tends to be well integrated by planting and/or localised landform patterns. Newer rural residential is considerably more exposed, with buildings sited to exploit landform screening (where possible). Clustered development evident in places. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (43). Typical lot sizes: evenly distributed mix. One property 100-500ha range, another 50-100ha. Balance typically shared lots or 4-10ha range.
Proximity to key route	Located away from key vehicular route.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A Council walkway/cycleway runs along Slope Hill Road (forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride').
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water, sewer and stormwater in places.
Existing zoning	PDP: Western slopes overlooking Hawthorn Triangle: Rural Lifestyle (no defensible edges). Balance of the unit: Rural.
Visibility/prominence	Visibility varies across the landscape unit. The elevated nature of the unit and its location adjacent a flat plain on its western side means that this part of the area is visually prominent. The steep hillslopes and escarpment faces edging Speargrass Flat to the north and Lake Hayes to the east, together with Slope Hill itself, serve to limit visibility of the balance of the unit from the wider basin landscape.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Views	Key views relate to the open vistas available from parts of Hawthorn Triangle environs to the western portion of the unit. The unit affords attractive long-range views out over the basin to the surrounding ONL mountain setting as well as open views of the nearby Slope Hill ONF from some public locations.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and enclosure. The older and more established rural residential development throughout the elevated slopes on the western side of the unit are reasonably enclosed, despite their elevation. Throughout the central and eastern areas, landform provides containment at a macro scale.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit due to the landform patterning. Vegetation patterns add to the complexity in places.
Coherence	The coordination of landform and vegetation patterns in places (associated with gully plantings), contributes a degree of landscape coherence. Elsewhere the discordant vegetation and landform patterning means that there is a limited perception of landscape coherence.
Naturalness	A variable sense of naturalness, largely dependent on how well buildings are integrated into the landscape. The large number of consented but unbuilt platforms suggest that a perception of naturalness could reduce appreciably in time.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural residential landscape. The elevated portions of the area read as a rural residential landscape 'at, or very near, its limit'. The lower-lying stream valley area to the east remains largely undeveloped, and functions as somewhat of a 'foil' for the more intensive rural residential landscape associated with the surrounding elevated slopes.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	DoC ownership of part of low lying stream valley to the east. Drainage in places (e.g. low-lying stream valley to east). Potential visibility of development throughout western hillslopes in particular. Importance of the western slopes as a contrasting and highly attractive backdrop to the intensive patterning throughout the Hawthorne Triangle, particularly in views from within the triangle. Importance of existing open views to Slope Hill. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. Environment Court history suggest that the capacity has been fully exploited in most parts of the LCU.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Improved landscape legibility via gully and steep slope planting.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform pattern. Careful integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from ridgeline crests to north and east of unit. Retention of existing open views to Slope Hill.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Landform patterns	Flat lake terrace / valley floor landform.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity plantings around established rural residential dwellings and along watercourses.
Hydrology	Several streams drain across the land unit to Lake Hayes.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Lake Hayes ONF along south edge.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Speargrass Flat Road, cadastral boundary, Hogans Gully. East: ridgeline crest. South: Toe of Speargrass Flat hillslopes, Lake Hayes ONF, descending ridgeline crest, Bendemeer Special Zone. West: cadastral boundary.
Land use	Almost entirely rural residential land use. Slivers of QLDC land including a lake front reserve. Agistment uses evident on the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road/Hogans Gully intersection.

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Settlement patterns	<p>Dwellings intensively clustered around the northern end of Lake Hayes and reasonably evenly distributed to the west, along the narrow flat margin on the south side of Speargrass Flat Road.</p> <p>Evenly dispersed arrangement of consented but unbuilt platforms throughout the flat land on the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road/Hogans Gully intersection.</p> <p>Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms, particularly in the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road / Hogans Gully intersection (27).</p> <p>More recent development would appear to have had consistent design controls applied and required mounding/planting which assist integration.</p> <p>Typical lot sizes: < 4ha.</p> <p>The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.</p>
Proximity to key route	Located on a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown (Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road).
Heritage features	Approximately two heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	<p>Council walkway / cycleway route passes through the area linking the Queenstown Trail 'Lake Hayes Circuit' to the 'Countryside Ride'.</p> <p>Art gallery, lakefront reserve.</p>
Infrastructure features	The majority of the unit has reticulated sewer and water. Limited reticulated stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	<p>The relatively low-lying and well-vegetated character of much of the unit makes it relatively visually discreet.</p> <p>The exceptions to this are the open and unbuilt (as yet) pocket at the eastern end and parts of the linear area adjacent Speargrass Flat Road at the western end of the unit.</p>
Views	<p>Key views relate to the outlook from the surrounding road network and walkway/cycleway route.</p> <p>Views from within the unit to Lake Hayes and the surrounding ONL mountain context.</p>
Enclosure/openness	<p>Generally, a high degree of enclosure as a consequence of the vegetation patterns.</p> <p>A considerably greater sense of openness at the western and eastern edges of the unit resulting in a direct relationship with the neighbouring Speargrass Flats LCU.</p>
Complexity	The extensive plantings throughout the unit contribute a relatively high degree of complexity, excepting the western and eastern ends, which are more open in character.
Coherence	<p>At a more detailed level, the varied patterning and character of plantings on individual lots results in a relatively low level of landscape coherence.</p> <p>However, at the macro level, the contrasting character of the relatively densely-planted (and inhabited) character of the unit in comparison to the surrounds lends a strong sense of coherence.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Naturalness	Generally, a low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as a distinct 'node' of rural residential development at the northern end of Lake Hayes (despite not having a discernible 'heart') that is buffered from the lake by plantings/open space. The ribbon-type patterning at the western end, extent of (as yet, unbuilt) development at the eastern end, and absence of legible defensible edges, including for the development to the north of Speargrass Flat Road, confer the impression of an 'actively' spreading node.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of legible edges to the west and north edges of the unit. Very few larger-scaled lots to accommodate additional development. Existing platform and lot arrangement together with vegetation patterns may constrain additional development. Proximity of popular walkway / cycleway route.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. The enclosed and screened nature of the area, together with its established rural residential node character, suggests the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider basin landscape. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Integration of buildings via planting and the application of building design controls. Retention of existing vegetation patterns. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Speargrass Flat Road to the surrounding escarpment and ONL mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, vegetation and lot patterns)

13: Lake Hayes Slopes

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Landform patterns	Variably steep to moderately sloping hillslopes.
Vegetation patterns	Fragmented patterning of exotic shelterbelts and amenity plantings. Viticulture in places.
Hydrology	No streams, ponds, wetlands evident.

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Southern edge adjoins Morven Hill ONL(WB). Overlooks Lake Hayes / Slope Hill ONF.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Descending ridgeline crest. East: Bendemeer Special Zone. South: Morven Hill ONL (WB). West: Lake Hayes or Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road / Low Density Residential zone straddling Lake Hayes.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential. QLDC land. Viticulture, hobby farming and public uses evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings scattered throughout slopes to enjoy panoramic lake and mountain views. Roading snakes up steep hillsides. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (24). Older dwellings reasonably well integrated by vegetation and generally of a relatively modest scale. Newer dwellings larger-scaled and generally very exposed with landscaping not providing material mitigation as at 2018. Typical lot sizes: almost all of the lots under 10ha.
Proximity to key route	The majority of the unit is located on a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown (Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road). The southern portion of the unit is located on SH6, a key vehicular route between Queenstown, Wanaka, Cardrona, Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Approximately four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No specific walkway or cycleway through the area, although Lake Hayes circuit (part of Queenstown Trail), nearby. Winery, cafes, scenic reserve, rowing club
Infrastructure features	Majority of the area has reticulated water, sewer and stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and exposed nature of much of the unit makes it prominent in views from Lake Hayes, parts of SH6, the walkway/cycleway around Lake Hayes and the Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Views	Key views relate to the views from the road network and Lake Hayes (including walkway/cycleway) to the area, and from the unit to the lake and mountain (ONF and ONL) setting.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, a relatively low degree of enclosure as a consequence of the elevated hillslope location and absence of vegetation.
Complexity	The hillslope landform patterns contribute complexity in places; however, this is somewhat outweighed by the paucity of vegetation.

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Coherence	Generally, a low degree of landscape coherence as a consequence of the open and exposed character, together with the frequency of highly visible large-scale buildings and winding roads up steep hill slopes.
Naturalness	Generally, a low degree of naturalness as a consequence of the frequency and exposure of buildings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a relatively unsympathetic rural residential character that reads as development sprawl up the hillsides. The exception to this is the older and lower lying, generally more modest development adjacent Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Elevated and in many places exposed location that is highly visible from the surrounding area, including from key scenic routes. Steep topography. Absence of vegetation in some areas. Highly modified rural living area with a risk of exacerbating perception of development sprawl.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Improve landscape legibility via gully/steep slope planting.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Careful integration of buildings with landform and planting.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

14: Lake Hayes Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Landform patterns	Elevated alluvial terrace landform.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic and remnant riparian vegetation along Hayes Creek margins. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Fragmented shelterbelt plantings and hedgerows.

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Hydrology	Bordered by the Hayes Creek to the west. No streams or wetlands evident. Amenity pond.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Morven Hill ONL (WB) along east and south boundary and Lake Hayes ONF along north boundary.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Lake Hayes ONF. East: Morven Hill ONL (WB). South: Morven Hill ONL (WB). West: Hayes Creek.
Land use	Rural residential uses with some lifestyle / hobby farming evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings typically located to the eastern edges of the terrace. Few consented but unbuilt platforms within the unit (2). Typical lot sizes: Predominantly 10-20ha. Smaller lots along eastern edge straddling ONL (under 10ha). The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located adjacent SH6, although its elevated terrace setting means that the unit is reasonably discreet from the highway.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways through the area.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water supply. Reticulated sewer nearby along SH6. No reticulated stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	Despite its elevation, the area is relatively visually discreet as a consequence of its position tucked into the side of Morven Hill, and the low-lying position of SH6 relative to the terrace. The area is visible from Lake Hayes Estate and in more distant views from Ladies Mile Highway further to the west.
Views	Key 'external' views relate to the distant view from Ladies Mile Highway across to the terrace backdropped by Morven Hill and views from Lake Hayes (including the walkway/cycleway route) to the area. From within the unit, key views relate to the highly attractive northern views towards Lake Hayes and Slope Hill and the quite different outlook westwards to Lake Hayes Estate urban area.
Enclosure/openness	The unit has a reasonably high degree of openness as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. That said, the Morven Hill landform and Remarkables Range to the east and south respectively, provide a strong sense of containment.
Complexity	Generally, the unit displays a low level of complexity as a consequence of landform and vegetative patterns.

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Coherence	Similarly, the absence of distinctive and coordinated landform, vegetation or building patterning confers a relatively low level of landscape coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a relatively low sense of naturalness as a consequence of the close proximity and exposure of the area to the lower lying Lake Hayes Estate urban area on the west side of Hayes Creek (despite close proximity of ONL/ONF).
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a relatively undeveloped small-scale plateau sandwiched between the urban area of Lake Hayes Estate and the Morven Hill ONL (WB).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Importance of the unit as a buffer between the urban area to the west and the ONL to the east and south.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision. Easy topography. 'Developed' context to the west. Proximity of urban infrastructure.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Impression of the area as a relatively visually discreet buffer between the urban area of Lake Hayes Estate and the undeveloped Morven Hill ONL to the east. Integration of buildings with plantings. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Alec Robins Road to the surrounding mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-High

15: Hogans Gully

Landscape Character Unit	15: Hogans Gully
Landform patterns	Gully framed by moraine-type landform, with the latter characterised by hummocky hills interspersed with plateaus.
Vegetation patterns	Isolated stands of bush, and patches of scrub in gullies and throughout some steeper areas. Exotic amenity plantings around buildings.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams and overland flow paths draining eastwards across the unit to the Arrow River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, open longer-range views to surrounding ONL context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest, SHA, golf course. East: toe of hummocky landform, Arrow River, cadastral boundary. South: Stream and Bendemeer Special Zone (LCU 16). West: Bendemeer Special Zone (LCU 16).
Land use	Mix of rural residential and rural. Relatively unkempt character of some of the larger rural lots suggests marginally productive.
Settlement patterns	Sparse scattering of dwellings, generally set back from the road and/or well contained by landform / vegetative patterns. No consented but unbuilt platforms evident. Typical lot sizes: predominantly larger lots >20ha. Some smaller lots (<4ha and 4-10ha) at north western end of unit.
Proximity to key route	McDonnell Road passes through the eastern end of the unit which is a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No Council walkways/cycleways within the unit.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water on north side of Hogans Gully Road.
Visibility/prominence	Visibility of the unit from Hogans Gully Road is limited to the plateaus and slopes immediately adjacent. The elevated hummocky nature of the balance of the unit means that visibility is limited to the higher ground to the north (The Hills LCU 22), the elevated land to the west (Bendemeer LCU 16), the Crown Terrace (LCU 20) and ONL(WB) mountain range to the east. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	15: Hogans Gully
Views	Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Morven Hill. The outlook from Hogans Gully Road comprises a relatively attractive, 'low key' rural view in which buildings are subservient. From within the unit, key views relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.
Enclosure/openness	The gully itself displays a relatively open character; however, throughout the elevated areas on either side, the hummocky landform pattern serves to create a sense of enclosure.
Complexity	Generally, there is a variable degree of complexity that derives from the gully and moraine landform pattern.
Coherence	Vegetation patterns reinforce landform patterns in places, conferring a limited sense of coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate to high perception of naturalness as a consequence of the limited visibility and sparse arrangement of buildings and the relatively 'unkempt' character of the area.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural residential area that is somewhat tucked away and forgotten. As a consequence, the unit functions as 'breathing space' between the more intensive rural residential 'nodes' at the north end of Lake Hayes (to the west) and the Arrow River crossing (to the east).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Potential visibility from nearby rural residential development on elevated land (Bendemeer), ONLs (including tracks) and zig zag lookout. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern. Potential visibility of development along ridgeline edges and from Hogans Gully Road. Lack of defensible edges in places. Potential for development to read as sprawl between the Lake Hayes Rural Residential and Arrow Junction 'nodes'. Also the potential for development here to read as sprawl between Arrow Junction and Arrowtown South.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Integration potential of landform pattern. Riparian restoration potential. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Relatively visually discreet nature of the majority of the unit (due to landform and to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Buildings integrated by landform and vegetation. Retention of hummock landform pattern. Reinforcement of landform patterning via gully / stream plantings.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate

17: Morven Ferry

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Landform patterns	Generally flat alluvial terrace landform.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts, scattered shade trees, the odd exotic woodlot planting, exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	No streams, wetlands or ponds evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins the Arrow River ONF along part of eastern edge and the Morven Hill ONL (WB) along western edge.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundaries. East: McDonnell Road, Arrow Junction rural residential land use edge (cadastral boundaries), Arrow River ONF. South: Toe of moraine landform east of Morven Hill. West: Morven Hill ONL boundary, Bendemeer Special Zone, toe of Hogans Gully hillslopes.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential and hobby farming type uses. Some areas of more open pastoral land particularly adjacent McDonnell Road.
Settlement patterns	Dispersed patterning with some consented but unbuilt platforms (7). Typical lot sizes: large lots on west side of McDonnell Road (>20ha). Elsewhere mix of under 4ha and 4-10ha with the odd lot between 20-50ha in size.
Proximity to key route	SH6 passes through the unit. McDonnell Road also traverses the unit – a popular route between SH6 and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway passes through the unit. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Arrow Bridges Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Very limited water reticulation.
Visibility/prominence	The northern portion of the unit enjoys a reasonably high public profile as a consequence of its location adjacent SH6 and McDonnell Road in conjunction with the relatively open nature of this part of the unit. In contrast, the southern portion of the unit is considerably more visually discreet as a result of its quiet rural road context and vegetation patterns. The popular walkway/cycleway route that passes through this area increases its 'profile'. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Views	Key views relate to the memorable vista from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south, and the highly attractive open views across the area from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway to Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the north. With respect to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout, the unit reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, flat rural/rural residential land flanking Morven Hill.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a variable sense of openness and enclosure largely as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	Similarly, the unit exhibits a variable degree of complexity, largely as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Coherence	The fragmented patterning of vegetation features detracts from the underlying coherence associated with the relatively uniform flat topography. The range of building styles evident does not reinforce the landscape coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate to low level of naturalness as a consequence of the patterning and visibility of rural residential development.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads a mixed rural and rural residential landscape on the edge of the established Arrow Junction rural residential 'node'.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The location of the northern portion of the area adjacent to scenic routes, in combination with its relatively open pastoral character, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Absence of legible edges to the rural residential enclave to the east associated with Arrow Junction makes the unit vulnerable to development creep. Potential for development in northern portion to read as sprawling into Hogans Gully and northwards to Arrowtown. Walkway/cycleway proximity.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Potential for development to form a legible node, as a consequence of 'junction' function, landform pattern (contrasting 'flats') and noting that this patterning is already emerging immediately to the east. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Open views from SH 6 and McDonnell Road to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south. Open views from SH 6 and McDonnell Road to Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the north. Integration of buildings with planting.

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-Low

18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills, swamps and remnant kettle lakes.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts and hedgerows in places. The odd scattered woodlot and patches of scrub in gullies. Pond edge plantings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	Stream, amenity and farm ponds, and wetland features evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins ONL (WB) on west and south sides and Arrow River ONF on eastern side.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Toe of the moraine landform. East: Arrow River ONF. South: ONL(WB)/study area boundary. West: ONL(WB)/study area boundary.
Land use	Predominantly rural lifestyle / hobby farming and more generously proportioned working rural lots with a limited amount of rural residential development evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings reasonably evenly dispersed along road or stream edges, and well integrated by plantings. A few consented but unbuilt platforms evident (5). Typical lot sizes: majority of unit > 10ha with approximately half of the unit 50ha or greater.
Proximity to key route	Not located near a key route. Morven Ferry Road is a dead-end road.
Heritage features	Four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway passes through the area (forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Twin Rivers Ride' and 'Arrow River Bridges Ride').
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, stormwater or water.

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Visibility/prominence	The somewhat sleepy backwater location (on a dead-end road), together with its (relatively) lower-lying topography means that the unit is not particularly prominent in terms of the wider basin landscape. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to the dramatic mountain, Morven Hill and Crown Terrace escarpment views available from the walkway / cycleway network, local roads, and dwellings.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and enclosure as a consequence of the landform patterning (west of Morven Ferry Road) and vegetation patterning (east of Morven Ferry Road).
Complexity	A correspondingly variable degree of complexity as a result of the landform and vegetation patterns.
Coherence	A low level of landscape coherence. Vegetation patterns generally do not reinforce landform features.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate perception of naturalness as a consequence of the limited visibility of buildings, the open hummocky pastoral character (particularly to the western side of Morven Ferry Road), and the close proximity and open views to the mountain setting and Crown Terrace escarpment.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural lifestyle / hobby farming area that functions as a transition between the mountain ONL and the lower-lying and more 'developed' river terrace to the north and east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The visibility of the unit from public roads and vantage points and from parts of the Queenstown Trail located on Crown land, very close proximity to ONLs and ONFs, together with the role of the area as a transition between the mountain ONL and the lower-lying and more 'developed' river terrace to the north and east, makes it sensitive to additional development.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Hummocky landform on western side of Morven Ferry Road, and vegetation patterns on eastern side of Morven Ferry Road, provide some potential to absorb additional development. Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision. Riparian, pond, and wetland restoration potential. Dead-end road – limited 'profile'.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting.

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

19: Gibbston Highway Flats

Landscape Character Unit	19: Gibbston Highway Flats
Landform patterns	Flat river terrace unit sandwiched between the vegetation-clad steep slopes of the Arrow River and the steep scrub and weed-dominated Crown Terrace escarpment.
Vegetation patterns	Numerous exotic shelterbelts and hedgerows, exotic amenity plantings around buildings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	A series of streams drain from the Crown Terrace across the flats to the Arrow River. A pond evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Crown Range ONL (WB) to the east and Arrow River ONF to the west.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundary. East: Toe of Crown Terrace Escarpment (ONL WB)/study area boundary. South: Top of Arrow River streambanks (ONF). West: Top of Arrow River streambanks (ONF).
Land use	Predominantly working rural landscape with some rural residential development, particularly along the Arrow River edge.
Settlement patterns	Reasonably spacious pattern with very few consented but unbuilt platforms (2). Typical lot sizes: majority of unit > 10ha with approximately half falling in the 20-50ha range.
Proximity to key route	Located on key scenic route between Queenstown and Gibbston Valley, Cromwell (SH6).
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways in the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Limited reticulated water.
Visibility/prominence	The area is highly visible from SH6.

Landscape Character Unit	19: Gibbston Highway Flats
Views	Key views relate to the highly attractive vistas from SH6 westwards across the flats to the Arrow River margins, backdropped by Morven Hill (ONL WB) and the ONL mountain range to the south (Remarkables), and eastwards to the large-scale and scrub-clad Crown Terrace escarpment.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a variable sense of enclosure and openness as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Complexity	Correspondingly variable degree of complexity as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Coherence	Generally a limited landscape coherence as a consequence of the fragmented vegetation patterns and flat topography.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate perception of naturalness as a consequence of the working rural landscape impression. The very close proximity of the 'wild' scrub-dominated Crown Terrace escarpment serves to counter the diminishing influence of visible dwellings etc. in terms of naturalness values.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as a working rural landscape on the very edge or at the entrance (depending on orientation) of the Wakatipu Basin.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The location of the unit adjacent to a scenic route, in combination with its relatively open pastoral character, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Absence of legible edges to the rural residential enclave to the north associated with Arrow Junction makes the unit vulnerable to development creep. Role of the unit as a 'gateway' to the Wakatipu Basin. Potential for development to read as linear sprawl from the established and legible rural residential 'node' associated with Arrow Junction.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Riparian restoration potential.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Maintenance of a relatively spacious and, in places, open, working rural landscape character. Open views from SH6 to the Crown Terrace escarpment, the Arrow River margins, Morven Hill and the Remarkables to the south. Impression of the area as a 'green' gateway to the Basin.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very Low.

20: Crown Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	20: Crown Terrace
Landform patterns	Elevated glacial terrace characterised by plateaus interspersed with rolling hummocky hills and includes the lower slopes of the Crown Range.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts/hedgerows, shade trees, pockets of bush and patches of scrub in gullies. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings in places. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams draining westwards across the terrace from the Crown Range to the Arrow River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Surrounded by ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: ONL (WB) toe of mountain range/study area boundary. East: ONL (WB) toe of mountain range/study area boundary. South: ONL (WB) top of escarpment/study area boundary. West: ONL (WB) top of escarpment/study area boundary.
Land use	Predominantly in rural production with loose groupings of rural residential development throughout the unit.
Settlement patterns	Relatively spacious rural residential development loosely grouped throughout the terrace and oriented to take advantage of the panoramic views out over the Wakatipu Basin. Relatively few existing dwellings. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms evident (33). Rural buildings evident. Typical lots sizes > 20ha.
Proximity to key route	The Crown Range Road passes through the terrace and comprises an important scenic route linking Queenstown to Cardrona and Wanaka. Formalised scenic lookouts at various points.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways in the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Limited reticulated water.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and relatively flat topography of the unit means that only its western edges are visible from the basin. The reasonably open character and flat to gently rolling landform pattern makes much of the unit highly visible from the Crown Range Road.

Landscape Character Unit	20: Crown Terrace
Views	Key views relate to the views across the terrace from the Crown Range Road to the Crown Range and wider Wakatipu Basin landscape, and views from the scenic lookouts out over the Wakatipu Basin.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, the unit exhibits a relatively high degree of openness. The Crown Range provides a strong sense of enclosure to the east. The lower-lying large scale basin landscape to the west amplifies the perception of openness.
Complexity	Localised landform (hummocky hills) and vegetation patterns confer a reasonable degree of complexity in places.
Coherence	The legible and largely uncluttered landform patterning, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence. However, minimal interplay between landform and vegetation patterning.
Naturalness	A reasonably high degree of naturalness as a consequence of its predominantly open and pastoral character combined with its proximity to the vastly scaled and relatively undeveloped Crown Range landscape to the east. In the main, (existing) buildings tend to be well integrated by plantings serving to reduce their prominence.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit displays a working rural landscape character with a reasonably spacious patterning of rural residential development in places. The terrace serves as an important transition between the 'inhabited' Wakatipu Basin landscape and the relatively unmodified 'wilderness' landscape of the Crown Range to the east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open and exposed nature of the unit, in addition to its importance as a scenic route and as a transition between the Wakatipu Basin and the Crown Range, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Potential integration of walkways/cycleways etc. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of openness and spaciousness associated with a predominantly pastoral landscape. Dramatic views from the Crown Range Road to the Wakatipu Basin and surrounding mountain setting. Impression of the area as a transition between the inhabited basin landscape and the more 'wild' Crown Range mountain- scape to the east.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very low.

21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Landform patterns	Alluvial river terrace landform flanking the west and east sides of the Arrow River.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic amenity planting around dwellings.
Hydrology	A tributary of the Arrow River passes through the northern portion of the unit on the west side of the river, and a stream drains from the Crown Terrace to a pond in the portion of the unit located on the east side of the river.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	The Arrow River ONF passes through the unit. The eastern portion adjoins the Crown Terrace escarpment ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundary. East: Arrow River and toe of Crown Terrace escarpment. South: landuse / cadastral boundaries. West: cadastral boundaries, SH6, McDonnell Road.
Land use	Rural residential with some rural lifestyle / hobby farming uses evident. Council reserve and DoC land on the eastern side of the river.
Settlement patterns	Generally, a node of relatively intensive rural residential development around the SH6 Arrow River crossing. A limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms on the south west side of the unit (5). Some larger-scaled lots to the north end. Typical lot sizes: predominantly <4ha The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of Residential Activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located on a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 i.e. McDonnell Road. SH6 passes through the southern portion of the unit.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A council walkway/cycleway passes through the unit. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Arrow River Bridges Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Very limited water reticulation.

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Visibility/prominence	The unit's location on a key vehicular route and a popular pedestrian, and cycle route suggests a prominent location. However, the extensive vegetation throughout much of the area, in combination with its low-lying and flat topography, limits visibility. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influence of relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Within the unit, roadside views tend to be framed and filtered by vegetation. The walkway / cycleway and SH6 river crossing affords highly attractive views of the Arrow River. Towards the edges of the unit, the open character affords longer range views to the surrounding mountain context. With respect to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout, the unit reads as a distinct 'node' of rural residential development.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, a relatively high degree of enclosure as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	A correspondingly high degree of complexity as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Coherence	Despite the extensive plantings, the varied character of the vegetation in combination with the predominant patterning of smaller lots results in a landscape of limited coherence.
Naturalness	A relatively low degree of naturalness within the unit itself as a consequence of the level of rural residential development. This is partially offset by the very close proximity of the unit to the 'wild' Crown Terrace escarpment and the vegetated margins of the Arrow River.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as an established node of rural residential development focused on the Arrow River crossing.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of legible edges to the unit to the southwest, southeast and north west. Existing platform and lot arrangement throughout the 'node' around the river crossing, together with vegetation patterns, may constrain additional development. Walkway/cycleway proximity. Scenic route proximity.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian, pond edge restoration potential. Some larger lots to the northern end of the unit suggest the potential for subdivision. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. The relatively visually discreet nature of the area, together with its established rural residential node character, suggest the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider basin landscape. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure.

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Maintaining a sense of openness in views from SH6 and McDonnell Road to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south; and Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the west and south. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway route to the Arrow River. Integration of buildings via planting. Retention of existing vegetation patterns.
Capability to absorb additional development	High

22: The Hills

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with hummocky hills, plateaus, and remnant kettle lakes, with the latter converted to amenity ponds.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic amenity plantings throughout the golf course and around rural residential dwellings. Native plantings around pond, stream, and wetland features. Isolated pockets of bush and woodlot plantings. Extensive roadside plantings to Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Hydrology	Several streams, ponds, and wetland areas.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: cadastral boundary. East: McDonnell Road, toe of hummocky hill landform pattern. South: toe of hummocky hill landform pattern, stream pattern. West: Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Land use	Golf course and rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Scattered dwellings throughout, primarily located around water features. Gated entrances requiring security codes. Typical lot sizes: one large lot of approximately 100ha, several smaller lots.

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Proximity to key route	Located on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road which is a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Also located on McDonnell Road which is a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways through the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer. No reticulated water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	<p>The area is visible from the elevated streets along the western edge of Arrowtown. The relatively close proximity and (reasonably) similar elevation means that part of the unit is prominent in the outlook while the hummocky terrain limits visibility to other parts.</p> <p>Roadside plantings limit views from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.</p> <p>Eastern edges of the unit are visible from McDonnell Road.</p> <p>The unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.</p>
Views	<p>Key views relate to the view out over the unit from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the unit reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown.</p> <p>The outlook from McDonnell Road and the western margins of Arrowtown comprises a relatively attractive, golf course / parkland landscape on the edge of Arrowtown. The recently approved Arrowtown South SHA comprising a distinctly urban three storey high density retirement village development will also be visible in each of these outlooks (albeit to a varying degree depending on location). The Arrowtown South Special Zone appears in the foreground of views west from the southern end of Cotter Avenue.</p> <p>From within the unit, key views are expected to relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.</p>
Enclosure/openness	Landform and vegetation create a variable sense of openness and enclosure.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex landscape as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.
Coherence	The underlying golf course landscape lends a coherence to the unit.
Naturalness	Generally, a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the distinctly modified character of the golf course setting.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a distinctly private, highly modified golf course parkland landscape in which rural residential development is an established component. The unit forms part of the swathe of golf courses that 'contain' the western and southern edges of Arrowtown, effectively functioning as a green belt to the village.

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Private golf course and previous resource consent processes suggest limited scope for residential development. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (due to landform and, to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Golf course landscape potentially suited to resort development. Landform pattern creates potential to integrate well sited buildings into the landscape. Riparian restoration potential. Integration of walkways / cycleways. Close proximity to Arrowtown. Large-scaled lots suggest some potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Locating buildings so that they are visually discreet. Integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from the ridgeline crests to the eastern edges of the unit.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate

23: Millbrook

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Landform patterns	The unit predominantly comprises an elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills and remnant kettle lakes. The exceptions to this are a band of flat land (effectively part of Malaghans Valley) running along the northern margins., a roche moutonnée (ONF) in the north-eastern quadrant adjacent Malaghans Road and a small flat triangular parcel at the eastern end of the unit.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity planting around buildings and throughout golf course, native riparian and pond edge plantings. Dense evergreen shelterbelt plantings along much of the Malaghans Road frontage. Appreciable stand of native bush in steep-sided gully around Waterfall Park. Generally, manicured lawn and parkland plantings dominate.
Hydrology	Numerous watercourses and amenity ponds.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit includes an ONF (roche moutonnée). Mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Character Unit boundaries	North: Malaghans Road. East: McDonnell Road, cadastral boundary, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. South: Millbrook Special zone boundary. West: Millbrook Special zone boundary.
Land use	Golf course, commercial and rural residential uses dominate. A small area of grazing land around the roche moutonnée.
Settlement patterns	Generally, the area is relatively intensively developed with substantial clusters of two-storey semi-detached and terraced housing units throughout the golf course area, accessed via a complex patterning of semi-rural lanes. Generally, development is set into either a comprehensive parkland setting (Millbrook) or a comprehensive bush setting (Waterfall Park Special Zone – undeveloped). Pockets of more spacious rural residential development in places along Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. Additional and similarly-scaled development is anticipated throughout the western portion of the Millbrook Special Zone. This area will be flanked by a golf course and landscape protection areas on its ‘exposed’ western margins. Large lot single ownership.
Proximity to key route	Located on Malaghans Road which comprises an important scenic route between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Also located on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road – a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway through Millbrook (forms part of the Queenstown Trail ‘Countryside Ride’). Golf course, restaurant, etc.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer, water and stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The dense evergreen shelterbelt plantings along Malaghans Road mean that the majority of development within Millbrook is screened from the much of Malaghans Road. The more open character at the eastern end of the unit is such that the eastern portion of Millbrook is visible from the eastern end of Malaghans Road, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the elevated north western margins of Arrowtown. Buildings are however relatively unobtrusive in these views as a consequence of the well-established parkland plantings. The far eastern triangular area is visually connected to Arrowtown. Waterfall Park (unbuilt) obscured from view by landform and vegetation patterns. The unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit’s prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Views	<p>Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown.</p> <p>The outlooks from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the north-western margins of Arrowtown which comprise a relatively attractive, golf course / parkland landscape on the edge of Arrowtown.</p> <p>The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.</p> <p>The containment of vegetation and localised hummocks means that a relatively limited number of dwellings are visible from the surrounding area (excepting areas at high elevation).</p>
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of enclosure and openness deriving primarily from vegetation patterns.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns, together with the dense arrangement of buildings.
Coherence	The relatively consistent planting treatment and architectural forms lend a reasonably strong degree of coherence to the Millbrook development. The varying planting and architectural styles associated with the handful of rural residential lots on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road means that these parts of the unit display a reduced perception of coherence.
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the level of existing and anticipated development.
Sense of Place	<p>Generally, the unit reads as an intensively-developed attractive urban settlement set within a parkland landscape.</p> <p>The area also forms part of the swathe of golf courses that frame the western and southern edges of Arrowtown and effectively function as a greenbelt to the village.</p> <p>The far eastern triangle comprises a discrete flat area that contrasts with the more rolling golf course/parkland landscape to the west and south (LCU 22) and associates more closely with the adjacent urban area of Arrowtown.</p>
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	<p>Existing density of development and the issue of absorbing additional development without compromising existing (urban) parkland feel.</p> <p>Ensuring existing development character does not sprawl westwards and southwards into the existing, 'more rural' areas.</p> <p>Private golf course and previous (recent) resource consent processes suggests limited further capability for development.</p>
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	<p>Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (due to landform and vegetation patterns).</p> <p>Close proximity to Arrowtown.</p> <p>Urban infrastructure.</p> <p>Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.</p>
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Attractive urban parkland character.</p> <p>Landscape coherence.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate: majority of unit High: triangular area at far eastern end of the unit

24: Arrowtown South

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Landform patterns	The unit encompasses the flat to gently rolling land on the south side of Arrowtown and includes the steep escarpment that currently defines the south western edge of the village.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity planting around buildings and throughout the public golf course. A mix of native and weeds species along watercourses. Native and amenity pond edge plantings (in golf course) Scrub and weeds throughout escarpment. Extensive amenity plantings anticipated throughout the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA (unbuilt).
Hydrology	A watercourse (running roughly parallel with McDonnell Road) and amenity ponds.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit adjoins ONL (WB) along east boundary. Mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Arrowtown Urban Growth Limit. East: ONL/study area boundary. South: cadastral boundaries. West: McDonnell Road, toe of hummocky hill landform pattern.
Land use	Golf course, rural residential (Arrowtown South Structure Plan) and retirement village (Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA) uses dominate. Open grazing land is required along the McDonnell Road frontage of the Arrowtown South Structure Plan area.
Settlement patterns	The Arrowtown South Special Zone anticipates a reasonably spacious patterning of rural residential development together with extensive riparian and escarpment restoration, pastoral areas and a landscape framework throughout the south western edges of Arrowtown to create an attractive edge to the settlement in conjunction with the adjacent golf courses and roads. The Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA anticipates an urban patterning of buildings ranging from one storey units along the McDonnell Road edge to three storey buildings in the central western margins of the area. Typical lot sizes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly 4-10ha. • Some larger lots 10-20ha. The Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village will have implications for future settlement patterns for the land around it south and west of McDonnell Road.

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Proximity to key route	Located on Centennial Avenue and Mc Donnell Road, both of which comprise a popular routes between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	Four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No Council walkways/cycleways through the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer in part. No reticulated water and stormwater although it is expected that the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA will be fully serviced.
Visibility/prominence	The area is visible from the elevated streets along the western edge of Arrowtown. The relatively close proximity means that the unit is prominent in the outlook. The unit is also visible from McDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue. Like The Hills, the unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown. The outlooks from McDonnell Road, Centennial Avenue and the western margins of Arrowtown comprise a golf course and rural residential landscape on the edge of Arrowtown. The relatively wild and unkempt escarpment forms a prominent element in views from McDonnell Road. The recently approved Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA comprising a distinctly urban one - three storey high density retirement village development will also be visible in each of these outlooks (albeit to a varying degree depending on location). From within the unit, key views are expected to relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of enclosure and openness deriving primarily from localised landform and vegetation patterns. The escarpment to the north east of the unit and the hummocky landform of The Hills to the south west provide containment to the McDonnell Road portion of the unit.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns (golf course area), together with the dense arrangement of buildings (SHA area).
Coherence	A limited perception of coherence as a consequence of the varying landform and vegetation patterns and the somewhat anomalous urban character of development associated with the approved SHA located at some distance from the legible village edge (i.e. the escarpment).

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the level of existing and anticipated built development together with the golf course patterning. The relatively wild and unkempt character of the escarpment counters this to a limited degree.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as part of the swathe of golf courses and rural residential development that frame the western and southern edges of Arrowtown and effectively function as a 'greenbelt' to the village. However, this 'greenbelt' effect, together with the legibility of the escarpment as a robust defensible edge to Arrowtown has been significantly compromised by the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent and sizeable part of the unit.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Extent to which the unit can continue to operate as a 'greenbelt' to Arrowtown. Role of the escarpment as an edge to the village. Ensuring urban residential development is constrained within defensible boundaries and does not sprawl westwards and southwards in an uncontrolled manner into the existing, 'more rural' areas. Public golf course facility.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Golf course landscape potentially suited to accommodating a reasonably high level of development (e.g. Millbrook). Close proximity to Arrowtown. Close proximity to urban infrastructure. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Urbanising effects of the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA suggest a tolerance for (sensitive) urban development. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways. Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Views from McDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue to the surrounding mountain/river context. Reinforcing/ re-establishing a robust and defensible edge to Arrowtown.
Capability to absorb additional development	High

Appendix 2: Variations to Chapters 2, 22, 27 and 36 as Recommended

Variation to Stage 1 Definition of Site Chapter 2:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

Site	<p><u>Means:</u></p> <p><u>Any area of land which meets one of the descriptions set out below:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>An area of land which is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) <u>Comprised of one allotment in one certificate of title, or two or more contiguous allotments held together in one certificate of title, in such a way that the allotments cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the council; or</u>(ii) <u>Contained in a single lot on an approved survey plan of subdivision for which a separate certificate of title could be issued without any further consent of the council;</u> <p><u>Being in any case the smaller area of clauses (i) or (ii) above; or</u></p> <p>(b) <u>An area of land which is composed of two or more contiguous lots held in two or more certificates of title where such titles are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) <u>Subject to a condition imposed under section 75 of the Building Act 2004; or</u>(ii) <u>Held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the council; or</u> <p>(c) <u>An area of land which is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) <u>Partly made up of land which complies with clauses (a) or (b) above; and</u>(ii) <u>Partly made up of an interest in any airspace above or subsoil below a road where (a) and (b) are adjoining and are held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior approval of the council;</u> <p><u>Except in relation to each description that in the case of land subdivided under the Unit Titles Act 1972 and 2010, the cross lease system or stratum subdivision, 'site' must be deemed to be the whole of the land subject to the unit development, cross lease or stratum subdivision.</u></p>
-------------	--

1. An area of land which is:

- (i) — comprised in a single lot or other legally defined parcel of land and held in a single Certificate of Title; or
- (ii) — comprised in a single lot or legally defined parcel of land for which a separate certificate of title could be issued without further consent of the Council.

Being in any case the smaller land area of i or ii, or

2. an area of land which is comprised in two or more adjoining lots or other legally defined parcels of land, held together in one certificate of title in such a way that the lots/parcels cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the Council; or

3. an area of land which is comprised in two or more adjoining certificates of title where such titles are:

- (i) — subject to a condition imposed under section 37 of the Building Act 2004 or section 643 of the Local Government Act 1974; or
- (ii) — held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the Council; or

4. In the case of land not subject to the Land Transfer Act 1952, the whole parcel of land last acquired under one instrument of conveyance;

Except:

- (i) — in the case of land subdivided under the cross lease of company lease systems, other than strata titles, site shall mean an area of land containing: —

- a) — a building or buildings for residential or business — purposes with any accessory buildings(s), plus any — land exclusively restricted to the users of that/those — building(s), plus an equal share of common property; or

- b) — a remaining share or shares in the fee simple creating a vacant part(s) of the whole for future cross lease or company lease purposes; and

- ii — in the case of land subdivided under Unit Titles Act 1972 and 2010 (other than strata titles), site shall mean an area of land containing a principal unit or proposed unit on a unit plan together with its accessory units and an equal share of common property; and

~~iii — in the case of strata titles, site shall mean the underlying certificate of title of the entire land containing the strata titles, immediately prior to subdivision.~~

~~In addition to the above.~~

~~a) — A site includes the airspace above the land.~~

~~b) — If any site is crossed by a zone boundary under this Plan, the site is deemed to be divided into two or more sites by that zone boundary.~~

~~e) — Where a site is situated partly within the District and partly in an adjoining District, then the part situated in the District shall be deemed to be one site.~~

Amendments to Chapter 6 Landscapes and Rural Character

Add new Policy 6.3.3A after Policy 6.3.3

6.3.3A Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this chapter related to those categories do not apply. (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.1.8, 3.2.5.2, 3.3.20-24, 3.3.32).

Variation to Stage 1 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Chapter 22:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

Part 22.1 Zone Purpose.

Paragraphs 5 and 6:

The ~~Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone east of Dalefield Road places limits on the expansion of rural lifestyle development at that location.~~

The ~~‘Hawthorn Triangle’ Rural Lifestyle Zone bordered by Speargrass Flat, Lower Shotover and Domain Roads defines an existing settlement of properties. The adjoining Rural Lifestyle zoned areas within the Wakatipu Basin identify the potential for further limited residential development, within the density limits set out in the provisions.~~

Provision 22.3.2.9

In addition to Tables 1 and 2, the following standards apply to the areas specified:

~~Table 3: Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer Zones~~

~~Table 43: Rural Residential Zone at Forest Hill.~~

~~Table 54: Rural Residential Bob’s Cove and Sub Zone.~~

~~Table 6: Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone.~~

~~Table 5: Rural Residential Zone at Camp Hill.~~

~~Table 76: Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.~~

Rule 22.5.4.3.

~~22.5.4.3 — Rural Residential zone at the north of Lake Hayes — 15m~~

Table 3: Rules 22.5.14 to 22.5.18


	Table 3: Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer zones	Non-compliance:
22.5.14	The erection of more than one non-residential building.	NC
22.5.15	In each area of the Deferred Rural Lifestyle zones east of Dalefield Road up to two residential allotments may be created with a single residential building platform on each allotment.	D
22.5.16	The land in the Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone shall be held in a single allotment containing no more than one residential building platform.	D
22.5.17	In the Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone, apart from the curtilage area, the land shall be maintained substantially in pasture. Tree planting and natural revegetation shall be confined to gullies and watercourses, as specified in covenants and on landscape plans.	D
22.5.18	In the Buffer zone, the maximum building height in the building platform shall be 6.5m.	NC

Table 6. Rules 22.5.33 to 22.5.37

	Table 6: Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone Refer to Part 22.7.2 for the concept development plan	Non-compliance:
22.5.33	Density There shall be no more than one residential unit per lot.	NC
22.5.34	Building Height The maximum building height shall be 6.5m for lots 9-15 on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone. Chimney and ventilation structures may be 7.2m high in this sub-zone.	D
22.5.35	Building Location The location of buildings shall be in accordance with the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone, in rule 22.7.2.	D
22.5.36	Design Standards Within Lots 9-15 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone: 22.5.36.1 The roof pitch shall be between 20° and 30° and roof dormers and roof lights are to be incorporated in the roof pitch; 22.5.36.2 Roof finishes of buildings shall be within the following range: Slate shingle, cedar shingle, steel roofing (long run corrugated or tray) in the following colours, or similar, only: Coloursteel colours New Denim Blue, Grey Friars, Ironsand or Lignite; 22.5.36.3 Wall claddings of buildings shall be within the following range: cedar shingles, natural timber (clear stain), painted plaster in the following colours or equivalent: Resene 5YO18, 5B025, 5B030, 4GR18, 1B55, 5G013, 3YO65, 3YO20; stone cladding provided the stone shall be limited to Otago schist only and all pointing/mortar shall be recessed.	D
22.5.37	Landscaping 22.5.37.1 Any application for building consent shall be accompanied by a landscape plan that shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme. 22.5.37.2 The landscape plan shall ensure: a. That the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone is planted with a predominance of indigenous species in a manner which enhances naturalness; and	D

	<p>b. That residential development on sites adjoining Tucker Beach Road is subject to screening.</p> <p>22.5.37.3 Plantings at the foot of, on, and above the escarpment within lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall include indigenous trees, shrubs, and tussock grasses.</p> <p>22.5.37.4 Plantings on Lots 1 – 17 may include, willow (except Crack Willow), larch, maple as well as indigenous species.</p> <p>22.5.37.5 The erection of solid or paling fences is not permitted.</p>	
--	---	--

22.7.2 Rural Residential Ferry Hill Sub-Zone Concept Development Plan



Variation to Stage 1 Subdivision and Development Chapter 27:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following restricted discretionary activity rule into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.9 All subdivision activities, unless otherwise provided for, in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Location of building platforms and accessways
- b. Subdivision design and lot layout including the location of boundaries, lot sizes and dimensions;
- c. Location, scale and extent of landform modification, and retaining structures;
- d. Property access and roading;
- e. Esplanade provision;
- f. Natural and other hazards;
- g. Firefighting water supply and access;
- h. Water supply;
- i. Network utility services, energy supply and telecommunications;
- j. Open space and recreation provision;
- k. Ecological and natural landscape features;
- l. Historic Heritage features;
- m. Easements;
- n. Vegetation removal, and proposed planting;
- o. Fencing and gates;
- p. Wastewater and stormwater management;
- q. Connectivity of existing and proposed pedestrian networks, bridle paths, cycle networks;
- r. Adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following discretionary activity rule into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.18A Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision which does not comply with the minimum net site area specified in Part 27.6 provided that the minimum net site area is not less than 4,000m² and the average area of all lots in the subdivision is not less than 1.0ha per lot..

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following non-complying activity rules into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.18B Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision with a minimum net site area less than 4,000m² or where the average area of lots in the subdivision is less than 1.0ha per lot.

27.5.26 The further subdivision of an allotment that has previously been used to calculate the average lot size net site area for subdivision in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct,

except where the further subdivision and any prior subdivision together complies with Rule 27.6.1.

Amend Chapter 27 by amending the table under Rule 27.6.1 as follows:

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Rural	Rural	No minimum
	Gibbston Character	
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u>	<u>80ha</u>
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	<u>6000m²</u> <u>1.0ha minimum average</u>
Rural Lifestyle	Rural Lifestyle	One hectare providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares. For the purposes of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.
	Rural Lifestyle Deferred A and B.	No minimum, but each of the two parts of the zone identified on the planning map shall contain no more than two allotments.
	Rural Lifestyle Buffer.	The land in this zone shall be held in a single allotment
Rural Residential	Rural Residential	4000m ²
	Rural Residential Bob's Cove sub-zone	No minimum, providing the total lots to be created, inclusive of the entire area within the zone shall have an average of 4000m ² .
	Rural Residential Ferry Hill Subzone	4000m² with no more than 17 lots created for residential activity

Amend Objective 27.7.6 and Policy 27.7.6.1- Location Specific objectives, policies and provisions

~~**27.7.6 Objective - Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone – Maintain and enhance visual amenity values and landscape character within and around the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone.**~~

Policies

~~27.7.6.1 At the time of considering a subdivision application, the following matters shall be had particular regard to:~~

- ~~• The subdivision design has had regard to minimising the number of accesses to roads;~~

- ~~the location and design of on-site vehicular access avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the landscape and visual amenity values by following the natural form of the land to minimise earthworks, providing common driveways and by ensuring that appropriate landscape treatment is an integral component when constructing such access;~~
- ~~The extent to which plantings with a predominance of indigenous species enhances the naturalness of the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone;~~
- ~~The extent to which the species, location, density, and maturity of the planting is such that residential development in the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone will be successfully screened from views obtained when travelling along Tucker Beach Road.~~

Insert the following after clause 27.9.3.2:

<p><u>27.9.3.3</u></p>	<p><u>Assessment Matters in relation to Rule 27.5.9 (Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct Subdivision Activities)</u></p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which the proposal is consistent with objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion.</u></p> <p>b. <u>The extent to which the subdivision provides for low impact design that avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the environment.</u></p> <p><u>Subdivision Design</u></p> <p>c. <u>The extent to which the location of future buildings, ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complements the existing landscape character, visual amenity values and wider amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, including consideration of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>i. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns;</u><u>ii. the alignment of lot boundaries in relation to landform and vegetation features and neighbouring development;</u><u>iii. earth mounding, and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways;</u><u>iv. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units;</u><u>v. riparian restoration planting;</u><u>vi. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement;</u><u>vii. how controls addressing such matters as building height, building colours and materials, building coverage, earthworks, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed plantings might be incorporated in the development in a manner ensuring ongoing compliance;</u><u>viii. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths.</u> <p>d. <u>The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the conditions governing the proposed development so as to ensure that landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.</u></p> <p>e. <u>The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity from public places and neighbouring properties.</u></p> <p>f. <u>Whether clustering of future buildings or varied allotment sizes as part of subdivision design would offer a better solution for maintaining a sense of openness and spaciousness, or the integration of development with existing landform, vegetation or settlement patterns.</u></p> <p>g. <u>The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of an appropriate setback from</u></p>
-------------------------------	---

such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.

- h. The extent to which development adversely affects Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps, and in particular the visual amenity values of those features in views from public places outside of the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.
- i. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds and consent notices.
- j. Whether the layout of reserves and accessways provides for adequate public access and use.
- k. Whether the proposed subdivision provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants or consent notices requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.

Access and Connectivity

- l. Whether proposed sites are located and designed so that each site has a minimum frontage that provides for practical, legal and safe access from a formed public road that is suitable for both normal road going vehicles and construction traffic.
- m. Whether the location and design of any proposed pedestrian, cycle, bridlepaths and vehicle accessways on the proposed site(s) avoid or minimise any adverse effects on soil stability, landform patterns and features, and vegetation.
- n. Whether subdivision provides for safe and practical pedestrian paths and cycle ways (whether sealed or unsealed) and bridle paths that are located in a manner which connect, or have the potential to connect, to reserves (existing or proposed), roads and existing rural walkways.
- o. Whether site design recognises any impact of roading and access on waterbodies, ecosystems, drainage patterns and ecological values.
- p. Whether any subdivision provides for future roads to serve surrounding land or for road links that need to pass through the subdivision.

Infrastructure and Services

- q. Ensuring there is sufficient capacity and treatment to provide for the safe and efficient disposal of stormwater and wastewater from possible future development without adversely affecting natural water systems and ecological values.
- r. Ensuring the design of stormwater and wastewater disposal systems incorporate measures to reduce runoff rates where there may be damage caused to natural waterway systems.
- s. Whether any subdivision proposal demonstrates how any natural water system on the site will be managed, protected or enhanced.
- t. Whether subdivision provides for an adequate and reliable supply of potable water to each proposed site.
- u. Whether subdivision provides for an adequate and reliable supply of emergency water supply to each site in the event of fire.

- v. Whether subdivision has sufficient capacity for the disposal of any effluent or other wastewater flow within the boundaries of each proposed site regardless of seasonal variations and loading.
- w. Assessing where more than one site will be created, whether a shared or individual wastewater treatment and disposal system is the most appropriate, having regard to any known physical constraints.
- x. Considering the extent to which easements and consent notices should be applied to protect the integrity of stormwater and/or wastewater treatment and disposal systems.
- y. Assessing the extent to which access easements should provide for lines, including electric lines, telecommunication lines and other lines, where such lines or cables are or may be located within any private property and serve other properties or sites.
- z. Whether sites can be connected to services such as telecommunications and electricity using low impact design methods including undergrounding of services.

Natural Environment and Cultural values

- aa. Considering the extent to which the subdivision provides for ecological restoration and enhancement. Ecological enhancement may include enhancement of existing vegetation, replanting and weed and pest control.
- bb. Assessing the extent to which the subdivision and subsequent land use on the proposed site(s) adversely affects the historical, cultural or spiritual significance of any site or waahi tapu of significance to iwi.
- cc. Assessing the extent to which the subdivision design and layout preserves and enhances areas of archaeological, cultural or spiritual significance.
- dd. Assessing the extent to which the integrity of any identified heritage feature(s) is maintained and enhanced.
- ee. Considering the benefits of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees.

Earthworks and Hazards

- ff. Considering how earthworks can be undertaken in a manner which mitigates and remedies adverse effects from soil erosion and the generation of sediments into receiving environments.
- gg. Considering whether earthworks are likely to have adverse effects on landscape character or visual amenity values which cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- hh. Considering the extent to which subdivision will increase the risks associated with any natural hazard and/or how the subdivision avoids, remedies or mitigates any hazard prone area.
- ii. Considering the extent to which contaminated or potentially contaminated soil is able to be treated or disposed of.
- jj. Where the subdivision land includes waterbodies, considering the extent to which remediation measures and methodologies can be employed to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on human health, water quality, and to the downstream receiving environment.

	<p>kk. <u>Considering whether consent notices or other protective instruments are needed to ensure that any hazard or contamination remediation measures and methodologies are implemented at the time of development.</u></p>
--	--

27.8 Rules - Location Specific Standards

Delete.

~~27.8.6 — Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone~~

~~27.8.6.1 — Notwithstanding any other rules, any subdivision of the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall be in accordance with the subdivision design as identified in the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone.~~

~~27.8.6.2 — Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall be retained for Landscape Amenity Purposes and shall be held in undivided shares by the owners of Lots 1-8 and Lots 11-15 as shown on the Concept Development Plan.~~

~~27.8.6.3 — Any application for subdivision consent shall:~~

- ~~a — Provide for the creation of the landscape allotments(s) referred to in rule 27.8.6.2 above;~~
- ~~b — Be accompanied by details of the legal entity responsible for the future maintenance and administration of the allotments referred to in rule 27.8.6.2 above;~~
- ~~c — Be accompanied by a Landscape Plan that shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme. The landscape Plan shall ensure:

 - ~~• That the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone is planted with a predominance of indigenous species in a manner that enhances naturalness; and~~
 - ~~• That residential development is subject to screening along Tucker Beach Road,~~~~

~~27.8.6.4 — Plantings at the foot of, on, and above the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall include indigenous trees, shrubs, and tussock grasses.~~

~~27.8.6.5 — Plantings elsewhere may include maple as well as indigenous species.~~

~~27.8.6.6 — The on-going maintenance of plantings established in terms of rule 27.8.6.3 above shall be subject to a condition of resource consent, and given effect to by way of consent notice that is to be registered on the title and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~


~~27.8.6.7 — Any subdivision shall be subject to a condition of resource consent that no buildings shall be located outside the building platforms shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone. The condition shall be subject to a consent notice~~

~~that is registered on the title and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~

~~27.8.6.8 Any subdivision of Lots 1 and 2 DP 26910 shall be subject to a condition of resource consent that no residential units shall be located and no subdivision shall occur on those parts of Lots 1 and 2 DP 26910 zoned Rural General and identified on the planning maps as a building restriction area. The condition shall be subject to a consent notice that is to be registered and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~

27.13 Structure Plans and Spatial Layout Plans

Amend 27.13.3 Waterfall Park Structure Plan




Amend 27.13.4 Millbrook Structure Plan




Structure Plan Legend

- R : Residential
- V : Village
- F : Recreational Facilities
- S : Resort Services
- G : Golf Course and Open Space
- H : Helipad
- LP : Landscape Protection
- LPM : Landscape Protection (Malaghans)
- Activity Area Boundary

Zone Boundary



27.13.1 Ferry Hill Rural Residential Subzone



Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 36 Noise:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

36.5 Rules – Standards Table 2: General Standards

	Standard				Non-Compliance Status
	Activity or sound source	Assessment location	Time	Noise limits	
36.5.1	<u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u>	Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L _{Aeq(15 min)}	NC
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB L _{Aeq(15 min)} 75 dB L _{AFmax}	NC
36.5.2	<u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	Any point within any site	0800h to 2000h	50 dB L _{Aeq(15 min)}	NC
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB L _{Aeq(15 min)} 75 dB L _{AFmax}	NC

Appendix 3: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions Lodged on Chapter 24 and Associated Variations to Stage 1 Chapters

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2016.1	Upper Clutha Environmental Society	Accept in Part	General
2028.1	Andrew and Ursula Davis	Accept in Part	2.4, 4.3
2040.19	Public Health South	Accept in Part	3.9
2040.20	Public Health South	Reject	3.9
2054.1	Erik Moen	Reject	3.16
2054.2	Erik Moen	Accept in Part	3.16
2055.1	Jane Shearer	Reject	2.4
2084.1	Miles Wilson	Reject	2.4, 4.3
2095.1	Peter Goulston	Accept in Part	2.4, 2.8
2097.10	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Reject	4.3
2097.11	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Reject	3.16
2097.12	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Reject	3.14
2097.2	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2097.3	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept	4.3
2097.4	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2097.5	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
2097.6	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Reject	3.14, 3.16
2097.7	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Reject	3.15
2097.8	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2097.9	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2122.1	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Reject	2.4,4.3
2122.2	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Reject	3.16
2122.3	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Reject	2.4
2122.4	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Accept in Part	3.18
2122.5	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2122.6	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Accept in Part	3.10, 3.18
2122.7	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Reject	3.14
2122.8	Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	Reject	2.4
2126.1	United Estates Ranch	Accept in Part	General
2126.10	United Estates Ranch	Accept in Part	4.3
2126.11	United Estates Ranch	Reject	3.18
2126.12	United Estates Ranch	Reject	3.18
2126.13	United Estates Ranch	Reject	3.18
2126.3	United Estates Ranch	Accept	3.6
2126.4	United Estates Ranch	Accept in Part	3.10
2126.5	United Estates Ranch	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2126.6	United Estates Ranch	Accept in Part	3.16
2126.7	United Estates Ranch	Accept	3.16
2126.8	United Estates Ranch	Reject	3.16
2126.9	United Estates Ranch	Reject	3.18
2133.4	Tonnie & Erna Spijkerbosch	Reject	3.2
2133.7	Tonnie & Erna Spijkerbosch	Accept	3.6
2135.1	David Shepherd	Reject	2.4
2135.2	David Shepherd	Reject	2.4
2135.3	David Shepherd	Reject	2.4
2135.4	David Shepherd	Reject	2.4
2135.5	David Shepherd	Reject	2.4
2140.1	Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc	Reject	2.4
2140.2	Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc	Accept	2.8
2144.2	Cassidy Trust	Reject	2.4
2150.1	Catherine Dumarchand	Accept in Part	2.4
2151.1	Ministry of Education	Accept in Part	3.2
2151.2	Ministry of Education	Accept in Part	General

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2169.1	Susan Harwood	Reject	2.4
2184.1	Luise Lockwood	Accept in Part	General
2189.1	Linda Jarvis	Reject	4.3
2190.1	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.9, 3.10
2190.2	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Reject	3.6
2190.3	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.9
2190.4	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.9
2190.5	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Reject	3.14
2190.6	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.18
2190.7	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.18
2190.8	Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group Incorporated	Reject	3.9
2192.1	Amanda Foo-Ryland	Reject	2.4
2193.1	Sarah Foo-Ryland	Reject	2.4
2194.1	Chorus	Accept in Part	General
2194.2	Chorus	Accept in Part	3.6
2194.3	Chorus	Accept in Part	3.2
2194.4	Chorus	Accept in Part	3.5
2194.5	Chorus	Accept	3.6
2194.6	Chorus	Accept in Part	3.5
2194.7	Chorus	Accept in Part	3.9
2195.1	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	General
2195.2	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2195.3	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	3.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2195.4	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in part	3.5
2195.5	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	3.6
2195.6	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5
2195.7	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	3.9
2206.1	Victoria Onions	Reject	2.4
2207.1	Wayne and Mi Ae McKeague	Accept in Part	General
2209.1	Beatrice Onions	Reject	2.4
2214.1	Julian Apse	Accept in Part	2.4
2218.1	HDS Ltd	Reject	4.3
2229.10	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.16
2229.11	R & M DONALDSON	Reject	3.16
2229.13	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.18
2229.14	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.18
2229.15	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.18
2229.16	R & M DONALDSON	Reject	3.18
2229.17	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.19
2229.18	R & M DONALDSON	Reject	4.3
2229.2	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.2
2229.3	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.5
2229.4	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.10
2229.5	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.10
2229.6	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.10
2229.7	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.14
2229.8	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in Part	3.14
2229.9	R & M DONALDSON	Reject	3.16
2231.1	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.10	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.11	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2231.12	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.14
2231.13	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.14
2231.14	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.14
2231.15	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
2231.16	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.14
2231.17	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.14
2231.18	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.15
2231.19	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.15
2231.2	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.20	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.15
2231.21	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.16
2231.22	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.16
2231.23	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	3.16
2231.24	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.16
2231.25	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.14
2231.3	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.6
2231.4	Bruce McLeod	Accept in Part	2.9
2231.6	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.7	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.8	Bruce McLeod	Reject	2.4
2231.9	Bruce McLeod	Reject	3.14
2234.1	Wendy Clarke	Reject	2.4
2240.1	Taramea Ltd	Accept in Part	General
2241.1	Anna-Marie Chin	Reject	2.4
2242.1	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	3.5
2242.2	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	3.6
2242.3	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	3.16
2242.4	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2243.1	Stewart Mahon	Reject	2.4
2243.2	Stewart Mahon	Reject	2.4
2244.2	Anthony Ward	Reject	2.5
2244.4	Anthony Ward	Reject	2.4, 4.3
2244.6	Anthony Ward	Reject	2.4, 4.3
2244.7	Anthony Ward	Accept in Part	3.19
2244.8	Anthony Ward	Accept in Part	4.3
2244.9	Anthony Ward	Reject	4.3
2246.3	J & L Bagrie	Accept in Part	3.6
2246.4	J & L Bagrie	Reject	3.16
2246.5	J & L Bagrie	Accept	3.16
2246.6	J & L Bagrie	Reject	3.19
2246.7	J & L Bagrie	Reject	2.4
2247.1	E, J, R & S Dennison	Reject	3.6
2247.2	E, J, R & S Dennison	Accept in Part	3.6
2247.3	E, J, R & S Dennison	Reject	3.16
2247.4	E, J, R & S Dennison	Accept	3.16
2247.5	E, J, R & S Dennison	Reject	3.19
2247.6	E, J, R & S Dennison	Reject	2.4
2248.3	D Gallagher	Reject	3.16
2248.4	D Gallagher	Accept	3.16
2248.5	D Gallagher	Reject	3.19
2248.6	D Gallagher	Accept in Part	3.6
2249.3	Ms M K Greenslade	Reject	3.16
2249.4	Ms M K Greenslade	Accept	3.16
2249.5	Ms M K Greenslade	Reject	3.19
2249.6	Ms M K Greenslade	Accept in Part	3.6
2250.1	Ms Anna Hutchinson	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2250.2	Ms Anna Hutchinson	Reject	3.16
2250.3	Ms Anna Hutchinson	Accept	3.16
2250.4	Ms Anna Hutchinson	Reject	3.19
2250.5	Ms Anna Hutchinson	Accept in Part	3.6
2251.2	R & J Kelly	Accept in Part	3.6
2251.3	R & J Kelly	Reject	3.16
2251.4	R & J Kelly	Accept	3.16
2251.5	R & J Kelly	Reject	3.19
2251.6	R & J Kelly	Reject	2.4
2252.1	Ms Sarah Lawrence	Accept in Part	4.3
2252.2	Ms Sarah Lawrence	Reject	3.16
2252.3	Ms Sarah Lawrence	Accept	3.16
2252.4	Ms Sarah Lawrence	Reject	3.19
2252.5	Ms Sarah Lawrence	Accept in Part	3.6
2253.2	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Accept in Part	3.6
2253.3	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Reject	3.16
2253.4	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Accept	3.16
2253.5	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Reject	3.19
2253.6	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Reject	2.4
2254.2	L M Topp	Accept in Part	4.3
2254.3	L M Topp	Reject	3.16
2254.4	L M Topp	Accept	3.16
2254.5	L M Topp	Reject	3.19
2254.6	L M Topp	Accept in Part	3.6
2255.1	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject	2.4
2255.2	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2255.3	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject	3.16
2255.4	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Accept	3.16
2255.5	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject	3.19
2255.6	Mr Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject	2.4
2256.1	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject	2.4
2256.2	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Accept in Part	3.6
2256.3	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject	3.16
2256.4	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Accept	3.16
2256.5	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject	3.19
2256.6	Mr Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject	2.4
2260.1	Alan Hamilton	Reject	2.4
2260.2	Alan Hamilton	Reject	2.4
2261.1	Ann Hamilton	Reject	2.4
2261.2	Ann Hamilton	Reject	3.16
2261.4	Ann Hamilton	Reject	3.19
2263.1	Gemma and Mike Smith	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
2263.2	Gemma and Mike Smith	Reject	3.16
2264.1	Geoffrey Clear	Reject	2.4
2264.2	Geoffrey Clear	Reject	2.4
2266.1	Janice Margaret Clear	Reject	2.4
2266.2	Janice Margaret Clear	Reject	2.4
2268.1	Lyn Hamilton	Reject	2.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2268.2	Lyn Hamilton	Reject	2.4
2272.1	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.2
2272.10	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2272.11	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.5
2272.12	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.10
2272.13	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.10
2272.14	Skipp Williamson	Accept	3.10
2272.15	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.10
2272.16	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.12
2272.17	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.13
2272.18	Skipp Williamson	Accept	3.14
2272.19	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.14
2272.2	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.2
2272.20	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.14
2272.21	Skipp Williamson	Accept	3.15
2272.22	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.14
2272.23	Skipp Williamson	Accept In Part	3.16
2272.24	Skipp Williamson	Accept In Part	3.16
2272.25	Skipp Williamson	Accept In Part	3.16
2272.26	Skipp Williamson	Accept	3.16
2272.27	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.17
2272.28	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.18
2272.29	Skipp Williamson	Reject	3.18
2272.3	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3
2272.30	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.19
2272.31	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.19
2272.32	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	4.3
2272.35	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2272.4	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.5
2272.5	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2272.6	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.6
2272.7	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2272.8	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.3
2272.9	Skipp Williamson	Accept in Part	3.6
2273.2	T McQuilkin and A P McQuilkin Family Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2275.1	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2275.10	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.10
2275.11	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.10
2275.12	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept	3.10
2275.13	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2275.14	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.12
2275.15	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.13
2275.16	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept	3.14
2275.17	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2275.18	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2275.19	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept	3.14
2275.2	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3
2275.20	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.14
2275.21	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2275.22	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2275.23	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2275.24	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2275.25	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept	3.16
2275.26	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.17
2275.27	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2275.28	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2275.29	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2275.3	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.5
2275.30	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2275.31	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2275.33	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
2275.34	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
2275.35	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2275.4	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2275.5	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2275.6	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2275.7	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in part	3.3, 3.6
2275.8	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2275.9	Wakatipu Investments Limited	Reject	3.5
2276.1	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2276.10	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
2276.11	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept	3.10
2276.12	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2276.13	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.12
2276.14	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.13
2276.15	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept	3.14
2276.16	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2276.17	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2276.18	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept	3.15
2276.19	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
2276.2	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3
2276.20	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2276.21	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2276.22	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2276.23	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
2276.24	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept	3.16
2276.25	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.17
2276.26	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2276.27	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2276.28	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2276.29	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2276.3	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2276.30	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2276.31	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2276.34	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2276.35	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
2276.36	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
2276.4	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6. 3.10
2276.5	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
2276.6	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
2276.7	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
2276.8	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.5
2276.9	D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
2281.10	Roger Monk	Reject	3.16
2281.3	Roger Monk	Reject	4.3
2281.4	Roger Monk	Reject	2.4
2281.5	Roger Monk	Reject	3.19
2281.6	Roger Monk	Accept	3.19
2281.7	Roger Monk	Reject	3.16
2281.8	Roger Monk	Accept In Part	3.16
2281.9	Roger Monk	Reject	3.16
2282.1	Roy and Gudrun Somerville	Accept in Part	2.4, 3.14, 3.16
2286.1	Conway Powell	Accept in Part	4.3
2286.2	Conway Powell	Accept in Part	General
2287.1	Ben Calvert	Reject	2.4
2287.2	Ben Calvert	Reject	2.4
2291.10	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	2.5
2291.11	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2291.12	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2291.13	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2291.14	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2291.15	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2291.16	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept In Part	3.16
2291.18	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2291.19	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.18
2291.2	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.2
2291.20	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept In Part	3.16
2291.21	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2291.22	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.14
2291.23	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.14
2291.24	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2291.3	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2291.4	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2291.5	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2291.6	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	4.3
2291.7	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.19
2291.9	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Reject	2.5
2292.10	M McGuinness	Accept in Part	3.14
2292.11	M McGuinness	Reject	3.14
2292.12	M McGuinness	Reject	3.14
2292.13	M McGuinness	Accept in Part	3.18
2292.14	M McGuinness	Accept in Part	3.18
2292.2	M McGuinness	Accept In Part	3.16
2292.3	M McGuinness	Accept In Part	3.16
2292.4	M McGuinness	Reject	3.16
2292.6	M McGuinness	Reject	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2292.9	M McGuinness	Accept in Part	3.14
2293.10	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19
2293.1	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.6, 3.9
2293.11	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19
2293.12	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19
2293.13	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.14
2293.14	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.15
2293.15	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.18
2293.16	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
2293.17	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.18
2293.18	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.18
2293.19	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.18
2293.2	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.9
2293.3	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.6
2293.4	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.7, 3.9
2293.5	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.9
2293.6	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.9
2293.7	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.9, 3.10
2293.8	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Reject	3.5
2293.9	Wakatipu Reforestation Trust	Accept in Part	3.9
2296.3	L McFadgen	Reject	3.16
2296.4	L McFadgen	Accept	3.16
2296.5	L McFadgen	Reject	3.19
2296.6	L McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2297.5	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	Reject	2.4
2298.3	P & J McLeod	Reject	3.16
2298.4	P & J McLeod	Accept	3.16
2298.5	P & J McLeod	Reject	3.19

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2298.6	P & J McLeod	Accept in Part	3.6
2300.3	R and S McLeod	Reject	3.16
2300.4	R and S McLeod	Accept	3.16
2300.5	R and S McLeod	Reject	3.19
2300.6	R and S McLeod	Accept in Part	3.6
2301.1	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in part	General
2301.10	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject	3.16
2301.11	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept	3.16
2301.12	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.16
2301.13	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject	3.16
2301.14	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject	3.18
2301.15	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	4.3
2301.16	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept	4.3
2301.17	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject	4.3
2301.18	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	4.3
2301.2	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject	3.6
2301.4	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.6
2301.5	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.6
2301.6	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2301.7	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.10
2301.8	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.14
2301.9	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Accept in Part	3.14
2303.1	N T McDonald	Reject	2.4, 3.6
2303.2	N T McDonald	Accept in Part	4.3
2303.3	N T McDonald	Accept in part	3.6
2303.4	N T McDonald	Reject	3.16
2303.5	N T McDonald	Accept	3.16
2303.6	N T McDonald	Reject	3.19
2303.7	N T McDonald	Reject	2.4
2303.8	N T McDonald	Accept in Part	3.14
2307.10	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
2307.1	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	2.5
2307.11	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
2307.12	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
2307.13	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
2307.14	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	3.10
2307.15	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	3.10
2307.16	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2307.17	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2307.18	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2307.19	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	3.14
2307.20	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
2307.2	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	2.5
2307.21	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
2307.22	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2307.23	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
2307.24	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
2307.25	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
2307.26	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	4.3
2307.3	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	2.5
2307.4	Crown Investment Trust	Reject	2.5
2307.8	Crown Investment Trust	Accept	2.7, 3.2
2307.9	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in Part	3.2
2308.12	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.2
2308.13	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2308.14	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.5
2308.15	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.10
2308.16	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.10
2308.17	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.10
2308.18	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.10
2308.19	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.14
2308.2	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.2
2308.20	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.16
2308.21	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.16
2308.23	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.18
2308.24	Jon Waterston	Reject	3.18
2308.3	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2308.4	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.5
2308.5	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.10
2308.6	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2308.7	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.16
2308.8	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	3.18
2308.9	Jon Waterston	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2309.1	Nikki Apse	Accept in Part	General
2312.1	Pete and Kelly Saxton	Reject	4.3
2312.2	Pete and Kelly Saxton	Reject	4.3
2313.10	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	2.5
2313.11	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.2
2313.12	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2313.13	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2313.14	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2313.15	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2313.16	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2313.17	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2313.18	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2313.19	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2313.20	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2313.2	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	4.3
2313.22	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2313.23	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	3.18
2313.3	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Reject	2.4
2313.4	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2313.5	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2313.6	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2313.7	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2313.8	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2313.9	HOGANS GULLY FARM LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2314.10	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.19
2314.12	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	2.5
2314.14	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.2
2314.15	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2314.16	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2314.17	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2314.18	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2314.19	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2314.2	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.2
2314.20	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2314.21	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2314.22	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2314.23	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2314.25	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2314.26	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Reject	3.18
2314.3	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2314.4	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2314.5	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2314.6	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2314.7	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2314.8	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2314.9	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in Part	4.3
2315.10	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.19
2315.12	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	2.5
2315.14	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.2
2315.15	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2315.16	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.5
2315.17	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.10
2315.18	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.10
2315.19	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.10
2315.2	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.2
2315.20	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2315.21	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.14
2315.22	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.16
2315.23	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.16
2315.25	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.18
2315.26	R G DAYMAN	Reject	3.18
2315.3	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2315.4	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.5
2315.5	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.10
2315.6	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2315.7	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.16
2315.8	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.18
2315.9	R G DAYMAN	Accept in Part	3.18
2316.10	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.19
2316.12	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	2.5
2316.14	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.2
2316.15	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2316.16	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2316.17	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2316.18	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2316.19	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2316.2	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.2
2316.20	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2316.21	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2316.22	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2316.23	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2316.25	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2316.26	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Reject	3.18
2316.3	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2316.4	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2316.5	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2316.6	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2316.7	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2316.8	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2316.9	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in Part	4.3
2317.10	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.19
2317.12	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	2.5
2317.14	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.2
2317.15	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2317.16	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.5
2317.17	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Reject	3.10
2317.18	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Reject	3.10
2317.19	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.10
2317.2	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Reject	3.2
2317.20	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Reject	3.10
2317.21	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.14
2317.22	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.16
2317.23	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.16
2317.25	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.18
2317.26	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Reject	3.18
2317.3	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2317.4	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.5
2317.5	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.10
2317.6	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2317.7	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.16
2317.8	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	3.18
2317.9	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2318.10	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.19
2318.12	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	2.5
2318.14	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.2
2318.15	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2318.16	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
2318.17	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.10
2318.18	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.10
2318.19	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.10
2318.2	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.2
2318.20	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.10
2318.21	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.14
2318.22	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.16
2318.23	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.16
2318.25	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.18
2318.26	C BATCHELOR	Reject	3.18
2318.3	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2318.4	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.5
2318.5	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.10
2318.6	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2318.7	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.16
2318.8	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	3.18
2318.9	C BATCHELOR	Accept in Part	4.3
2319.10	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.19
2319.12	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	2.5
2319.14	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.2
2319.15	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2319.16	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.5
2319.17	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2319.18	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.10
2319.19	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.10
2319.2	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.2
2319.20	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.10
2319.21	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.14
2319.22	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.16
2319.23	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.16
2319.25	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.18
2319.26	D D & J C DUNCAN	Reject	3.18
2319.3	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2319.4	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
2319.5	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.10
2319.6	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2319.7	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.16
2319.8	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	3.18
2319.9	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in Part	4.3
2320.12	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	2.5
2320.13	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	2.5
2320.14	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.2
2320.15	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2320.16	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.5
2320.17	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.10
2320.18	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.10
2320.19	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.10
2320.2	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.2
2320.20	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.10
2320.21	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.14
2320.22	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2320.23	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.16
2320.25	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.18
2320.26	G WILLS & T BURDON	Reject	3.18
2320.3	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2320.4	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.5
2320.5	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.10
2320.6	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2320.7	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.16
2320.8	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	3.18
2320.9	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in Part	4.3
2321.1	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	2.4
2321.10	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	3.16
2321.11	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.16
2321.13	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.18
2321.14	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	3.18
2321.2	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.2
2321.3	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2321.4	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.5
2321.5	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	3.10
2321.6	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	3.10
2321.7	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.10
2321.8	D J ROBERTSON	Reject	3.10
2321.9	D J ROBERTSON	Accept in Part	3.14
2329.4	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua and Te Runanga o Oraka-Aparima (Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2329.7	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua and Te Runanga o Oraka-Aparima (Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.5
2332.3	Middleton Family Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
2332.4	Middleton Family Trust	Reject	2.4
2332.5	Middleton Family Trust	Reject	3.6
2332.6	Middleton Family Trust	Reject	3.16
2332.7	Middleton Family Trust	Accept	3.16
2332.8	Middleton Family Trust	Reject	3.19
2332.9	Middleton Family Trust	Reject	2.4
2334.2	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2334.3	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2334.4	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Reject	3.14
2334.5	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2334.6	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Reject	3.14
2334.7	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Reject	3.16
2334.8	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Reject	3.15
2334.9	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2338.2	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2338.3	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2338.4	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2338.5	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2338.6	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Reject	3.14
2338.7	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Reject	3.16
2338.8	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Reject	3.15
2338.9	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2343.2	Tom and Lee Hazlett	Reject	4.3
2343.3	Tom and Lee Hazlett	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16, 4.3
2346.1	Jacqui McLean	Reject	2.4
2347.1	Bruce and Suzy Walker	Reject	2.4
2350.1	Debbie MacColl	Reject	2.4
2350.3	Debbie MacColl	Accept	3.2
2350.4	Debbie MacColl	Reject	3.16
2350.5	Debbie MacColl	Accept in Part	3.16
2350.6	Debbie MacColl	Reject	3.16
2350.7	Debbie MacColl	Reject	3.16
2355.2	Phillip Bunn	Reject	2.4
2355.3	Phillip Bunn	Accept	3.2
2355.4	Phillip Bunn	Reject	3.16
2355.5	Phillip Bunn	Accept in Part	3.16
2355.6	Phillip Bunn	Reject	3.16
2355.7	Phillip Bunn	Reject	3.16
2356.2	Steven Bunn	Reject	2.4
2356.3	Steven Bunn	Accept	3.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2356.4	Steven Bunn	Reject	3.16
2356.5	Steven Bunn	Accept in Part	3.16
2356.6	Steven Bunn	Reject	3.16
2356.7	Steven Bunn	Reject	3.16
2360.1	Kaye Eden	Reject	2.4
2360.2	Kaye Eden	Reject	2.4
2360.3	Kaye Eden	Reject	2.4, 4.3
2360.4	Kaye Eden	Reject	4.3
2367.1	Lucinda Macfarlane	Reject	2.4
2368.1	Karen Page	Accept in Part	General
2376.10	Darby Planning LP	Reject	3.10
2376.11	Darby Planning LP	Reject	3.13
2376.12	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.14
2376.13	Darby Planning LP	Reject	3.15
2376.14	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.16
2376.15	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.16
2376.16	Darby Planning LP	Reject	3.16
2376.17	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.16
2376.18	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.17
2376.19	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.18
2376.4	Darby Planning LP	Accept	3.5
2376.5	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.6
2376.6	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.6
2376.7	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.6
2376.8	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.6
2376.9	Darby Planning LP	Reject	3.10
2377.10	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2377.1	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2377.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
2377.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.10
2377.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
2377.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
2377.15	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2377.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2377.17	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
2377.18	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2377.19	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2377.20	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
2377.38	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	4.3
2377.39	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.3
2377.5	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.2
2377.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.5
2377.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.6
2377.8	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2377.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2378.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2378.11	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
2378.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Reject	3.10
2378.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
2378.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Reject	3.15
2378.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2378.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2378.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Reject	3.16
2378.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
2378.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.17
2378.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2378.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
2378.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Reject	4.3
2378.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept	4.3
2378.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept	3.2
2378.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept	3.5
2378.8	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2378.9	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
2385.11	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.18
2385.12	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Reject	3.18
2385.13	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.19
2385.14	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	4.3
2385.16	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	2.5
2385.2	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.2
2385.3	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
2385.4	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Reject	3.14
2385.5	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.14
2385.6	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept	3.14
2385.7	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Reject	3.15
2385.8	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Reject	3.16
2385.9	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in Part	3.16
2386.10	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	3.16
2386.11	BOXER HILL TRUST	Reject	3.16
2386.14	BOXER HILL TRUST	Reject	3.18
2386.15	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	3.19
2386.16	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	4.3
2386.18	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	2.5
2386.2	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	3.2
2386.3	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	3.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2386.4	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
2386.5	BOXER HILL TRUST	Reject	3.14
2386.6	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in Part	3.14
2386.7	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept	3.14
2386.8	BOXER HILL TRUST	Reject	3.15
2386.9	BOXER HILL TRUST	Reject	3.16
2387.10	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2387.13	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2387.15	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.19
2387.18	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	2.5
2387.2	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept	3.2
2387.3	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2387.4	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
2387.5	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Reject	3.14
2387.6	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2387.7	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Accept	3.14
2387.8	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Reject	3.15
2387.9	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2388.10	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2388.11	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2388.12	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14
2388.13	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.16
2388.14	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2388.16	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2388.17	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.18
2388.5	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.2
2388.6	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2388.7	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2388.8	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2388.9	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.10
2389.10	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.19
2389.12	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	2.5
2389.13	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	2.5
2389.2	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Reject	3.2
2389.3	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2389.4	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.5
2389.5	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.10
2389.6	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2389.7	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.16
2389.8	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	3.18
2389.9	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2397.1	A Feeley, E Borrie & LP Trustees Limited	Reject	2.4
2398.2	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Accept in Part	4.3
2398.3	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Accept	4.3
2398.4	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Accept in Part	3.14
2398.5	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Reject	3.14
2398.6	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Reject	3.16
2398.7	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Reject	3.14
2398.8	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Reject	3.16
2398.9	AK Robins, Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co	Accept in Part	4.3
2400.1	Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited and others	Accept in Part	3.14
2400.2	Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited and others	Accept in Part	4.3
2403.2	Leslie Richard Nelson and Judith Anne Nelson	Accept in Part	3.14
2410.1	Speargrass Trust	Reject	2.4
2410.10	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.14
2410.3	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2410.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
2410.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.15
2410.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.14
2410.7	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2410.8	Speargrass Trust	Accept	3.14
2410.9	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2412.3	Maxwell Campbell Guthrie	Accept in Part	3.14
2412.4	Maxwell Campbell Guthrie	Accept in Part	3.14
2414.1	Kobie and Peter Cadle	Accept in Part	2.5
2418.2	James Canning Muspratt	Accept in Part	3.14
2418.3	James Canning Muspratt	Accept in Part	3.14
2419.1	Jillian Egerton & Cook Allan Gibson Trustee Company Limited	Reject	2.4
2422.1	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Accept in Part	4.3
2422.2	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Accept in Part	4.3
2422.3	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Accept in Part	3.14
2422.4	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Accept in Part	3.14
2422.5	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Reject	3.14
2422.6	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Reject	3.16
2422.7	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Reject	3.15
2422.8	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Reject	3.16
2422.9	D Hamilton & L Hayden	Accept in Part	4.3
2423.2	Family Bloomfield	Reject	3.16
2424.2	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
2424.3	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept	4.3
2424.4	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2424.5	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2424.6	Bendall Family Land Trust	Reject	3.14
2424.7	Bendall Family Land Trust	Reject	3.16
2424.8	Bendall Family Land Trust	Reject	3.15
2424.9	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
2426.2	Michael Paul and Maureen Elizabeth Henry	Accept in Part	3.14
2426.3	Michael Paul and Maureen Elizabeth Henry	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2430.1	Peter, Jillian and Simon Beadle	Reject	2.4
2433.2	Rene Kampman	Accept in Part	3.14
2433.3	Rene Kampman	Reject	3.14
2433.4	Rene Kampman	Reject	3.14
2433.5	Rene Kampman	Accept in Part	3.16
2433.6	Rene Kampman	Accept in Part	3.16
2433.7	Rene Kampman	Reject	3.16
2437.10	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.14
2437.1	Shotover Trust	Reject	2.4
2437.3	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2437.4	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.14
2437.5	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
2437.6	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.15
2437.7	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.14
2437.8	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
2437.9	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.14
2439.1	Susan May Todd	Reject	2.4
2439.2	Susan May Todd	Reject	2.4
2442.1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Reject	3.5
2442.2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2442.3	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Reject	3.12
2442.4	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Reject	3.19
2442.5	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Reject	3.19
2444.1	Boundary Trust	Reject	2.4
2445.1	C Walker	Accept in Part	4.3
2445.2	C Walker	Reject	4.3
2446.1	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	General
2447.1	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	General

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2447.3	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2447.4	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	3.15
2447.5	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	2.4
2449.10	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
2449.1	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
2449.11	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2449.12	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2449.13	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
2449.14	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
2449.15	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2449.16	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.6
2449.17	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2449.18	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2449.19	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2449.20	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2449.21	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.7
2449.22	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2449.23	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2449.24	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2449.25	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2449.26	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2449.27	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.10
2449.28	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
2449.29	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2449.30	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
2449.31	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
2449.32	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
2449.33	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2449.34	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2449.35	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
2449.36	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2449.37	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
2449.38	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2449.39	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
2449.4	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2449.40	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2449.41	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2449.42	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2449.43	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.18
2449.44	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.18
2449.45	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
2449.46	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2449.47	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
2449.48	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2449.49	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4, 4.3
2449.50	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2449.5	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
2449.51	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2449.52	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
2449.53	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
2449.55	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2449.56	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2449.57	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
2449.6	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2449.7	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2449.8	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2449.9	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
2455.10	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	3.18
2455.1	Otago Fish and Game Council	Reject	3.14
2455.11	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	4.3
2455.12	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	4.3
2455.2	Otago Fish and Game Council	Reject	3.16
2455.3	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.16
2455.4	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2455.5	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.7
2455.6	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.8
2455.7	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
2455.8	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.9
2457.1	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Reject	4.2
2458.1	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.2
2458.10	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.6
2458.11	Peter Hale	Reject	3.6
2458.12	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.6
2458.13	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2458.14	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.7
2458.15	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.7
2458.16	Peter Hale	Reject	3.7
2458.17	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.5
2458.18	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.9
2458.19	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.10
2458.2	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.6
2458.20	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.10
2458.21	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.10
2458.22	Peter Hale	Reject	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2458.23	Peter Hale	Reject	3.15
2458.24	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.14
2458.25	Peter Hale	Reject	3.14
2458.26	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.14
2458.27	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.15
2458.28	Peter Hale	Reject	3.15
2458.29	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.16
2458.3	Peter Hale	Reject	3.6
2458.30	Peter Hale	Reject	3.16
2458.31	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.16
2458.32	Peter Hale	Reject	3.16
2458.33	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.16
2458.34	Peter Hale	Reject	3.16
2458.35	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.18
2458.36	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.18
2458.37	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.18
2458.38	Peter Hale	Reject	3.18
2458.39	Peter Hale	Accept	3.18
2458.4	Peter Hale	Accept	3.6
2458.40	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	4.3
2458.41	Peter Hale	Reject	3.16
2458.5	Peter Hale	Accept	3.6
2458.6	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.6
2458.7	Peter Hale	Accept in Part	3.6
2458.8	Peter Hale	Accept	3.6
2458.9	Peter Hale	Accept	3.6
2459.1	QN1 Limited	Reject	2.4
2464.1	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2464.10	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2464.11	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
2464.12	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2464.13	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2464.14	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
2464.15	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
2464.16	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.7
2464.17	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5
2464.18	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.9
2464.19	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2464.2	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2464.20	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2464.21	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2464.22	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.10
2464.23	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.15
2464.24	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
2464.25	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.14
2464.26	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
2464.27	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2464.28	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2464.29	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2464.3	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
2464.30	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2464.31	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2464.32	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2464.33	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2464.34	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2464.35	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2464.36	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
2464.37	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
2464.38	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.18
2464.39	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.18
2464.4	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2464.41	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
2464.42	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2464.5	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2464.6	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2464.7	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2464.8	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2464.9	Ray Ferner (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2470.1	Richard Anthony Smith and Banco Trustees Limited	Reject	2.4
2470.2	Richard Anthony Smith and Banco Trustees Limited	Reject	2.4
2472.1	S Flood	Reject	2.4
2472.2	S Flood	Reject	2.4
2475.10	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2475.1	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	2.5
2475.11	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2475.12	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2475.13	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2475.14	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2475.15	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2475.16	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.6
2475.17	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2475.18	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2475.19	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2475.20	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7
2475.21	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.7
2475.22	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5
2475.23	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.9
2475.24	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2475.25	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2475.26	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2475.27	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.10
2475.28	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.15
2475.29	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
2475.30	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
2475.31	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
2475.32	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2475.33	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2475.34	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
2475.35	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2475.36	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
2475.37	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2475.38	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
2475.39	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2475.4	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
2475.40	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2475.41	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2475.42	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2475.43	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.18
2475.44	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.18
2475.45	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	4.3
2475.46	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2475.47	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
2475.48	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2475.49	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
2475.50	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2475.5	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
2475.51	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2475.52	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
2475.53	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	4.3
2475.55	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2475.56	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2475.6	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.2
2475.7	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2475.8	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.6
2475.9	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2477.1	Timothy Roberts	Reject	2.4
2477.2	Timothy Roberts	Reject	3.15
2477.3	Timothy Roberts	Reject	2.4
2478.1	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	General
2478.2	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2478.3	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2478.4	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2478.5	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	3.6
2478.6	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2478.7	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2479.10	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	3.6
2479.1	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
2479.11	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2479.12	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2479.13	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	3.6
2479.14	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	3.6
2479.15	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2479.16	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.6
2479.17	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2479.18	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2479.19	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2479.20	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2479.21	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.7
2479.22	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2479.23	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2479.24	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2479.25	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2479.26	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2479.27	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.10
2479.28	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.15
2479.29	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2479.30	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
2479.31	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2479.32	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2479.33	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2479.34	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2479.35	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
2479.36	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2479.37	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
2479.38	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2479.39	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
2479.4	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2479.40	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2479.41	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2479.42	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2479.43	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.18
2479.44	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	3.18
2479.45	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	4.3
2479.46	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2479.47	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	4.3
2479.48	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2479.49	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
2479.50	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2479.5	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
2479.51	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2479.52	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	4.3
2479.53	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	4.3
2479.55	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2479.56	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
2479.6	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2479.7	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2479.8	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.6
2479.9	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept	3.6
2480.1	Walrus Jack Trustee Limited	Reject	2.4
2480.2	Walrus Jack Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.10
2480.3	Walrus Jack Trustee Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2480.4	Walrus Jack Trustee Limited	Reject	3.16
2480.5	Walrus Jack Trustee Limited	Reject	4.1
2482.3	WK & FL Allen	Accept in Part	3.6
2482.4	WK & FL Allen	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2483.1	Woodford Alexander Rouse	Reject	2.4
2487.1	BSTGT Limited	Reject	2.4
2487.10	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.19
2487.11	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.16
2487.12	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2487.13	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2487.2	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2487.3	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2487.4	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2487.5	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2487.6	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2487.7	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.14
2487.8	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2487.9	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2488.10	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
2488.1	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
2488.11	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2488.12	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2488.13	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
2488.14	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
2488.15	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2488.16	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6
2488.17	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2488.18	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2488.19	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2488.20	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2488.21	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.7
2488.22	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2488.23	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2488.24	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2488.25	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2488.26	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2488.27	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.10
2488.28	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.15
2488.29	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2488.30	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.14
2488.31	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2488.32	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2488.33	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2488.34	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2488.35	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
2488.36	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2488.37	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
2488.38	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2488.39	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
2488.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2488.40	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2488.41	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2488.42	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2488.43	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
2488.44	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.18
2488.45	Juie QT Limited	Accept	4.3
2488.46	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2488.47	Juie QT Limited	Reject	4.3
2488.48	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2488.49	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2488.50	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2488.5	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
2488.51	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2488.52	Juie QT Limited	Reject	4.3
2488.53	Juie QT Limited	Accept	4.3
2488.55	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2488.56	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
2488.6	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2488.7	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2488.8	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6
2488.9	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
2489.10	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.6
2489.11	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.6
2489.12	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
2489.13	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
2489.14	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.6
2489.15	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.6
2489.16	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
2489.17	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.6
2489.18	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
2489.19	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2489.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	2.5
2489.20	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.7
2489.21	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.7
2489.22	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.7
2489.23	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5
2489.24	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.9
2489.25	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2489.26	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10
2489.27	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10
2489.28	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.10
2489.29	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.15
2489.30	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
2489.31	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.14
2489.32	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
2489.33	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2489.34	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2489.35	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.16
2489.36	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
2489.37	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.16
2489.38	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
2489.39	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.16
2489.40	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
2489.41	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
2489.42	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
2489.43	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
2489.44	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
2489.45	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.18
2489.46	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	4.3
2489.47	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
2489.48	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	4.3
2489.49	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
2489.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
2489.50	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.4
2489.51	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
2489.52	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2489.53	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	4.3
2489.54	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	4.3
2489.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.4
2489.7	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.2
2489.8	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
2489.9	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.6
2490.10	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	3.6
2490.1	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	2.5
2490.11	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.6
2490.12	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.6
2490.13	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	3.6
2490.14	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	3.6
2490.15	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in part	3.6
2490.16	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.6
2490.17	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.6
2490.18	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2490.19	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.7
2490.20	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.7
2490.21	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.7

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2490.22	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.5
2490.23	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.9
2490.24	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.10
2490.25	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.10
2490.26	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.10
2490.27	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.10
2490.28	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.15
2490.29	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.14
2490.30	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.14
2490.31	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.14
2490.32	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2490.33	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2490.34	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.16
2490.35	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.16
2490.36	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.16
2490.37	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.16
2490.38	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2490.39	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.16
2490.4	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.14
2490.40	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.18
2490.41	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.18
2490.42	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.18
2490.43	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.18
2490.44	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	3.18
2490.45	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	4.3
2490.46	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	4.3
2490.47	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	4.3
2490.48	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	4.3
2490.49	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	4.3
2490.50	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	4.3
2490.5	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	2.4
2490.51	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	4.3
2490.52	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	4.3
2490.53	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2490.55	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	4.3
2490.56	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.16
2490.6	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.2
2490.7	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in Part	3.6
2490.8	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Reject	3.6
2490.9	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept	3.6
2495.6	Young Changemakers - Wakatipu Youth Trust Advisory Group	Accept in Part	General
2496.2	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
2496.3	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept	4.3
2496.4	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
2496.5	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
2496.6	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Reject	3.14
2496.7	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Reject	3.16
2496.8	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept	3.14
2496.9	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
2499.1	Philip and Mary Blakely and Wallace	Accept in Part	3.2
2499.2	Philip and Mary Blakely and Wallace	Accept in Part	2.4, 3.6
2499.3	Philip and Mary Blakely and Wallace	Reject	2.4
2499.5	Philip and Mary Blakely and Wallace	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.10	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
2500.1	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	2.5
2500.11	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
2500.12	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
2500.13	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2500.14	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
2500.15	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
2500.16	Philip Smith	Reject	3.6
2500.17	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
2500.18	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2500.19	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.7
2500.20	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.7
2500.21	Philip Smith	Reject	3.7
2500.22	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.5
2500.23	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.9
2500.24	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10
2500.25	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10
2500.26	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10
2500.27	Philip Smith	Reject	3.10
2500.28	Philip Smith	Reject	3.15
2500.29	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
2500.30	Philip Smith	Reject	3.14
2500.31	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
2500.32	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2500.33	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2500.34	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
2500.35	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
2500.36	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
2500.37	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
2500.38	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
2500.39	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
2500.4	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
2500.40	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2500.41	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18
2500.42	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18
2500.43	Philip Smith	Reject	3.18
2500.44	Philip Smith	Accept	3.18
2500.45	Philip Smith	Accept	4.3
2500.46	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.47	Philip Smith	Reject	4.3
2500.48	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.49	Philip Smith	Reject	2.4
2500.50	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.5	Philip Smith	Reject	2.4
2500.51	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.52	Philip Smith	Reject	4.3
2500.53	Philip Smith	Accept	4.3
2500.55	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
2500.56	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
2500.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.2
2500.7	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
2500.8	Philip Smith	Reject	3.6
2500.9	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
2501.10	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	3.6
2501.1	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	2.5
2501.11	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.6
2501.12	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.6
2501.13	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	3.6
2501.14	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	3.6
2501.15	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in part	3.6
2501.16	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2501.17	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.6
2501.18	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2501.19	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.7
2501.20	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.7
2501.21	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	43284
2501.22	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.5
2501.23	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.9
2501.24	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.10
2501.25	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.10
2501.26	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.10
2501.27	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.10
2501.28	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.15
2501.29	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
2501.30	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.14
2501.31	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
2501.32	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2501.33	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2501.34	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.16
2501.35	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.16
2501.36	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.16
2501.37	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.16
2501.38	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.16
2501.39	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.16
2501.4	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
2501.40	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.18
2501.41	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.18
2501.42	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.18
2501.43	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2501.44	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	3.18
2501.45	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	4.3
2501.46	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	4.3
2501.47	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	4.3
2501.48	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	4.3
2501.49	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	2.4
2501.50	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	4.3
2501.5	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	2.4
2501.51	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	4.3
2501.52	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	4.3
2501.53	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	4.3
2501.55	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	4.3
2501.56	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.16
2501.6	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.2
2501.7	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.6
2501.8	Phillipa Archibald	Reject	3.6
2501.9	Phillipa Archibald	Accept	3.6
2502.1	MW & JM McWhirter	Accept in Part	3.14
2504.1	Arcadian Triangle Limited (Arcadian)	Reject	4.2
2504.3	Arcadian Triangle Limited (Arcadian)	Accept in Part	3.14
2504.4	Arcadian Triangle Limited (Arcadian)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
2504.5	Arcadian Triangle Limited (Arcadian)	Reject	3.15
2505.10	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2505.1	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	2.5
2505.11	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2505.12	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2505.13	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2505.14	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2505.15	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	3.6
2505.16	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.6
2505.17	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
2505.18	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2505.19	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7
2505.20	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7
2505.21	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.7
2505.22	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5
2505.23	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.9
2505.24	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2505.25	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2505.26	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
2505.27	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.10
2505.28	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.15
2505.29	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2505.30	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
2505.31	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
2505.32	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
2505.33	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
2505.34	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
2505.35	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2505.36	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
2505.37	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2505.38	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2505.39	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2505.4	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
2505.40	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2505.41	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2505.42	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
2505.43	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.18
2505.44	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.18
2505.45	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2505.46	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2505.47	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
2505.48	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2505.49	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
2505.50	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2505.5	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
2505.51	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2505.52	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
2505.53	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	4.3
2505.54	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
2505.55	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
2505.6	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.2
2505.7	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	3.6
2505.8	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.6
2505.9	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
2508.1	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept	4.3
2508.2	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept	4.3
2509.10	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2509.1	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	2.5
2509.11	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
2509.12	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
2509.13	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
2509.14	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
2509.15	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
2509.16	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6
2509.17	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
2509.18	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2509.19	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7
2509.20	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7
2509.21	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.7
2509.22	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5
2509.23	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.9
2509.24	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
2509.25	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
2509.26	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2509.27	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.10
2509.28	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.15
2509.29	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
2509.30	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.14
2509.31	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
2509.32	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2509.33	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2509.34	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
2509.35	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
2509.36	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
2509.37	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
2509.38	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
2509.39	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
2509.4	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
2509.40	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
2509.41	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
2509.42	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2509.43	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.18
2509.44	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.18
2509.45	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3
2509.46	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
2509.47	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
2509.48	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
2509.49	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
2509.50	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
2509.5	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
2509.51	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
2509.52	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
2509.53	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3
2509.55	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.19
2509.56	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
2509.57	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
2509.6	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.2
2509.7	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2509.8	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6
2509.9	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
2512.1	Spruce Grove Trust (Butel Road)	Reject	2.4
2515.1	V Buckham	Reject	2.4
2519.1	C & Y Guillot and Cook Adam Trustees Limited	Reject	2.4
2519.2	C & Y Guillot and Cook Adam Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2519.3	C & Y Guillot and Cook Adam Trustees Limited	Reject	3.15
2525.10	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2525.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
2525.11	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2525.12	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2525.13	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2525.14	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2525.15	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2525.16	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
2525.17	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2525.18	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2525.19	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2525.20	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2525.21	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.7
2525.22	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2525.23	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2525.24	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2525.25	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2525.26	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2525.27	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
2525.28	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
2525.29	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2525.30	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
2525.31	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2525.32	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2525.33	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2525.34	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2525.35	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2525.36	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2525.37	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2525.38	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2525.39	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2525.4	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2525.40	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2525.41	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2525.42	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2525.43	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2525.44	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.18
2525.45	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3
2525.46	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2525.47	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
2525.48	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2525.49	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
2525.50	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2525.5	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
2525.51	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2525.52	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
2525.53	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3
2525.55	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2525.56	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2525.6	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2525.7	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	3.6
2525.8	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
2525.9	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2526.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.2
2526.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2526.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
2526.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2526.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2526.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
2526.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
2526.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.7
2526.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2526.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.9
2526.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2526.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2526.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2526.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
2526.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.10
2526.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.15
2526.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
2526.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.14
2526.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
2526.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2526.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2526.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2526.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
2526.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2526.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2526.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2526.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
2526.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2526.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
2526.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
2526.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
2526.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.18
2526.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.18
2526.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2526.40	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
2526.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
2526.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2526.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2526.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
2526.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2526.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
2527.10	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept	3.6
2527.1	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2527.11	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
2527.12	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.6
2527.13	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
2527.14	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2527.15	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
2527.16	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
2527.17	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.7
2527.18	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.5
2527.19	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.9
2527.2	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.2
2527.20	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
2527.21	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
2527.22	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
2527.23	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.10
2527.24	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.15
2527.25	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
2527.26	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2527.27	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
2527.28	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2527.29	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2527.30	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
2527.3	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.6
2527.31	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.16
2527.32	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
2527.33	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.16
2527.34	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
2527.35	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.16
2527.36	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
2527.37	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
2527.38	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
2527.39	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.18
2527.40	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept	3.18
2527.4	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.6
2527.41	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Reject	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2527.5	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept	3.6
2527.6	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept	3.6
2527.7	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
2527.8	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
2527.9	Crosby Developments Limited (North Ridge)	Accept	3.6
2529.1	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.2
2529.10	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2529.11	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.6
2529.12	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2529.13	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2529.14	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.7
2529.15	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.7
2529.16	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.7
2529.17	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.5
2529.18	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.9
2529.19	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
2529.2	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2529.20	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
2529.21	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
2529.22	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.10
2529.23	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.15
2529.24	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
2529.25	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.14
2529.26	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
2529.27	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2529.28	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2529.29	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.16
2529.3	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.6
2529.30	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
2529.31	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.16
2529.32	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
2529.33	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.16
2529.34	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
2529.35	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.18
2529.36	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.18
2529.37	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.18
2529.38	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.18
2529.39	Len McFadgen	Accept	3.18
2529.4	Len McFadgen	Accept	3.6
2529.40	Len McFadgen	Accept	4.3
2529.41	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
2529.42	Len McFadgen	Reject	4.3
2529.43	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
2529.44	Len McFadgen	Reject	2.4
2529.45	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
2529.46	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
2529.47	Len McFadgen	Reject	4.3
2529.48	Len McFadgen	Accept	4.3
2529.5	Len McFadgen	Accept	3.6
2529.50	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	2.5
2529.53	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
2529.54	Len McFadgen	Reject	2.4
2529.55	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2529.56	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
2529.6	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2529.7	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.6
2529.8	Len McFadgen	Accept	3.6
2529.9	Len McFadgen	Accept	3.6
2530.1	Crown Range Holdings Limited	Reject	2.4
2532.1	D Smith and G Mirkin	Reject	2.4
2534.1	MW and S Lawn	Reject	2.4
2538.10	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.18
2538.1	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.5
2538.11	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.18
2538.12	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.18
2538.13	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.18
2538.14	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.18
2538.15	NZ Transport Agency	Reject	3.19
2538.16	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	4.3
2538.17	NZ Transport Agency	Accept In Part	4.3
2538.18	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	4.3
2538.19	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	4.3
2538.20	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	4.3
2538.2	NZ Transport Agency	Reject	3.7
2538.21	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	4.3
2538.22	NZ Transport Agency	Reject	4.3
2538.3	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.5
2538.4	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.9
2538.5	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.14
2538.6	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.14
2538.7	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2538.9	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.18
2540.1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	4.2
2540.10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.6
2540.13	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.7
2540.14	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.7
2540.15	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.5
2540.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.8
2540.17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.5
2540.18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.9
2540.19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.9
2540.2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.5
2540.20	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.14
2540.21	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.14
2540.22	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.14
2540.23	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
2540.24	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
2540.25	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
2540.26	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
2540.27	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.14
2540.29	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.16
2540.3	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.30	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.16
2540.31	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.16
2540.32	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.16
2540.4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.5	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2540.6	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
2540.9	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.6
2544.1	Mylore Family Trust	Reject	2.4
2550.10	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2550.1	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
2550.11	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2550.12	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2550.13	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2550.14	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2550.15	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2550.16	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.6
2550.17	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2550.18	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2550.19	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2550.20	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2550.21	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.7
2550.22	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2550.23	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2550.24	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2550.25	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2550.26	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2550.27	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.10
2550.28	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.15
2550.29	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2550.30	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.14
2550.31	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2550.32	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2550.33	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2550.34	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2550.35	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2550.36	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2550.37	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2550.38	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2550.39	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2550.4	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2550.40	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2550.41	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2550.42	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2550.43	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2550.44	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.18
2550.45	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	4.3
2550.46	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2550.47	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	4.3
2550.48	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2550.49	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	4.3
2550.50	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2550.5	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	2.4
2550.51	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2550.52	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	4.3
2550.53	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	4.3
2550.55	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2550.56	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2550.6	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2550.7	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2550.8	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.6
2550.9	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2553.1	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	2.4
2553.10	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.6
2553.11	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	3.6
2553.12	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	3.6
2553.13	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.6
2553.14	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.6
2553.15	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	3.6
2553.16	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	3.6
2553.17	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.6
2553.18	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.6
2553.19	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.6
2553.20	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2553.2	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	4.3
2553.21	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.7
2553.22	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.7
2553.23	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.7

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2553.24	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.5
2553.25	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.9
2553.26	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.10
2553.27	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.10
2553.28	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.10
2553.29	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.10
2553.3	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	2.5
2553.30	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.15
2553.31	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.14
2553.32	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.14
2553.33	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.14
2553.34	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2553.35	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2553.36	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.16
2553.37	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.16
2553.38	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.16
2553.39	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2553.40	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.16
2553.41	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.16
2553.42	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.18
2553.43	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.18
2553.44	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.18
2553.45	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.18
2553.46	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	3.18
2553.47	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	4.3
2553.48	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	4.3
2553.49	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	4.3
2553.50	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	4.3
2553.51	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	4.3
2553.52	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	4.3
2553.53	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	4.3
2553.54	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	4.3
2553.55	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept	4.3
2553.57	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2553.58	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	3.16
2553.6	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.14
2553.7	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Reject	4.3
2553.8	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.2
2553.9	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in Part	3.6
2555.1	Hermine Mauvernay	Reject	3.15
2555.2	Hermine Mauvernay	Reject	3.15
2562.1	Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf	Accept in Part	2.5
2562.5	Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf	Accept in Part	3.14
2564.1	TJ Investments Pte Limited	Reject	2.4
2564.2	TJ Investments Pte Limited	Reject	2.4
2564.3	TJ Investments Pte Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2567.1	Kirsty MacTaggart and Justin Crane	Accept in Part	3.14
2567.2	Kirsty MacTaggart and Justin Crane	Reject	4.1
2567.3	Kirsty MacTaggart and Justin Crane	Reject	4.1
2575.1	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	2.5
2575.14	Queenstown Trails Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
2575.2	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	3.2
2575.3	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	3.5
2575.4	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	3.16
2575.5	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	3.19
2577.10	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	3.6
2577.1	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	2.5
2577.11	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.6
2577.12	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2577.13	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	3.6
2577.14	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	3.6
2577.15	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.6
2577.16	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.6
2577.17	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.6
2577.18	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2577.19	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.7
2577.20	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.7
2577.21	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.7
2577.22	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.5
2577.23	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.9
2577.24	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.10
2577.25	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.10
2577.26	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.10
2577.27	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.10
2577.28	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.15
2577.29	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.14
2577.30	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.14
2577.31	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.14
2577.32	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2577.33	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2577.34	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.16
2577.35	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.16
2577.36	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.16
2577.37	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.16
2577.38	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.16
2577.39	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.16
2577.4	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2577.40	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.18
2577.41	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.18
2577.42	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.18
2577.43	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.18
2577.44	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	3.18
2577.45	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	4.3
2577.46	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	4.3
2577.47	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	4.3
2577.48	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	4.3
2577.49	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	2.4
2577.50	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	4.3
2577.5	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	2.4
2577.51	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	4.3
2577.52	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	4.3
2577.53	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	4.3
2577.55	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	4.3
2577.56	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.16
2577.6	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.2
2577.7	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in Part	3.6
2577.8	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject	3.6
2577.9	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept	3.6
2578.1	Owen Nash	Reject	2.4
2579.1	J Gott	Reject	2.4
2580.10	John Edward Griffin	Accept	3.6
2580.1	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	2.5
2580.11	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.6
2580.12	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.6
2580.13	John Edward Griffin	Accept	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2580.14	John Edward Griffin	Accept	3.6
2580.15	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.6
2580.16	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.6
2580.17	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.6
2580.18	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2580.19	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.7
2580.20	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.7
2580.21	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.7
2580.22	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.5
2580.23	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.9
2580.24	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.10
2580.25	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.10
2580.26	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.10
2580.27	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.10
2580.28	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.15
2580.29	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.14
2580.30	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.14
2580.31	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.14
2580.32	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2580.33	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2580.34	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.16
2580.35	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.16
2580.36	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.16
2580.37	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.16
2580.38	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.16
2580.39	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.16
2580.4	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.14
2580.40	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2580.41	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.18
2580.42	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.18
2580.43	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.18
2580.44	John Edward Griffin	Accept	3.18
2580.45	John Edward Griffin	Accept	4.3
2580.46	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	4.3
2580.47	John Edward Griffin	Reject	4.3
2580.48	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	4.3
2580.49	John Edward Griffin	Reject	2.4
2580.50	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	4.3
2580.5	John Edward Griffin	Reject	2.4
2580.51	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	4.3
2580.52	John Edward Griffin	Reject	4.3
2580.53	John Edward Griffin	Accept	4.3
2580.55	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	4.3
2580.56	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.16
2580.6	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.2
2580.7	John Edward Griffin	Accept in Part	3.6
2580.8	John Edward Griffin	Reject	3.6
2580.9	John Edward Griffin	Accept	3.6
2584.10	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2584.1	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
2584.11	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept	3.5
2584.12	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2584.13	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2584.14	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
2584.15	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
2584.16	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2584.17	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2584.18	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
2584.19	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
2584.20	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2584.2	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.5, 3.9
2584.21	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2584.22	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.7
2584.23	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2584.24	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept	3.7
2584.25	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept	3.8
2584.26	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.9
2584.27	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
2584.28	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.12
2584.29	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
2584.30	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2584.3	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
2584.31	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2584.32	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
2584.33	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
2584.34	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
2584.35	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
2584.36	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2584.37	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2584.38	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2584.39	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
2584.4	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2584.41	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2584.42	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2584.43	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2584.44	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2584.45	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2584.46	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
2584.5	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2584.6	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
2584.9	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2586.1	C Dagg	Reject	2.4
2586.2	C Dagg	Reject	3.6
2586.3	C Dagg	Reject	3.16
2586.4	C Dagg	Accept in Part	3.14
2586.5	C Dagg	Reject	2.4
2586.6	C Dagg	Reject	3.16
2589.2	Kim Fam	Reject	2.4
2589.3	Kim Fam	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2589.4	Kim Fam	Accept in Part	3.14
2591.2	M & C Burgess	Reject	4.3
2591.3	M & C Burgess	Reject	3.14
2591.4	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.14
2596.1	Heather Moore & Szigetvey Trustee Services	Reject	4.3
2603.1	Wendy McGuinness	Accept in Part	General
2606.1	John Martin	Reject	2.4
2606.2	John Martin	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2606.3	John Martin	Reject	2.4
2606.4	John Martin	Reject	2.4
2606.5	John Martin	Reject	2.4
2607.10	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2607.1	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2607.11	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2607.12	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2607.13	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2607.14	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2607.15	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2607.16	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.6
2607.17	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2607.18	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
2607.19	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2607.20	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
2607.21	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.7
2607.22	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
2607.23	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
2607.24	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2607.25	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2607.26	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
2607.27	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.10
2607.28	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.15
2607.29	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2607.30	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.14
2607.31	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2607.32	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2607.33	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
2607.34	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2607.35	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2607.36	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
2607.37	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2607.38	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.16

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2607.39	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.16
2607.4	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
2607.40	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2607.41	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2607.42	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
2607.43	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.18
2607.44	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.18
2607.45	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	4.3
2607.46	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	4.3
2607.47	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	4.3
2607.48	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2607.49	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	2.4
2607.50	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2607.5	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	2.4
2607.51	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
2607.52	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	4.3
2607.53	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	4.3
2607.6	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
2607.7	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2607.8	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject	3.6
2607.9	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept	3.6
2608.1	Scott Carran	Reject	4.3
2609.2	KT Dunlop & SA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
2619.1	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	General
2619.2	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
2619.3	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	3.14

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2619.4	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	3.15
2619.5	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Reject	3.16
2619.6	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Reject	3.16
2619.7	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
2619.8	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept	3.18
2619.9	X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
2656.1	Robert Dumarchand	Reject	2.4
2657.1	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14
2660.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept	3.7
2660.10	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.16
2660.11	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.16
2660.2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept	3.9
2660.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.14
2660.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.14
2660.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.16
2660.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.16
2660.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.16
2660.7	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.16
2660.8	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Reject	3.14
2660.9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Accept	3.18

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2701.10	2387.10	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2701.13	2387.13	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2701.15	2387.15	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2701.18	2387.18	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2701.2	2387.2	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept	3.2
FS2701.3	2387.3	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2701.5	2387.5	Murray & Clare Doyle	Reject	3.14
FS2701.6	2387.6	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2701.7	2387.7	Murray & Clare Doyle	Accept	3.14
FS2701.8	2387.8	Murray & Clare Doyle	Reject	3.15
FS2701.9	2387.9	Murray & Clare Doyle	Reject	3.16
FS2706.1	2126.1	Tim Proctor	Accept in Part	General
FS2706.10	2126.10	Tim Proctor	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2706.11	2126.11	Tim Proctor	Reject	3.18
FS2706.12	2126.12	Tim Proctor	Reject	3.18
FS2706.13	2126.13	Tim Proctor	Reject	3.18
FS2706.3	2126.3	Tim Proctor	Accept	3.6
FS2706.4	2126.4	Tim Proctor	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2706.5	2126.5	Tim Proctor	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2706.6	2126.6	Tim Proctor	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2706.7	2126.7	Tim Proctor	Accept	3.16
FS2706.8	2126.8	Tim Proctor	Reject	3.16
FS2706.9	2126.9	Tim Proctor	Reject	3.18
FS2707.1	2478.1	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2707.2	2195.1	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2707.3	2194.1	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2707.4	2478.3	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	3.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2707.5	2195.3	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2707.6	2194.3	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2708.1	2490.1	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2708.10	2490.10	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2708.11	2490.11	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2708.12	2490.12	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2708.13	2490.13	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2708.14	2490.14	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2708.15	2490.15	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in part	3.6
FS2708.16	2490.16	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.6
FS2708.17	2490.17	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2708.18	2490.18	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2708.19	2490.19	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2708.20	2490.20	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2708.21	2490.21	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.7
FS2708.22	2490.22	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2708.23	2490.23	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2708.24	2490.24	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2708.25	2490.25	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2708.26	2490.26	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2708.27	2490.27	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.10
FS2708.28	2490.28	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.15
FS2708.29	2490.29	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2708.30	2490.30	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.14
FS2708.31	2490.31	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2708.32	2490.32	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2708.33	2490.33	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2708.34	2490.34	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2708.35	2490.35	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2708.36	2490.36	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2708.37	2490.37	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2708.38	2490.38	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2708.39	2490.39	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2708.4	2490.4	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2708.40	2490.40	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2708.41	2490.41	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2708.42	2490.42	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2708.43	2490.43	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2708.44	2490.44	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	3.18
FS2708.45	2490.45	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	4.3
FS2708.46	2490.46	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2708.47	2490.47	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2708.48	2490.48	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2708.49	2490.49	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2708.5	2490.5	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	2.4
FS2708.50	2490.50	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2708.51	2490.51	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2708.52	2490.52	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2708.53	2490.53	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	4.3
FS2708.55	2490.55	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2708.56	2490.56	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2708.6	2490.6	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2708.7	2490.7	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2708.8	2490.8	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Reject	3.6
FS2708.9	2490.9	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2709.1	2490.1	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2709.10	2490.10	Adele Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2709.11	2490.11	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2709.12	2490.12	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2709.13	2490.13	Adele Robins	Accept	3.6.
FS2709.14	2490.14	Adele Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2709.15	2490.15	Adele Robins	Accept in part	3.6
FS2709.16	2490.16	Adele Robins	Reject	3.6
FS2709.17	2490.17	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2709.18	2490.18	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2709.19	2490.19	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2709.20	2490.20	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2709.21	2490.21	Adele Robins	Reject	3.7
FS2709.22	2490.22	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2709.23	2490.23	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2709.24	2490.24	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2709.25	2490.25	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2709.26	2490.26	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2709.27	2490.27	Adele Robins	Reject	3.10
FS2709.28	2490.28	Adele Robins	Reject	3.15
FS2709.29	2490.29	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2709.30	2490.30	Adele Robins	Reject	3.14
FS2709.31	2490.31	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2709.32	2490.32	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2709.33	2490.33	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2709.34	2490.34	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2709.35	2490.35	Adele Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2709.36	2490.36	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2709.37	2490.37	Adele Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2709.38	2490.38	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2709.39	2490.39	Adele Robins	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2709.4	2490.4	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2709.40	2490.40	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2709.41	2490.41	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2709.42	2490.42	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2709.43	2490.43	Adele Robins	Reject	3.18
FS2709.44	2490.44	Adele Robins	Accept	3.18
FS2709.45	2490.45	Adele Robins	Accept	4.3
FS2709.46	2490.46	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2709.47	2490.47	Adele Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2709.48	2490.48	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2709.49	2490.49	Adele Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2709.5	2490.5	Adele Robins	Reject	2.4
FS2709.50	2490.50	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2709.51	2490.51	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2709.52	2490.52	Adele Robins	Reject	4.3
FS2709.53	2490.53	Adele Robins	Accept	4.3
FS2709.55	2490.55	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2709.56	2490.56	Adele Robins	Reject	3.16
FS2709.6	2490.6	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2709.7	2490.7	Adele Robins	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2709.8	2490.8	Adele Robins	Reject	3.6
FS2709.9	2490.9	Adele Robins	Accept	3.6
FS2710.1	2619.1	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2710.17	2388.5	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2710.18	2388.6	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2710.19	2388.7	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2710.2	2619.2	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2710.20	2388.8	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2710.21	2388.9	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.10
FS2710.22	2388.10	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2710.23	2388.11	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.10
FS2710.24	2388.12	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2710.25	2388.13	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2710.26	2388.14	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2710.28	2388.16	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2710.29	2388.17	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2710.3	2619.3	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2710.4	2619.4	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.15
FS2710.5	2619.5	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2710.54	2234.1	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2710.6	2619.6	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2710.7	2619.7	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2710.8	2619.8	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2710.9	2619.9	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2711.37	2500.7	The Ashford Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2711.38	2500.8	The Ashford Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2711.42	2500.12	The Ashford Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2711.45	2500.15	The Ashford Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2711.46	2500.16	The Ashford Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2711.47	2500.17	The Ashford Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2711.48	2500.18	The Ashford Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2712.37	2500.7	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2712.38	2500.8	M & C Burgess	Reject	3.6
FS2712.42	2500.12	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2712.45	2500.15	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2712.46	2500.16	M & C Burgess	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2712.47	2500.17	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2712.48	2500.18	M & C Burgess	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2714.3	2332.3	James Canning Muspratt	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2714.4	2332.4	James Canning Muspratt	Accept	2.4
FS2714.5	2332.4	James Canning Muspratt	Accept	3.6
FS2714.6	2332.4	James Canning Muspratt	Accept	3.16
FS2714.7	2332.4	James Canning Muspratt	Reject	3.16
FS2714.8	2332.4	James Canning Muspratt	Accept	3.19
FS2714.9	2332.9	James Canning Muspratt	Accept	2.4
FS2715.1	2475.1	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2715.10	2475.10	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.6
FS2715.11	2475.11	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.12	2475.12	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in part	3.6
FS2715.13	2475.13	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.6
FS2715.14	2475.14	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.6
FS2715.15	2475.15	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2715.16	2475.16	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.6
FS2715.17	2475.17	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.18	2475.18	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2715.19	2475.19	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2715.20	2475.20	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2715.21	2475.21	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.7
FS2715.22	2475.22	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2715.23	2475.23	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.9

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.24	2475.24	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2715.25	2475.25	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2715.26	2475.26	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.10
FS2715.27	2475.27	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.10
FS2715.28	2475.28	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.15
FS2715.29	2475.29	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.30	2475.30	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.14
FS2715.31	2475.31	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2715.32	2475.32	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2715.33	2475.33	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2715.34	2475.34	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2715.35	2475.35	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.36	2475.36	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2715.37	2475.37	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.16
FS2715.38	2475.38	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2715.39	2475.39	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.16
FS2715.4	2475.4	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2715.40	2475.40	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.41	2475.41	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2715.42	2475.42	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2715.43	2475.43	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	3.18
FS2715.44	2475.44	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.18
FS2715.45	2475.45	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	4.3
FS2715.46	2475.46	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.47	2475.47	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	4.3
FS2715.48	2475.48	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2715.49	2475.49	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	2.4
FS2715.5	2475.5	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	2.4
FS2715.50	2475.50	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2715.51	2475.51	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.52	2475.52	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept	4.3
FS2715.53	2475.53	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	4.3
FS2715.55	2475.55	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2715.56	2475.56	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.16
FS2715.6	2475.6	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2715.7	2475.7	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2715.8	2475.8	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.6
FS2715.9	2475.9	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Reject	3.6
FS2716.2	2397.1	Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited, and others	Reject	2.4
FS2719.166	2584.1	BSTGT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2719.167	2584.2	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.5, 3.9
FS2719.168	2584.3	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2719.169	2584.4	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2719.170	2584.5	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2719.171	2584.6	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2719.174	2584.9	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2719.175	2584.10	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2719.176	2584.11	BSTGT Limited	Accept	3.5
FS2719.177	2584.12	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2719.178	2584.13	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2719.179	2584.14	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2719.180	2584.15	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2719.181	2584.16	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2719.182	2584.17	BSTGT Limited	Accept	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2719.183	2584.18	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2719.184	2584.19	BSTGT Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2719.185	2584.20	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2719.186	2584.21	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2719.187	2584.22	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2719.188	2584.23	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2719.189	2584.24	BSTGT Limited	Accept	3.7
FS2719.190	2584.25	BSTGT Limited	Accept	3.8
FS2719.191	2584.26	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.9
FS2719.192	2584.27	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
FS2719.193	2584.28	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.12
FS2719.194	2584.29	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2719.195	2584.30	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2719.196	2584.31	BSTGT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2719.197	2584.32	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2719.198	2584.33	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2719.199	2584.34	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2719.200	2584.35	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2719.201	2584.36	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2719.202	2584.37	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2719.203	2584.38	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2719.204	2584.39	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2719.206	2584.41	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2719.207	2584.42	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2719.208	2584.43	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2719.209	2584.44	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2719.210	2584.45	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2719.211	2584.46	BSTGT Limited	Reject	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2720.133	2480.1	Boundary Trust	Accept	2.4
FS2720.134	2480.2	Boundary Trust	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.10
FS2720.135	2480.3	Boundary Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2720.136	2480.4	Boundary Trust	Accept	3.16
FS2720.137	2480.5	Boundary Trust	Accept	4.1
FS2721.15	2296.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.2	2248.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.21	2300.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.27	2298.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.33	2591.2	Shotover Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2721.34	2591.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2721.35	2591.4	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2721.37	2500.1	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2721.40	2500.4	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2721.41	2500.5	Shotover Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2721.42	2500.6	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2721.43	2500.7	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.44	2500.8	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2721.45	2500.9	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.46	2500.10	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2721.47	2500.11	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.48	2500.12	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.49	2500.13	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2721.50	2500.14	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2721.51	2500.15	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.52	2500.16	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2721.53	2500.17	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2721.54	2500.18	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2721.55	2500.19	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2721.56	2500.20	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2721.57	2500.21	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.7
FS2721.58	2500.22	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2721.59	2500.23	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2721.60	2500.24	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2721.61	2500.25	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2721.62	2500.26	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2721.63	2500.27	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.10
FS2721.64	2500.28	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.15
FS2721.65	2500.29	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2721.66	2500.30	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2721.67	2500.31	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2721.68	2500.32	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2721.69	2500.33	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2721.70	2500.34	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2721.71	2500.35	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.72	2500.36	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2721.73	2500.37	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.74	2500.38	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2721.75	2500.39	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.76	2500.40	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2721.77	2500.41	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2721.78	2500.42	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2721.79	2500.43	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.18
FS2721.80	2500.44	Shotover Trust	Accept	3.18
FS2721.81	2500.45	Shotover Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2721.82	2500.46	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2721.83	2500.47	Shotover Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2721.84	2500.48	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2721.85	2500.49	Shotover Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2721.86	2500.50	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2721.87	2500.51	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2721.88	2500.52	Shotover Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2721.89	2500.53	Shotover Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2721.9	2249.3	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2721.91	2500.55	Shotover Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2721.92	2500.56	Shotover Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.15	2296.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.21	2300.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.27	2298.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.3	2248.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.33	2591.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2722.34	2591.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2722.35	2591.4	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2722.37	2500.1	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2722.40	2500.4	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2722.41	2500.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2722.42	2500.6	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2722.43	2500.7	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.44	2500.8	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2722.45	2500.9	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.46	2500.10	Speargrass Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2722.47	2500.11	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.48	2500.12	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.49	2500.13	Speargrass Trust	Accept	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2722.50	2500.14	Speargrass Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2722.51	2500.15	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.52	2500.16	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2722.53	2500.17	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2722.54	2500.18	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2722.55	2500.19	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2722.56	2500.20	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2722.57	2500.21	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.7
FS2722.58	2500.22	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2722.59	2500.23	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2722.60	2500.24	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2722.61	2500.25	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2722.62	2500.26	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2722.63	2500.27	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.10
FS2722.64	2500.28	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.15
FS2722.65	2500.29	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2722.66	2500.30	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2722.67	2500.31	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2722.68	2500.32	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2722.69	2500.33	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2722.70	2500.34	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2722.71	2500.35	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.72	2500.36	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2722.73	2500.37	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.74	2500.38	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2722.75	2500.39	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.76	2500.40	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2722.77	2500.41	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2722.78	2500.42	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2722.79	2500.43	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.18
FS2722.80	2500.44	Speargrass Trust	Accept	3.18
FS2722.81	2500.45	Speargrass Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2722.82	2500.46	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2722.83	2500.47	Speargrass Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2722.84	2500.48	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2722.85	2500.49	Speargrass Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2722.86	2500.50	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2722.87	2500.51	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2722.88	2500.52	Speargrass Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2722.89	2500.53	Speargrass Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2722.9	2249.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2722.91	2500.55	Speargrass Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2722.92	2500.56	Speargrass Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2723.133	2480.1	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	2.4
FS2723.134	2480.2	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.10
FS2723.135	2480.3	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2723.136	2480.4	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	3.16
FS2723.137	2480.5	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	4.1
FS2724.133	2480.1	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	2.4
FS2724.134	2480.2	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2724.135	2480.3	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2724.136	2480.4	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	3.16
FS2724.137	2480.5	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	4.1
FS2725.1	2519.1	Guenther Raedler	Reject	2.4
FS2725.10	2319.6	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2725.11	2319.7	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2725.12	2319.8	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2725.13	2319.9	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2725.14	2319.10	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2725.16	2319.12	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2725.18	2319.14	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2725.19	2319.15	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2725.2	2519.2	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2725.20	2319.16	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2725.21	2319.17	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.22	2319.18	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.23	2319.19	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2725.24	2319.20	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.25	2319.21	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2725.26	2319.22	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.16
FS2725.27	2319.23	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2725.29	2319.25	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2725.3	2519.3	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.15
FS2725.30	2319.26	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.18
FS2725.32	2317.2	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.2
FS2725.33	2317.3	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2725.34	2317.4	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2725.35	2317.5	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2725.36	2317.6	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2725.37	2317.7	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2725.38	2317.8	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2725.39	2317.9	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2725.40	2317.10	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2725.42	2317.12	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2725.44	2317.14	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2725.45	2317.15	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2725.46	2317.16	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2725.47	2317.17	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.48	2317.18	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.49	2317.19	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2725.50	2317.20	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.10
FS2725.51	2317.21	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2725.52	2317.22	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2725.53	2317.23	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2725.55	2317.25	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2725.56	2317.26	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.18
FS2725.6	2319.2	Guenther Raedler	Reject	3.2
FS2725.7	2319.3	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2725.8	2319.4	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
FS2725.9	2319.5	Guenther Raedler	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2727.1	2095.1	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	2.4, 2.8
FS2727.12	2553.2	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2727.2	2194.3	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2727.9	2489.21	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2732.10	2307.1	Tom Hardley	Accept	2.5
FS2732.100	2275.25	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.16
FS2732.101	2275.26	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.17
FS2732.102	2275.27	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2732.103	2275.28	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.18
FS2732.104	2275.29	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2732.105	2275.30	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2732.106	2275.31	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2732.108	2275.33	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
FS2732.109	2275.34	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
FS2732.11	2307.2	Tom Hardley	Accept	2.5
FS2732.110	2275.35	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2732.12	2307.3	Tom Hardley	Accept	2.5
FS2732.13	2307.4	Tom Hardley	Accept	2.5
FS2732.17	2307.8	Tom Hardley	Reject	2.7, 3.2
FS2732.18	2307.9	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2732.19	2307.10	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.2	2496.2	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2732.20	2307.11	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.21	2307.12	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.22	2307.13	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.23	2307.14	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.24	2307.15	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.25	2307.16	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.26	2307.17	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2732.27	2307.18	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2732.28	2307.19	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.14
FS2732.29	2307.20	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2732.3	2496.3	Tom Hardley	Reject	4.3
FS2732.30	2307.21	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2732.31	2307.22	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.16
FS2732.32	2307.23	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2732.33	2307.24	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2732.34	2307.25	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2732.35	2307.26	Tom Hardley	Accept	4.3
FS2732.4	2496.4	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.40	2276.1	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2732.41	2276.2	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3
FS2732.42	2276.3	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2732.43	2276.4	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6. 3.10
FS2732.44	2276.5	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
FS2732.45	2276.6	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
FS2732.46	2276.7	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6.
FS2732.47	2276.8	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.5
FS2732.48	2276.9	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.49	2276.10	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.5	2496.5	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.50	2276.11	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.10
FS2732.51	2276.12	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2732.52	2276.13	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.12
FS2732.53	2276.14	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.13
FS2732.54	2276.15	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.14
FS2732.55	2276.16	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2732.56	2276.17	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.57	2276.18	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.15
FS2732.58	2276.19	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.14
FS2732.59	2276.20	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.6	2496.6	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.14
FS2732.60	2276.21	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.61	2276.22	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.62	2276.23	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.63	2276.24	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.16
FS2732.64	2276.25	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.17
FS2732.65	2276.26	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2732.66	2276.27	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.18
FS2732.67	2276.28	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2732.68	2276.29	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2732.69	2276.30	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2732.7	2496.7	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.16
FS2732.70	2276.31	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2732.73	2276.34	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
FS2732.74	2276.35	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
FS2732.75	2276.36	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2732.76	2275.1	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2732.77	2275.2	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3
FS2732.78	2275.3	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.5
FS2732.79	2275.4	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.5
FS2732.8	2496.8	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.14
FS2732.80	2275.5	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2732.81	2275.6	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.82	2275.7	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2732.83	2275.8	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2732.84	2275.9	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.5
FS2732.85	2275.10	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.86	2275.11	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.10
FS2732.87	2275.12	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.10
FS2732.88	2275.13	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2732.89	2275.14	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.12
FS2732.9	2496.9	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2732.90	2275.15	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.13
FS2732.91	2275.16	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.14
FS2732.92	2275.17	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.93	2275.18	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2732.94	2275.19	Tom Hardley	Reject	3.14
FS2732.95	2275.20	Tom Hardley	Accept	3.14
FS2732.96	2275.21	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.97	2275.22	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.98	2275.23	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2732.99	2275.24	Tom Hardley	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2733.10	2387.10	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2733.13	2387.13	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2733.15	2387.15	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2733.18	2387.18	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2733.2	2387.2	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept	3.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2733.3	2387.3	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2733.4	2387.4	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
FS2733.5	2387.5	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2733.6	2387.6	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2733.7	2387.7	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Accept	3.14
FS2733.8	2387.8	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2733.9	2387.9	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.10	2231.4	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	2.9
FS2734.101	2509.4	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.102	2509.5	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.103	2509.6	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2734.104	2509.7	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	3.6
FS2734.105	2509.8	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2734.106	2509.9	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.107	2509.10	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.108	2509.11	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.109	2509.12	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.110	2509.13	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.111	2509.14	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.112	2509.15	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.113	2509.16	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2734.114	2509.17	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.115	2509.18	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2734.116	2509.19	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2734.117	2509.20	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2734.118	2509.21	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2734.119	2509.22	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2734.12	2231.6	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.120	2509.23	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2734.121	2509.24	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.122	2509.25	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.123	2509.26	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.124	2509.27	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2734.125	2509.28	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.126	2509.29	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.127	2509.30	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.128	2509.31	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.129	2509.32	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2734.13	2231.7	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.130	2509.33	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2734.131	2509.34	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.132	2509.35	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.133	2509.36	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.134	2509.37	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.135	2509.38	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.136	2509.39	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.137	2509.40	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.138	2509.41	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.139	2509.42	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.14	2231.8	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.140	2509.43	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2734.141	2509.44	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2734.142	2509.45	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2734.143	2509.46	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.144	2509.47	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2734.145	2509.48	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.146	2509.49	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.147	2509.50	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.148	2509.51	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.149	2509.52	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2734.15	2231.9	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.150	2509.53	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2734.152	2509.55	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2734.153	2509.56	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.154	2509.57	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.16	2231.10	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.17	2231.11	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.18	2231.12	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.19	2231.13	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.20	2231.14	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.21	2231.15	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
FS2734.22	2231.16	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.23	2231.17	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.24	2231.18	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.25	2231.19	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.26	2231.20	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.27	2231.21	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.28	2231.22	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.29	2231.23	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.30	2231.24	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.31	2231.25	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.33	2449.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2734.36	2449.4	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.37	2449.5	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.38	2449.6	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2734.39	2449.7	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.4	2243.2	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.40	2449.8	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2734.41	2449.9	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.42	2449.10	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.43	2449.11	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.44	2449.12	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.45	2449.13	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.46	2449.14	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2734.47	2449.15	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.48	2449.16	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2734.49	2449.17	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2734.50	2449.18	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.51	2449.19	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2734.52	2449.20	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2734.53	2449.21	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2734.54	2449.22	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2734.55	2449.23	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2734.56	2449.24	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.57	2449.25	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.58	2449.26	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2734.59	2449.27	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2734.60	2449.28	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.61	2449.29	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2734.62	2449.30	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.63	2449.31	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2734.64	2449.32	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.65	2449.33	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2734.66	2449.34	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.67	2449.35	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.68	2449.36	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.69	2449.37	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.7	2231.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.70	2449.38	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.71	2449.39	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.72	2449.40	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.73	2449.41	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.74	2449.42	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2734.75	2449.43	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2734.76	2449.44	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2734.77	2449.45	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.78	2449.46	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.79	2449.47	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2734.8	2231.2	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2734.80	2449.48	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.81	2449.49	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4, 4.3
FS2734.82	2449.50	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.83	2449.51	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.84	2449.52	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2734.85	2449.53	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2734.87	2449.55	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2734.88	2449.56	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2734.89	2449.57	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.9	2231.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2734.90	2350.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2734.92	2350.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept	3.2
FS2734.93	2350.4	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.94	2350.5	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2734.95	2350.6	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.96	2350.7	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2734.98	2509.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2740.1	2464.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2740.10	2464.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.100	2445.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	4.3
FS2740.103	2504.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.11	2464.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
FS2740.12	2464.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.13	2464.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2740.14	2464.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2740.15	2464.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2740.16	2464.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.7
FS2740.17	2464.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2740.18	2464.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2740.19	2464.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2740.2	2464.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.20	2464.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2740.21	2464.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2740.22	2464.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.23	2464.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.15
FS2740.24	2464.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.25	2464.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.14
FS2740.26	2464.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.27	2464.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2740.28	2464.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2740.29	2464.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2740.3	2464.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
FS2740.30	2464.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.31	2464.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2740.32	2464.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.33	2464.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2740.34	2464.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.35	2464.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.36	2464.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.37	2464.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.38	2464.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.18
FS2740.39	2464.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.18
FS2740.4	2464.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.41	2464.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2740.42	2464.42	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.43	2529.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.44	2529.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.45	2529.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6
FS2740.46	2529.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.47	2529.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.48	2529.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.49	2529.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.5	2464.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
FS2740.50	2529.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
FS2740.51	2529.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
FS2740.52	2529.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.53	2529.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.54	2529.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.55	2529.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2740.56	2529.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2740.57	2529.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2740.58	2529.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.7
FS2740.59	2529.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2740.6	2464.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.60	2529.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2740.61	2529.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2740.62	2529.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2740.63	2529.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.64	2529.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.10
FS2740.65	2529.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.15
FS2740.66	2529.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.67	2529.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.14
FS2740.68	2529.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.69	2529.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2740.7	2464.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2740.70	2529.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2740.71	2529.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2740.72	2529.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.73	2529.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.74	2529.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.75	2529.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2740.76	2529.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.77	2529.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.78	2529.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.79	2529.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2740.8	2464.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
FS2740.80	2529.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.18
FS2740.81	2529.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.18
FS2740.82	2529.40	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	4.3
FS2740.83	2529.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.84	2529.42	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	4.3
FS2740.85	2529.43	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2740.86	2529.44	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	2.4
FS2740.87	2529.45	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2740.88	2529.46	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2740.89	2529.47	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	4.3
FS2740.9	2464.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	3.6
FS2740.90	2529.48	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept	4.3
FS2740.92	2529.50	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2740.95	2529.53	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2740.96	2529.54	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.97	2529.55	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2740.98	2529.56	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Reject	3.16
FS2740.99	2445.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.1	2458.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2741.10	2458.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.100	2529.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2741.101	2529.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2741.102	2529.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.103	2529.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.104	2529.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.105	2529.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.10
FS2741.106	2529.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.15
FS2741.107	2529.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.108	2529.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.14
FS2741.109	2529.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.11	2458.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6
FS2741.110	2529.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2741.111	2529.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2741.112	2529.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.113	2529.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.114	2529.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.115	2529.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.116	2529.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.117	2529.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.118	2529.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.119	2529.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.12	2458.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.120	2529.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.121	2529.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.18
FS2741.122	2529.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.18
FS2741.123	2529.40	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	4.3
FS2741.124	2529.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.125	2529.42	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	4.3
FS2741.126	2529.43	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.127	2529.44	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	2.4
FS2741.128	2529.45	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.129	2529.46	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.13	2458.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2741.130	2529.47	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	4.3
FS2741.131	2529.48	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	4.3
FS2741.133	2529.50	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.136	2529.53	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.137	2529.54	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	2.4
FS2741.138	2529.55	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.139	2529.56	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.14	2458.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.148	2231.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reconing	N/A
FS2741.15	2458.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.16	2458.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.7
FS2741.17	2458.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2741.18	2458.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2741.19	2458.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.2	2458.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.20	2458.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.21	2458.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.22	2458.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.10
FS2741.23	2458.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.15
FS2741.24	2458.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.25	2458.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.14
FS2741.26	2458.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.27	2458.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.15
FS2741.28	2458.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.15
FS2741.29	2458.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.3	2458.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6
FS2741.30	2458.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.31	2458.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.32	2458.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.33	2458.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.34	2458.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.35	2458.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.36	2458.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.37	2458.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.38	2458.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.18
FS2741.39	2458.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.18
FS2741.4	2458.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.40	2458.40	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.41	2458.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.42	2464.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2741.43	2464.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.44	2464.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6
FS2741.45	2464.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.46	2464.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.47	2464.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.48	2464.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.49	2464.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.5	2458.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.50	2464.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.51	2464.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.52	2464.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6
FS2741.53	2464.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.54	2464.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2741.55	2464.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.56	2464.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.57	2464.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.7
FS2741.58	2464.17	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2741.59	2464.18	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2741.6	2458.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.60	2464.19	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.61	2464.20	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.62	2464.21	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2741.63	2464.22	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.10
FS2741.64	2464.23	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.15
FS2741.65	2464.24	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.66	2464.25	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.14
FS2741.67	2464.26	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2741.68	2464.27	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2741.69	2464.28	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2741.7	2458.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.70	2464.29	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.71	2464.30	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.72	2464.31	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.73	2464.32	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.74	2464.33	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2741.75	2464.34	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.76	2464.35	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.77	2464.36	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.78	2464.37	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2741.79	2464.38	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.18
FS2741.8	2458.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.80	2464.39	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.18
FS2741.82	2464.41	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2741.83	2464.42	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.16
FS2741.84	2529.1	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2741.85	2529.2	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.86	2529.3	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2741.87	2529.4	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.88	2529.5	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.89	2529.6	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.9	2458.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.90	2529.7	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.91	2529.8	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.92	2529.9	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept	3.6
FS2741.93	2529.10	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.94	2529.11	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.6
FS2741.95	2529.12	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2741.96	2529.13	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2741.97	2529.14	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.98	2529.15	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2741.99	2529.16	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Reject	3.7

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.1	2509.1	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2743.100	2525.1	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2743.103	2525.4	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.104	2525.5	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.105	2525.6	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2743.106	2525.7	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.107	2525.8	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2743.108	2525.9	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2743.109	2525.10	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2743.110	2525.11	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.111	2525.12	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.112	2525.13	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2743.113	2525.14	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2743.114	2525.15	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.115	2525.16	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2743.116	2525.17	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.117	2525.18	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2743.118	2525.19	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2743.119	2525.20	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.120	2525.21	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2743.121	2525.22	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2743.122	2525.23	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2743.123	2525.24	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.124	2525.25	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.125	2525.26	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.126	2525.27	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2743.127	2525.28	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2743.128	2525.29	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.129	2525.30	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2743.13	2509.13	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	
FS2743.130	2525.31	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.131	2525.32	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2743.132	2525.33	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2743.133	2525.34	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2743.134	2525.35	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.135	2525.36	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2743.136	2525.37	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.137	2525.38	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.138	2525.39	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.139	2525.40	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.14	2509.14	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2743.140	2525.41	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.141	2525.42	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.142	2525.43	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2743.143	2525.44	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2743.144	2525.45	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2743.145	2525.46	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.146	2525.47	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2743.147	2525.48	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.148	2525.49	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.149	2525.50	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.15	2509.15	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.150	2525.51	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.151	2525.52	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2743.152	2525.53	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2743.154	2525.55	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.155	2525.56	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.16	2509.16	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2743.17	2509.17	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2743.18	2509.18	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2743.19	2509.19	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2743.20	2509.20	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2743.21	2509.21	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2743.22	2509.22	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2743.23	2509.23	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2743.24	2509.24	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.25	2509.25	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.26	2509.26	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2743.27	2509.27	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2743.28	2509.28	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2743.29	2509.29	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.30	2509.30	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2743.31	2509.31	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.32	2509.32	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2743.33	2509.33	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2743.34	2509.34	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.35	2509.35	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.36	2509.36	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2743.37	2509.37	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.38	2509.38	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2743.39	2509.39	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.4	2509.4	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.40	2509.40	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.41	2509.41	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.42	2509.42	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2743.43	2509.43	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2743.44	2509.44	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2743.45	2509.45	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2743.46	2509.46	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.47	2509.47	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2743.48	2509.48	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.49	2509.49	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.5	2509.5	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.50	2509.50	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.51	2509.51	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2743.52	2509.52	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2743.53	2509.53	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2743.55	2509.55	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2743.56	2509.56	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2743.57	2509.57	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.6	2509.6	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2743.60	2350.3	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept	3.2
FS2743.73	2231.12	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.74	2231.13	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.79	2231.18	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2743.87	2243.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.89	2243.1	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2743.90	2386.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2743.91	2386.3	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
FS2743.92	2386.4	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
FS2743.93	2386.6	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2743.94	2386.5	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2743.95	2386.9	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2743.96	2386.10	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2744.1	2231.1	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.10	2231.10	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.11	2231.11	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.12	2231.12	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2744.13	2231.13	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2744.14	2231.14	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2744.15	2231.15	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
FS2744.16	2231.16	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.14
FS2744.17	2231.17	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.14
FS2744.18	2231.18	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.15
FS2744.19	2231.19	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.15
FS2744.2	2231.2	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.20	2231.20	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.15
FS2744.21	2231.21	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2744.22	2231.22	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.16
FS2744.23	2231.23	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2744.24	2231.24	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.16
FS2744.25	2231.25	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.14
FS2744.3	2231.3	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.6
FS2744.4	2231.4	Philippa Archibald	Accept in Part	2.9
FS2744.6	2231.6	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.7	2231.7	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.8	2231.8	Philippa Archibald	Reject	2.4
FS2744.9	2231.9	Philippa Archibald	Reject	3.14
FS2745.21	2126.1	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2745.23	2126.3	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2745.24	2126.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2745.25	2126.5	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2745.26	2126.6	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2745.27	2126.7	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2745.28	2126.8	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.29	2126.9	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2745.30	2126.10	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2745.31	2126.11	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2745.32	2126.12	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2745.33	2126.13	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2745.35	2301.1	Juie QT Limited	Accept in part	General
FS2745.36	2301.2	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2745.38	2301.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2745.39	2301.5	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2745.40	2301.6	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2745.41	2301.7	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2745.42	2301.8	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2745.43	2301.9	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2745.44	2301.10	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.45	2301.11	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2745.46	2301.12	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2745.47	2301.13	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.48	2301.14	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2745.49	2301.15	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2745.50	2301.16	Juie QT Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2745.51	2301.17	Juie QT Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2745.52	2301.18	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2745.53	2231.1	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.54	2231.2	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.55	2231.3	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2745.56	2231.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	2.9
FS2745.58	2231.6	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.59	2231.7	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.60	2231.8	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.61	2231.9	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2745.62	2231.10	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.63	2231.11	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.64	2231.12	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2745.65	2231.13	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2745.66	2231.14	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2745.67	2231.15	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
FS2745.68	2231.16	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2745.69	2231.17	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2745.70	2231.18	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2745.71	2231.19	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2745.72	2231.20	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2745.73	2231.21	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2745.74	2231.22	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.75	2231.23	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2745.76	2231.24	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.77	2231.25	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2745.79	2247.1	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2745.80	2247.2	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2745.81	2247.3	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2745.82	2247.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2745.83	2247.5	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2745.84	2247.6	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2745.85	2234.1	Juie QT Limited	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2746.1	2307.8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	2.7, 3.2
FS2746.10	2293.8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2746.11	2307.10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2746.12	2293.4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.7, 3.9
FS2746.13	2442.1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.5
FS2746.14	2190.5	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
FS2746.15	2293.13	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.14
FS2746.16	2455.10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.18
FS2746.17	2455.3	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2746.18	2190.6	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2746.19	2190.7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2746.2	2377.5	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.2
FS2746.20	2293.10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19
FS2746.21	2293.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2746.22	2293.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.19
FS2746.23	2293.14	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.15
FS2746.24	2293.15	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.18
FS2746.25	2293.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2746.26	2293.17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.18
FS2746.27	2293.18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.18
FS2746.28	2293.19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.18
FS2746.29	2097.7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.15
FS2746.3	2464.1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2746.30	2455.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	4.3
FS2746.4	2190.2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	3.6
FS2746.5	2190.3	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2746.6	2190.4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2746.7	2293.2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6, 3.9

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2746.8	2307.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2746.9	2313.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2747.1	2445.1	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.2	2445.2	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
FS2747.21	2500.1	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2747.24	2500.4	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2747.25	2500.5	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
FS2747.26	2500.6	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2747.27	2500.7	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2747.28	2500.8	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.6
FS2747.29	2500.9	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
FS2747.30	2500.10	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
FS2747.31	2500.11	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2747.32	2500.12	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2747.33	2500.13	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
FS2747.34	2500.14	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.6
FS2747.35	2500.15	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2747.36	2500.16	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2747.37	2500.17	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2747.38	2500.18	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2747.39	2500.19	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2747.40	2500.20	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2747.41	2500.21	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.7
FS2747.42	2500.22	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2747.43	2500.23	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2747.44	2500.24	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2747.45	2500.25	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2747.46	2500.26	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2747.47	2500.27	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.10
FS2747.48	2500.28	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.15
FS2747.49	2500.29	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2747.50	2500.30	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
FS2747.51	2500.31	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2747.52	2500.32	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2747.53	2500.33	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2747.54	2500.34	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2747.55	2500.35	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2747.56	2500.36	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2747.57	2500.37	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2747.58	2500.38	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2747.59	2500.39	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2747.60	2500.40	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2747.61	2500.41	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2747.62	2500.42	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2747.63	2500.43	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.18
FS2747.64	2500.44	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	3.18
FS2747.65	2500.45	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	4.3
FS2747.66	2500.46	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.67	2500.47	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
FS2747.68	2500.48	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.69	2500.49	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
FS2747.7	2591.2	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
FS2747.70	2500.50	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.71	2500.51	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.72	2500.52	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
FS2747.73	2500.53	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2747.75	2500.55	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2747.76	2500.56	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2747.8	2591.3	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
FS2747.9	2591.4	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.10	2504.3	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.11	2445.1	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2748.12	2445.2	Len McFadgen	Reject	4.3
FS2748.2	2249.3	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
FS2748.25	2231.12	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.26	2231.13	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.4	2248.3	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
FS2748.51	2231.12	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.6	2298.3	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
FS2748.67	2291.2	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2748.68	2291.3	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2748.69	2291.4	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2748.70	2291.5	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2748.71	2291.6	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2748.72	2291.7	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2748.74	2291.9	Len McFadgen	Reject	2.5
FS2748.75	2291.10	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2748.76	2291.11	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2748.77	2291.12	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2748.78	2291.13	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.10
FS2748.79	2291.14	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.8	2300.3	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2748.80	2291.15	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.16
FS2748.81	2291.16	Len McFadgen	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2748.83	2291.18	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2748.84	2291.19	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.18
FS2748.85	2291.20	Len McFadgen	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2748.86	2291.21	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2748.87	2291.22	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.14
FS2748.88	2291.23	Len McFadgen	Reject	3.14
FS2748.89	2291.24	Len McFadgen	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.1	2449.1	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2749.10	2449.10	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.100	2386.9	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.101	2386.10	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.105	2525.1	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2749.108	2525.4	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.109	2525.5	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
FS2749.11	2449.11	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.110	2525.6	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2749.111	2525.7	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.112	2525.8	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6
FS2749.113	2525.9	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.114	2525.10	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.115	2525.11	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.116	2525.12	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.117	2525.13	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.118	2525.14	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.119	2525.15	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.12	2449.12	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.120	2525.16	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6
FS2749.121	2525.17	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.122	2525.18	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2749.123	2525.19	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2749.124	2525.20	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.125	2525.21	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.7
FS2749.126	2525.22	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2749.127	2525.23	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2749.128	2525.24	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.129	2525.25	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.13	2449.13	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.130	2525.26	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.131	2525.27	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.10
FS2749.132	2525.28	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.133	2525.29	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2749.134	2525.30	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.14
FS2749.135	2525.31	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2749.136	2525.32	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2749.137	2525.33	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2749.138	2525.34	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.139	2525.35	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.14	2449.14	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.6
FS2749.140	2525.36	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.141	2525.37	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.142	2525.38	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.143	2525.39	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.144	2525.40	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.145	2525.41	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.146	2525.42	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.147	2525.43	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.18
FS2749.148	2525.44	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.18
FS2749.149	2525.45	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.15	2449.15	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.150	2525.46	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.151	2525.47	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
FS2749.152	2525.48	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.153	2525.49	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
FS2749.154	2525.50	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.155	2525.51	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.156	2525.52	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
FS2749.157	2525.53	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.159	2525.55	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.16	2449.16	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6
FS2749.160	2525.56	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.17	2449.17	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.18	2449.18	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2749.19	2449.19	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2749.20	2449.20	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2749.21	2449.21	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.7
FS2749.22	2449.22	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.23	2449.23	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2749.24	2449.24	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.25	2449.25	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.26	2449.26	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2749.27	2449.27	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.10
FS2749.28	2449.28	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.15
FS2749.29	2449.29	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2749.30	2449.30	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.15
FS2749.31	2449.31	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.32	2449.32	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
FS2749.33	2449.33	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.14
FS2749.34	2449.34	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.35	2449.35	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.36	2449.36	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.37	2449.37	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.38	2449.38	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.39	2449.39	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.4	2449.4	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.40	2449.40	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.41	2449.41	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.42	2449.42	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2749.43	2449.43	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.18
FS2749.44	2449.44	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.18
FS2749.45	2449.45	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3
FS2749.46	2449.46	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.47	2449.47	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
FS2749.48	2449.48	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.49	2449.49	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4, 4.3
FS2749.5	2449.5	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
FS2749.50	2449.50	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.51	2449.51	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.52	2449.52	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	4.3
FS2749.53	2449.53	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	4.3
FS2749.55	2449.55	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2749.56	2449.56	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2749.57	2449.57	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.6	2449.6	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2749.61	2350.4	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.62	2350.5	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2749.63	2350.6	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.64	2350.7	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.16
FS2749.65	2350.3	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept	3.2
FS2749.7	2449.7	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.77	2231.12	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2749.8	2449.8	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.9	2449.9	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2749.92	2243.2	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
FS2749.94	2243.1	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	2.4
FS2749.95	2386.2	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2749.96	2386.3	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2749.97	2386.4	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
FS2749.98	2386.6	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2749.99	2386.5	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	3.14
FS2750.1	2445.1	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2750.10	2231.7	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2750.11	2231.8	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2750.12	2231.9	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.13	2231.10	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2750.14	2231.11	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2750.15	2231.12	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.16	2231.13	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.17	2231.14	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.18	2231.15	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
FS2750.19	2231.16	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.2	2445.2	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2750.20	2231.17	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.21	2231.18	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2750.22	2231.19	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2750.23	2231.20	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2750.24	2231.21	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2750.25	2231.22	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2750.26	2231.23	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2750.27	2231.24	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2750.28	2231.25	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.31	2437.3	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2750.32	2437.5	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2750.34	2410.3	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.35	2410.4	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2750.37	2291.2	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2750.38	2291.3	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2750.39	2291.4	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2750.4	2231.1	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2750.40	2291.5	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2750.41	2291.6	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2750.42	2291.7	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2750.43	2291.9	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2750.44	2291.10	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2750.45	2291.11	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2750.46	2291.12	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2750.47	2291.13	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2750.48	2291.14	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.49	2291.15	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2750.5	2231.2	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2750.50	2291.16	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept In Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2750.52	2291.18	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2750.53	2291.19	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2750.54	2291.20	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2750.55	2291.21	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2750.56	2291.22	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.57	2291.23	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2750.58	2291.24	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2750.6	2231.3	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2750.7	2231.4	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in Part	2.9
FS2750.9	2231.6	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2757.1	2194.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2757.2	2478.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2757.3	2195.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2759.1	2194.1	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in Part	General
FS2759.2	2195.1	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in Part	General
FS2759.3	2478.1	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in Part	General
FS2760.10	2538.9	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2760.11	2538.10	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.12	2538.11	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2760.13	2538.12	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2760.14	2538.13	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2760.15	2538.14	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2760.16	2538.15	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2760.17	2538.16	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2760.18	2538.17	Real Journeys Limited	Accept In Part	4.3
FS2760.19	2538.18	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2760.2	2538.1	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2760.20	2538.19	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2760.21	2538.20	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2760.22	2538.21	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2760.23	2538.22	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.3	2538.2	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2760.4	2538.3	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2760.5	2538.4	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2760.515	2455.3	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2760.6	2538.5	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2760.7	2538.6	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.8	2538.7	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2761.3	2591.2	Michael Brial	Reject	4.3
FS2761.4	2591.3	Michael Brial	Accept	3.14
FS2761.5	2591.4	Michael Brial	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2762.1	2272.1	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2762.10	2272.10	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2762.11	2272.11	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.5
FS2762.12	2272.12	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.10
FS2762.13	2272.13	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.10
FS2762.14	2272.14	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Reject	3.10
FS2762.15	2272.15	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2762.16	2272.16	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.12
FS2762.17	2272.17	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.13
FS2762.18	2272.18	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Reject	3.14
FS2762.19	2272.19	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2762.2	2272.2	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2762.20	2272.20	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2762.21	2272.21	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Reject	3.15
FS2762.22	2272.22	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.14
FS2762.23	2272.23	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept In Part	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2762.24	2272.24	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2762.25	2272.25	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2762.26	2272.26	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Reject	3.16
FS2762.27	2272.27	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept	3.17
FS2762.28	2272.28	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2762.29	2272.29	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Reject	3.18
FS2762.3	2272.3	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3
FS2762.30	2272.30	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2762.31	2272.31	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2762.32	2272.32	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2762.35	2272.35	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.10
FS2762.4	2272.4	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2762.5	2272.5	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2762.6	2272.6	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2762.7	2272.7	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3, 3.6
FS2762.8	2272.8	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.3
FS2762.9	2272.9	Leslie and Judith Nelson	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2765.10	2251.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.100	2291.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2765.101	2291.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2765.102	2291.5	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2765.103	2291.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.104	2291.7	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2765.105	2291.9	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2765.106	2291.10	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2765.107	2291.11	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2765.108	2291.12	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2765.109	2291.13	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2765.11	2251.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2765.110	2291.14	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2765.111	2291.15	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.112	2291.16	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2765.114	2291.18	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.115	2291.19	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.116	2291.20	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2765.117	2291.21	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2765.118	2291.22	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2765.119	2291.23	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2765.12	2251.5	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2765.120	2291.24	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.13	2251.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2765.15	2253.2	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2765.16	2253.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.17	2253.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2765.18	2253.5	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2765.19	2253.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2765.22	2538.1	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2765.23	2538.2	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2765.24	2538.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2765.25	2538.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2765.26	2538.5	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2765.27	2538.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2765.28	2538.7	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.3	2246.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2765.30	2538.9	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.31	2538.10	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.32	2538.11	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2765.33	2538.12	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.34	2538.14	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.35	2538.13	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.36	2538.15	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	3.19
FS2765.37	2538.16	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.38	2538.17	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept In Part	4.3
FS2765.39	2538.18	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2765.4	2246.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.40	2538.19	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.41	2538.20	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2765.42	2538.21	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.43	2538.22	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2765.45	2489.2	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2765.49	2489.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2765.5	2246.5	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2765.6	2246.6	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2765.7	2246.7	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2765.78	2489.35	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2765.79	2489.36	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2765.80	2489.37	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2765.81	2489.38	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.82	2489.39	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2765.83	2489.40	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2765.84	2489.41	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.85	2489.42	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.86	2489.43	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2765.87	2489.44	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2765.88	2489.45	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2765.89	2489.46	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2765.9	2251.2	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2765.90	2489.47	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.91	2489.48	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2765.92	2489.49	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.93	2489.50	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2765.94	2489.51	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.95	2489.52	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2765.96	2489.53	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2765.97	2489.54	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2765.99	2291.2	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2766.10	2251.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
FS2766.11	2251.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.16
FS2766.12	2251.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.19
FS2766.13	2251.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.4
FS2766.15	2253.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2766.16	2253.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
FS2766.17	2253.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.16
FS2766.18	2253.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.19
FS2766.19	2253.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.4
FS2766.24	2567.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.1
FS2766.25	2538.1	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2766.26	2538.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2766.27	2538.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2766.28	2538.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2766.29	2538.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2766.3	2246.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2766.31	2538.7	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
FS2766.32	2538.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2766.33	2538.10	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
FS2766.34	2538.9	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2766.35	2538.11	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2766.36	2538.12	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
FS2766.37	2538.14	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
FS2766.38	2538.13	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
FS2766.39	2538.15	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.19
FS2766.4	2246.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2766.40	2538.16	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2766.41	2538.17	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept In Part	4.3
FS2766.42	2538.18	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	4.3
FS2766.43	2538.19	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2766.44	2538.20	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	4.3
FS2766.45	2538.21	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2766.46	2538.22	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	4.3
FS2766.48	2291.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2766.49	2291.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2766.5	2246.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept	3.16
FS2766.50	2291.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2766.51	2291.5	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2766.52	2291.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2766.53	2291.7	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2766.54	2291.9	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.5
FS2766.55	2291.10	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2766.56	2291.11	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2766.57	2291.12	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2766.58	2291.13	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.10
FS2766.59	2291.14	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2766.6	2246.6	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.19
FS2766.60	2291.15	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.16
FS2766.61	2291.16	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2766.63	2291.18	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2766.64	2291.19	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.18
FS2766.65	2291.20	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2766.66	2291.21	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2766.67	2291.22	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2766.68	2291.23	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	3.14
FS2766.69	2291.24	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2766.7	2246.7	Ladies Mile Consortium	Reject	2.4
FS2766.9	2251.2	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2769.10	2281.9	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2769.11	2281.10	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2769.13	2387.2	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.2
FS2769.14	2387.3	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2769.15	2387.4	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
FS2769.16	2387.5	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
FS2769.17	2387.6	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2769.18	2387.7	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.14
FS2769.19	2387.8	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.15
FS2769.20	2387.9	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2769.21	2387.10	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2769.24	2387.13	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2769.26	2387.15	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2769.27	2387.18	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2769.29	2386.2	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2769.30	2386.3	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2769.31	2386.4	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	Section 3.10
FS2769.32	2386.5	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.14
FS2769.33	2386.6	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2769.34	2386.7	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.14
FS2769.35	2386.8	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.15
FS2769.36	2386.9	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2769.37	2386.10	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2769.4	2281.3	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	4.3
FS2769.41	2386.14	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.18
FS2769.42	2386.15	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	3.19

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2769.43	2386.16	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2769.45	2386.18	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2769.5	2281.4	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	2.4
FS2769.6	2281.5	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.19
FS2769.7	2281.6	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept	3.19
FS2769.8	2281.7	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject	3.16
FS2769.9	2281.8	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2770.1	2445.1	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.100	2529.53	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.101	2529.54	Philip Smith	Reject	2.4
FS2770.102	2529.55	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.103	2529.56	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.106	2298.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.107	2298.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.16
FS2770.108	2298.5	Philip Smith	Reject	3.19
FS2770.109	2298.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.112	2300.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.113	2300.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.16
FS2770.114	2300.5	Philip Smith	Reject	3.19
FS2770.115	2300.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.123	2437.3	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.124	2437.5	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.126	2410.3	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.127	2410.4	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.15	2231.12	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.2	2445.2	Philip Smith	Reject	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2770.21	2231.18	Philip Smith	Reject	3.15
FS2770.32	2249.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.33	2249.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.16
FS2770.34	2249.5	Philip Smith	Reject	3.19
FS2770.35	2249.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.38	2248.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.39	2248.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.16
FS2770.40	2248.5	Philip Smith	Reject	3.19
FS2770.41	2248.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.44	2296.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.45	2296.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.16
FS2770.46	2296.5	Philip Smith	Reject	N/A
FS2770.47	2296.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.48	2529.1	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2770.49	2529.2	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.50	2529.3	Philip Smith	Reject	3.6
FS2770.51	2529.4	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
FS2770.52	2529.5	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
FS2770.53	2529.6	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.54	2529.7	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.55	2529.8	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
FS2770.56	2529.9	Philip Smith	Accept	3.6
FS2770.57	2529.10	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.58	2529.11	Philip Smith	Reject	3.6
FS2770.59	2529.12	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2770.60	2529.13	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2770.61	2529.14	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2770.62	2529.15	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2770.63	2529.16	Philip Smith	Reject	3.7
FS2770.64	2529.17	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2770.65	2529.18	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2770.66	2529.19	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2770.67	2529.20	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2770.68	2529.21	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2770.69	2529.22	Philip Smith	Reject	3.10
FS2770.70	2529.23	Philip Smith	Reject	3.15
FS2770.71	2529.24	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.72	2529.25	Philip Smith	Reject	3.14
FS2770.73	2529.26	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2770.74	2529.27	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2770.75	2529.28	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2770.76	2529.29	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2770.77	2529.30	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.78	2529.31	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2770.79	2529.32	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.80	2529.33	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2770.81	2529.34	Philip Smith	Reject	3.16
FS2770.82	2529.35	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2770.83	2529.36	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2770.84	2529.37	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2770.85	2529.38	Philip Smith	Reject	3.18
FS2770.86	2529.39	Philip Smith	Accept	3.18
FS2770.87	2529.40	Philip Smith	Accept	4.3
FS2770.88	2529.41	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.89	2529.42	Philip Smith	Reject	4.3
FS2770.90	2529.43	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.91	2529.44	Philip Smith	Reject	2.4
FS2770.92	2529.45	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.93	2529.46	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2770.94	2529.47	Philip Smith	Reject	4.3
FS2770.95	2529.48	Philip Smith	Accept	4.3
FS2770.97	2529.50	Philip Smith	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2772.1	2234.1	R Hadley	Reject	2.4
FS2772.17	2388.7	R Hadley	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2772.19	2388.9	R Hadley	Accept	3.10
FS2772.20	2388.10	R Hadley	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2773.1	2229.18	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	Reject	4.3
FS2781.1	2490.1	Gavin Muldoon	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2782.1	2376.10	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2782.10	2376.19	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.100	2449.50	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2782.101	2449.51	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2782.102	2449.52	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2782.103	2449.53	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2782.105	2449.55	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2782.106	2449.56	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2782.107	2449.57	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2782.11	2376.4	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	3.5
FS2782.12	2376.5	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.14	2376.6	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.17	2376.7	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.18	2376.8	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.19	2376.9	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2782.2	2376.11	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.13
FS2782.3	2376.12	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2782.32	2487.1	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2782.33	2487.2	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2782.34	2487.3	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2782.35	2487.4	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.38	2487.7	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2782.39	2487.8	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2782.4	2376.13	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2782.40	2487.9	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2782.41	2487.10	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2782.43	2487.12	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2782.44	2487.13	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2782.5	2376.14	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.50	2530.1	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2782.51	2449.1	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2782.54	2449.4	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2782.55	2449.5	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2782.56	2449.6	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2782.57	2449.7	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.58	2449.8	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2782.59	2449.9	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.6	2376.15	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.60	2449.10	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2782.61	2449.11	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.62	2449.12	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.63	2449.13	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.64	2449.14	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2782.65	2449.15	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.66	2449.16	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2782.67	2449.17	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2782.68	2449.18	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2782.69	2449.19	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2782.7	2376.16	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2782.70	2449.20	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2782.71	2449.21	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2782.72	2449.22	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2782.73	2449.23	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2782.74	2449.24	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2782.75	2449.25	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2782.76	2449.26	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2782.77	2449.27	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2782.78	2449.28	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2782.79	2449.29	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.8	2376.17	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.80	2449.30	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2782.81	2449.31	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2782.82	2449.32	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
FS2782.83	2449.33	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2782.84	2449.34	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.85	2449.35	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2782.86	2449.36	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.87	2449.37	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2782.88	2449.38	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2782.89	2449.39	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2782.9	2376.18	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.17
FS2782.90	2449.40	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2782.91	2449.41	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2782.92	2449.42	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2782.93	2449.43	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2782.94	2449.44	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2782.95	2449.45	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2782.96	2449.46	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.97	2449.47	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2782.98	2449.48	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2782.99	2449.49	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	2.4, 4.3
FS2783.1	2376.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.10	2376.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.100	2316.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.101	2316.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.102	2316.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.103	2316.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.105	2316.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.106	2316.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.107	2316.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.108	2316.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.109	2316.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.11	2376.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	3.5
FS2783.110	2316.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.111	2316.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.112	2316.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.113	2316.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.114	2316.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.115	2316.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.117	2316.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.119	2317.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.12	2376.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.120	2317.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.121	2317.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.122	2317.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.123	2317.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.124	2317.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.125	2317.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.127	2317.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.128	2317.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.129	2317.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.13	2376.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.130	2317.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.131	2317.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.132	2317.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.133	2317.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.134	2317.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.135	2317.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.136	2317.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.138	2317.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.140	2318.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.141	2318.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.142	2318.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.143	2318.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.144	2318.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.145	2318.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.146	2318.8	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.147	2318.9	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.148	2318.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.150	2318.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.152	2318.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.153	2318.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.154	2318.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
FS2783.155	2318.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.156	2318.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.157	2318.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.158	2318.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.159	2318.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.160	2318.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.162	2318.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.163	2318.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.165	2319.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.166	2319.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.167	2319.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
FS2783.168	2319.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.169	2319.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.17	2376.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.170	2319.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.171	2319.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.173	2319.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.174	2319.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.175	2319.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.176	2319.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.177	2319.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.178	2319.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.179	2319.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.18	2376.8	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.180	2319.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.181	2319.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.182	2319.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.184	2319.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.19	2376.9	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.193	2231.9	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reconing	N/A
FS2783.2	2376.11	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.13
FS2783.211	2449.1	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.214	2449.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.215	2449.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2783.216	2449.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.217	2449.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.218	2449.8	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2783.219	2449.9	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.220	2449.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2783.221	2449.11	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.222	2449.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.223	2449.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.224	2449.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2783.225	2449.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.226	2449.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2783.227	2449.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2783.228	2449.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.229	2449.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2783.230	2449.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2783.231	2449.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2783.232	2449.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.233	2449.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2783.234	2449.24	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.235	2449.25	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.236	2449.26	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.237	2449.27	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.238	2449.28	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2783.239	2449.29	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.240	2449.30	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.241	2449.31	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2783.242	2449.32	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
FS2783.243	2449.33	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2783.244	2449.34	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.245	2449.35	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.246	2449.36	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.247	2449.37	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.248	2449.38	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.249	2449.39	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.250	2449.40	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.251	2449.41	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.252	2449.42	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.253	2449.43	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2783.254	2449.44	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2783.255	2449.45	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2783.256	2449.46	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.257	2449.47	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2783.258	2449.48	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.259	2449.49	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	2.4, 4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.260	2449.50	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.261	2449.51	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.262	2449.52	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2783.263	2449.53	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2783.265	2449.55	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.266	2449.56	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2783.267	2449.57	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.3	2376.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.33	2291.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.34	2291.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.38	2291.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.4	2376.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.15
FS2783.43	2291.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.48	2291.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2783.49	2291.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2783.5	2376.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.50	2291.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2783.52	2291.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2783.54	2291.24	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.56	2314.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.57	2314.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.58	2314.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.59	2314.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.6	2376.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.60	2314.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.61	2314.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.62	2314.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.63	2314.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.64	2314.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.65	2314.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.66	2314.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.67	2314.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.68	2314.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.7	2376.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2783.70	2314.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.71	2314.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.73	2314.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.74	2314.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.75	2314.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.77	2315.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.78	2315.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.79	2315.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.8	2376.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.80	2315.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.81	2315.6	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2783.82	2315.7	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.83	2315.12	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2783.85	2315.14	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2783.86	2315.15	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2783.87	2315.16	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2783.88	2315.17	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.89	2315.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.9	2376.18	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.17
FS2783.90	2315.19	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2783.91	2315.20	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2783.92	2315.21	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2783.93	2315.22	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2783.94	2315.23	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2783.96	2315.10	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2783.98	2316.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2783.99	2316.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2784.1	2376.10	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.10
FS2784.10	2376.19	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.100	2449.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2784.101	2449.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.102	2449.8	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.6
FS2784.103	2449.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.104	2449.10	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.6
FS2784.105	2449.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.106	2449.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.107	2449.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in part	3.6
FS2784.108	2449.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.6
FS2784.109	2449.15	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.11	2376.4	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.5
FS2784.110	2449.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.6
FS2784.111	2449.17	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.112	2449.18	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2784.113	2449.19	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2784.114	2449.20	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2784.115	2449.21	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.7
FS2784.116	2449.22	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2784.117	2449.23	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2784.118	2449.24	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2784.119	2449.25	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2784.12	2376.5	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.120	2449.26	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2784.121	2449.27	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.10
FS2784.122	2449.28	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.123	2449.29	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.124	2449.30	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.125	2449.31	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.126	2449.32	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15, 3.16
FS2784.127	2449.33	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.128	2449.34	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.129	2449.35	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.130	2449.36	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.131	2449.37	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.132	2449.38	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.133	2449.39	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.134	2449.40	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.135	2449.41	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.136	2449.42	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.137	2449.43	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.18
FS2784.138	2449.44	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.18
FS2784.139	2449.45	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.3
FS2784.14	2376.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.140	2449.46	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.141	2449.47	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	4.3
FS2784.142	2449.48	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.143	2449.49	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4, 4.3
FS2784.144	2449.50	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2784.145	2449.51	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.146	2449.52	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	4.3
FS2784.147	2449.53	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.3
FS2784.149	2449.55	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2784.150	2449.56	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.151	2449.57	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.17	2376.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.18	2376.8	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2784.19	2376.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.10
FS2784.2	2376.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.13
FS2784.3	2376.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.32	2291.2	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2784.33	2291.3	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2784.34	2291.4	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2784.35	2291.5	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2784.36	2291.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.37	2291.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2784.38	2291.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.5
FS2784.39	2291.10	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2784.4	2376.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.40	2291.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2784.41	2291.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2784.42	2291.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.10
FS2784.43	2291.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.44	2291.15	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.45	2291.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2784.47	2291.18	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.48	2291.19	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.18

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2784.49	2291.20	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2784.5	2376.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.50	2291.21	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.51	2291.22	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.52	2291.23	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.53	2291.24	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.54	2231.1	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.55	2231.2	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.56	2231.3	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.6
FS2784.57	2231.4	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	2.9
FS2784.59	2231.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.6	2376.15	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.60	2231.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.61	2231.8	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.62	2231.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.64	2231.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2784.65	2231.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.66	2231.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.67	2231.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.68	2231.15	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.16
FS2784.69	2231.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.7	2376.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.70	2231.17	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.71	2231.18	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.72	2231.19	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.73	2231.20	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.74	2231.21	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.75	2231.22	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2784.76	2231.23	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.77	2231.24	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.78	2231.25	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.8	2376.17	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.81	2385.2	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2784.82	2385.3	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.10
FS2784.83	2385.4	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.14
FS2784.84	2385.5	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.85	2385.6	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.14
FS2784.86	2385.7	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.15
FS2784.87	2385.8	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.16
FS2784.88	2385.9	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2784.9	2376.18	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.17
FS2784.90	2385.11	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2784.91	2385.12	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	3.18
FS2784.92	2385.13	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2784.93	2385.14	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2784.94	2385.16	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2784.95	2449.1	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2784.98	2449.4	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2784.99	2449.5	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	2.4
FS2786.1	2184.1	Hogans Gully Farm Limited	Accept in Part	General
FS2787.10	2291.10	P Chittock	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2787.101	2317.25	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.102	2317.26	P Chittock	Reject	3.18
FS2787.104	2319.2	P Chittock	Reject	3.2
FS2787.105	2319.3	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.106	2319.4	P Chittock	Accept in Part	Section 3.5
FS2787.107	2319.5	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2787.108	2319.6	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2787.109	2319.7	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.11	2291.11	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.110	2319.8	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.111	2319.9	P Chittock	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2787.112	2319.10	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2787.114	2319.12	P Chittock	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2787.116	2319.14	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2787.117	2319.15	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.118	2319.16	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.119	2319.17	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.12	2291.12	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.120	2319.18	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.121	2319.19	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.122	2319.20	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.123	2319.21	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.124	2319.22	P Chittock	Reject	3.16
FS2787.125	2319.23	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.127	2319.25	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.128	2319.26	P Chittock	Reject	3.18
FS2787.13	2291.13	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.14	2291.14	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.15	2291.15	P Chittock	Reject	3.16
FS2787.16	2291.16	P Chittock	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2787.18	2291.18	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.19	2291.19	P Chittock	Reject	3.18
FS2787.2	2291.2	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2787.20	2291.20	P Chittock	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2787.21	2291.21	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.22	2291.22	P Chittock	Reject	3.14
FS2787.23	2291.23	P Chittock	Reject	3.14
FS2787.24	2291.24	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.26	2315.2	P Chittock	Reject	3.2
FS2787.27	2315.3	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.28	2315.4	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.29	2315.5	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2787.3	2291.3	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.30	2315.6	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2787.31	2315.7	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.32	2315.8	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.33	2315.9	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.34	2315.10	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2787.36	2315.12	P Chittock	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2787.38	2315.14	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2787.39	2315.15	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.4	2291.4	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.40	2315.16	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.41	2315.17	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.42	2315.18	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.43	2315.19	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.44	2315.20	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.45	2315.21	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.46	2315.22	P Chittock	Reject	3.16
FS2787.47	2315.23	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.49	2315.25	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.5	2291.5	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.50	2315.26	P Chittock	Reject	3.18
FS2787.52	2316.2	P Chittock	Reject	3.2
FS2787.53	2316.3	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.54	2316.4	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.55	2316.5	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.56	2316.6	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2787.57	2316.7	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.58	2316.8	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.59	2316.9	P Chittock	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2787.6	2291.6	P Chittock	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2787.60	2316.10	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2787.62	2316.12	P Chittock	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2787.64	2316.14	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2787.65	2316.15	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.66	2316.16	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2787.67	2316.17	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.68	2316.18	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.69	2316.19	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.7	2291.7	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2787.70	2316.20	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.71	2316.21	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.72	2316.22	P Chittock	Reject	3.16
FS2787.73	2316.23	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.75	2316.25	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.76	2316.26	P Chittock	Reject	3.18
FS2787.78	2317.2	P Chittock	Reject	3.2
FS2787.79	2317.3	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.80	2317.4	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.81	2317.5	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.82	2317.6	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2787.83	2317.7	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.84	2317.8	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2787.85	2317.9	P Chittock	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2787.86	2317.10	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.19
FS2787.88	2317.12	P Chittock	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2787.9	2291.9	P Chittock	Reject	2.5
FS2787.90	2317.14	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2787.91	2317.15	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2787.92	2317.16	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2787.93	2317.17	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.94	2317.18	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.95	2317.19	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2787.96	2317.20	P Chittock	Reject	3.10
FS2787.97	2317.21	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2787.98	2317.22	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2787.99	2317.23	P Chittock	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2791.1	2126.1	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept in Part	General

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2791.10	2126.10	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2791.11	2126.11	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject	3.18
FS2791.12	2126.12	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject	3.18
FS2791.13	2126.13	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject	3.18
FS2791.3	2126.3	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept	3.6
FS2791.4	2126.4	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2791.5	2126.5	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2791.6	2126.6	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2791.7	2126.7	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Accept	3.16
FS2791.8	2126.8	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject	3.16
FS2791.9	2126.9	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject	3.18
FS2792.1	2490.1	Debbie MacColl	Reject	2.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2792.59	2490.3	Debbie MacColl	Reject	2.4
FS2792.74	2490.18	Debbie MacColl	Reject	2.4
FS2795.10	2281.10	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.100	2307.12	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.101	2307.13	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.102	2307.14	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.10
FS2795.103	2307.15	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.10
FS2795.104	2307.16	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2795.105	2307.17	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2795.106	2307.18	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2795.107	2307.19	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2795.108	2307.20	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.109	2307.21	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.11	2505.1	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2795.110	2307.22	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.111	2307.23	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.112	2307.24	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2795.113	2307.25	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.114	2307.26	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2795.14	2505.4	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2795.15	2505.5	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2795.16	2505.6	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2795.17	2505.7	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.18	2505.8	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2795.19	2505.9	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2795.20	2505.10	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2795.21	2505.11	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.22	2505.12	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2795.23	2505.13	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2795.24	2505.14	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2795.25	2505.15	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.26	2505.16	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2795.27	2505.17	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.28	2505.18	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2795.29	2505.19	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2795.3	2281.3	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2795.30	2505.20	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2795.31	2505.21	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.7
FS2795.32	2505.22	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2795.33	2505.23	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2795.34	2505.24	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2795.35	2505.25	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2795.36	2505.26	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2795.37	2505.27	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.10
FS2795.38	2505.28	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.15
FS2795.39	2505.29	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2795.4	2281.4	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2795.40	2505.30	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.14
FS2795.41	2505.31	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2795.42	2505.32	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
FS2795.43	2505.33	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
FS2795.44	2505.34	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.45	2505.35	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.46	2505.36	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.47	2505.37	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.48	2505.38	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2795.49	2505.39	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.5	2281.5	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.19
FS2795.50	2505.40	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2795.51	2505.41	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2795.52	2505.42	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2795.53	2505.43	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.18
FS2795.54	2505.44	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.18
FS2795.55	2505.45	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2795.56	2505.46	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.57	2505.47	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2795.58	2505.48	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.59	2505.49	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.4
FS2795.6	2281.6	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.19
FS2795.60	2505.50	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.61	2505.51	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.62	2505.52	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2795.63	2505.53	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2795.64	2505.54	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.65	2505.55	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.7	2281.7	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.16
FS2795.71	2301.1	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	General
FS2795.72	2301.2	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2795.74	2301.4	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.75	2301.5	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.76	2301.6	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.77	2301.7	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2795.78	2301.8	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2795.79	2301.9	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2795.8	2281.8	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2795.80	2301.10	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.81	2301.11	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	3.16
FS2795.82	2301.12	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2795.83	2301.13	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.84	2301.14	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.18
FS2795.85	2301.15	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.86	2301.16	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	4.3
FS2795.87	2301.17	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	4.3
FS2795.88	2301.18	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2795.89	2307.1	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.5
FS2795.9	2281.9	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	3.16
FS2795.90	2307.2	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.5
FS2795.91	2307.3	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.5
FS2795.92	2307.4	Boxer Hills Trust	Reject	2.5
FS2795.96	2307.8	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept	2.7, 3.2
FS2795.97	2307.9	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2795.98	2307.10	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2795.99	2307.11	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.1	2397.1	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2796.10	2281.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept In Part	3.16
FS2796.100	2307.13	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.101	2307.14	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2796.102	2307.15	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2796.103	2307.16	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.104	2307.17	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2796.105	2307.18	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14, 3.15
FS2796.106	2307.19	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2796.107	2307.20	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.108	2307.21	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.109	2307.22	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.111	2281.9	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.110	2307.23	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.111	2307.24	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2796.112	2307.25	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.113	2307.26	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2796.12	2281.10	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.13	2505.1	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	2.5
FS2796.16	2505.4	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2796.17	2505.5	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2796.18	2505.6	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2796.19	2505.7	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.20	2505.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2796.21	2505.9	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.22	2505.10	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2796.23	2505.11	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.24	2505.12	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	3.6
FS2796.25	2505.13	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2796.26	2505.14	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2796.27	2505.15	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.28	2505.16	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2796.29	2505.17	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.30	2505.18	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.5, 3.6
FS2796.31	2505.19	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2796.32	2505.20	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.7
FS2796.33	2505.21	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.7
FS2796.34	2505.22	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.5
FS2796.35	2505.23	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.9
FS2796.36	2505.24	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2796.37	2505.25	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2796.38	2505.26	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2796.39	2505.27	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.10
FS2796.40	2505.28	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.15

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.41	2505.29	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2796.42	2505.30	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.14
FS2796.43	2505.31	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2796.44	2505.32	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
FS2796.45	2505.33	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14,3.15
FS2796.46	2505.34	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.47	2505.35	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.48	2505.36	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.49	2505.37	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.5	2281.3	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2796.50	2505.38	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.51	2505.39	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.52	2505.40	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2796.53	2505.41	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2796.54	2505.42	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.18
FS2796.55	2505.43	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2796.56	2505.44	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.18
FS2796.57	2505.45	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2796.58	2505.46	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.59	2505.47	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2796.6	2281.4	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2796.60	2505.48	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.61	2505.49	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.4
FS2796.62	2505.50	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.63	2505.51	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.64	2505.52	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2796.65	2505.53	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2796.66	2505.54	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.67	2505.55	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.7	2281.5	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.19
FS2796.70	2301.1	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	General
FS2796.71	2301.2	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2796.73	2301.4	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.74	2301.5	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.75	2301.6	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.76	2301.7	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.10
FS2796.77	2301.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14
FS2796.78	2301.9	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.14

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.79	2301.10	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.8	2281.6	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.19
FS2796.80	2301.11	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2796.81	2301.12	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.16
FS2796.82	2301.13	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.16
FS2796.83	2301.14	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	3.18
FS2796.84	2301.15	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.85	2301.16	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2796.86	2301.17	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2796.87	2301.18	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2796.88	2307.1	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2796.89	2307.2	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2796.9	2281.7	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	3.16
FS2796.90	2307.3	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2796.91	2307.4	Trojan Helmet Limited	Reject	2.5
FS2796.95	2307.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept	2.7, 3.2
FS2796.96	2307.9	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2796.97	2307.10	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2796.98	2307.11	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioner's Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.99	2307.12	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
FS2797.5	2135.1	M & R Donaldson	Accept	2.4
FS2797.6	2135.2	M & R Donaldson	Accept	2.4
FS2797.7	2135.3	M & R Donaldson	Accept	2.4
FS2797.8	2135.4	M & R Donaldson	Accept	2.4
FS2797.9	2135.5	M & R Donaldson	Accept	2.4
FS2802	2332.3	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2802.4	2332.4	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept	2.4
FS2802.5	2332.4	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept	3.6
FS2802.6	2332.4	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept	3.16
FS2802.7	2332.4	Tucker Beach Residents	Reject	3.16
FS2802.8	2332.4	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept	3.19
FS2802.9	2332.9	Tucker Beach Residents	Accept	2.4

Appendix 4: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions Transferred from Stage 1 to Chapter 24

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
26.20	David Clarke	Reject
26.2	David Clarke	Reject
21.55	Alison Walsh	Reject
157.1	Miles Wilson	Reject
157.1	Miles Wilson	Reject
157.2	Miles Wilson	Reject
166.1	Aurum Survey Consultants (Part)	Reject
166.20	Bruce McLeod	Reject
216.1	Elizabeth Wadworth	Reject
228.1	Hutchinson, Anna	Reject
231.2	A, S and S Strain	Reject
231.2	Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject
231.3	Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject
231.4	Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	Reject
232.5	D & K Andrew, R Macashev	Reject
232.5	Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject
232.6	Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject
232.7	Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	Reject
233.2	D Gallaqher	Reject
233.2	Dean Gallagher	Reject
233.3	Dean Gallagher	Reject
233.4	Dean Gallagher	Reject
235.2	G Sim	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
235.2	Graeme Sim	Reject
235.3	Graeme Sim	Reject
235.4	Graeme Sim	Reject
239.1	D Moffat	Reject
239.1	Don Moffat	Reject
248.2	Shotover Jet	Reject
248.20	Shotover Trust	Reject
248.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
248.7	Shotover Trust	Reject
314.4	Wakatipu Holdings	Reject
314.5	Wakatipu Holdings	Reject
328.3	Noel Gutzewitz	Reject
328.4	N Gutzewitz	Reject
328.4	Noel Gutzewitz	Reject
331.2	Watiri Station	Reject
331.2	The Station at Waitiri	Reject
331.4	The Station at Waitiri	Reject
331.7	The Station at Waitiri	Reject
348.4	Mrs M K Greenslade	Reject
348.5	MK Greenslade	Reject
348.5	Mrs M K Greenslade	Reject
348.7	Mrs M K Greenslade	Reject
350.1	Dalefield Trustee Ltd	Reject
350.10	Dalefield Trustee Ltd	Reject
350.9	Dalefield Trustee Ltd	Reject
350.9	Dalefield Trustee Ltd	Reject
351.2	Sam Strain	Reject
351.3	S Strain	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
351.3	Sam Strain	Reject
367.1	John Borrell	Reject
367.6	J Borrell	Reject
367.6	John Borrell	Reject
367.7	John Borrell	Reject
370.1	Paterson Pitts Group	Accept in part
383.50	Queenstown Lakes District Council	Reject
389.9	Body Corporate 22362	Reject
391.15	S & J McLeod	Reject
402.2	L R Nelson & J A Nelson	Reject
402.5	L R Nelson & J A Nelson	Reject
411.2	NT McDonald Family Trust	Reject
414.4	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	Reject
414.4	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	Reject
414.5	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	Reject
414.7	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	Reject
428.3	B F Ellis & S J Ellis	Reject
431.3	B Kipke	Reject
497.10	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.11	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.12	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.13	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.2	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.20	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.21	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
497.21	Arcadian Triangle Ltd	Reject
513.39	J Barb	Reject
513.40	J Barb	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
513.41	J Barb	Reject
513.46	J Barb	Reject
513.46	Jenny Barb	Reject
513.47	J Barb	Reject
513.47	Jenny Barb	Reject
514.5	D Fea	Reject
514.6	D Fea	Reject
514.6	Duncan Fea	Reject
515.33	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.34	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.35	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.38	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.38	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.39	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.39	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
515.40	Wakatipu Equities	Reject
522.37	KJ Brustad and HJ Inch	Reject
522.38	KJ Brustad and HJ Inch	Reject
522.42	KJ Brustad and HJ Inch	Reject
522.42	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Reject
522.43	KJ Brustad and HJ Inch	Reject
522.43	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Reject
523.11	R & E Heywood	Reject
523.12	R & E Heywood	Reject
523.17	R & E Heywood	Reject
523.17	Robert and Elvena Heywood	Reject
523.18	R & E Hevwood	Reject
523.18	Robert and Elvena Heywood	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
530.10	B Ballan	Reject
530.11	B Ballan	Reject
530.12	B Ballan	Reject
530.15	B Ballan	Reject
530.15	Byron Ballan	Reject
530.16	B Ballan	Reject
530.16	Byron Ballan	Reject
530.9	B Ballan	Reject
532.25	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.26	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.27	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.28	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.35	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.35	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
532.36	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
532.36	Bill and Jan Walker Familv Trust	Reject
534.28	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henrv	Reject
534.29	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henrv	Reject
534.30	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henrv	Reject
534.31	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henrv	Reject
534.36	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henrv	Reject
534.36	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Reject
534.37	W Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Reject
534.37	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Reject
535.28	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject
535.29	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
535.30	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject
535.31	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject
535.36	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject
535.36	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Reject
535.37	GW Stalker Family Trust, M Henry, M Tylden, W French, D Finlin, S Strain	Reject
535.37	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Reject
537.35	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
537.36	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
537.4	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
537.40	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
537.41	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
537.41	Slopehill Joint Venture	Reject
546.4	J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	Reject
554.4	R H Ffiske	Reject
557.3	Speargrass Trust	Reject
594.4	Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	Reject
600.104	Federated Farmers	Reject
631.4	Shelley Chadwick	Reject
631.6	Cassidy Trust	Reject
669.2	Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	Reject
674.4	Hadley, J & R	Reject
674.5	Hadley, J & R	Reject
717.18	Jandel Trust	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
763.11	Lake Haves Ltd	Reject
763.12	Lake Haves Ltd	Reject
763.13	Lake Haves Ltd	Reject
763.16	Lake Haves Ltd	Reject
763.16	Lake Hayes Limited	Reject
763.17	Lake Haves Ltd	Reject
811.11	Marc Scaife	Reject
830.3	Duncan Edward Robertson	Reject
830.4	Duncan Edward Robertson	Reject
830.6	D Robertson	Reject
847.17	Fli Holdings Ltd	Reject

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1050.6	674.5	Jan Andersson	Reject
FS1065.1	231.2	Ohapi Trust	Reject
FS1065.2	232.5	Ohapi Trust	Reject
FS1065.3	233.2	Ohapi Trust	Reject
FS1065.4	235.2	Ohapi Trust	Reject
FS1065.5	239.1	Ohapi Trust	Reject
FS1068.28	535.28	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject
FS1068.29	535.29	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject
FS1068.30	535.30	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1068.31	535.31	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject
FS1068.36	535.36	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject
FS1068.37	535.37	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre	Reject
FS1071.107	414.4	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.108	414.5	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.110	414.7	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.41	535.28	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.42	535.29	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.43	535.30	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.44	535.31	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.49	535.36	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.50	535.37	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.56	351.2	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.57	351.3	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1071.83	532.25	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.84	532.26	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.85	532.27	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.86	532.28	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.93	532.35	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.94	532.36	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1071.98	239.1	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Reject
FS1082.5	674.5	Hadley, J and R	Reject
FS1089.6	674.5	McGuinness, Mark	Reject
FS1111.6	166	C Mantel	Reject
FS1120.39	537.35	Michael Brial	Reject
FS1120.40	537.36	Michael Brial	Reject
FS1120.44	537.40	Michael Brial	Reject
FS1120.45	537.41	Michael Brial	Reject
FS1146.5	674.5	Nicolson, Lee	Reject
FS1157.55	166.20	Amy Wilson-White	Reject
FS1209.104	600	Richard Burdon	Reject
FS1224.58	811.11	Matakauri Lodge Ltd	Reject
FS1255.13	414.4	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Reject
FS1255.14	414.5	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1255.16	414.7	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Reject
FS1255.8	674.5	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Reject
FS1256.11	523.11	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.12	523.12	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.17	523.17	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.18	523.18	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.53	537.35	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.54	537.36	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.58	537.40	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1256.59	537.41	Ashford Trust	Reject
FS1259.12	535.28	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1259.13	535.29	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1259.14	535.30	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1259.15	535.31	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1259.20	535.36	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1259.21	535.37	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1267.12	535.28	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1267.13	535.29	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1267.14	535.30	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1267.15	535.31	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1267.20	535.36	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1267.21	535.37	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Reject
FS1270.23	847	Hansen Family Partnership	Reject
FS1286.44	537.35	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.45	537.36	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.49	537.40	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.50	537.41	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.6	348.4	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.61	231.2	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.62	231.3	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.63	231.4	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.7	348.5	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.71	232.5	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.72	232.6	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.73	232.7	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.76	830.3	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.77	830.4	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1286.9	348.7	Mr M and Mrs J Henry	Reject
FS1292.39	537.35	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.40	537.36	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.44	537.40	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.45	537.41	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.86	522.37	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.87	522.38	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1292.91	522.42	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1292.92	522.43	Roger and Carol Wilkinson	Reject
FS1309.4	314.4	The Alpine Group	Reject
FS1322.105	535.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.106	535.29	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.107	535.30	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.108	535.31	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.113	535.36	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.114	535.37	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.29	532.25	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.30	532.26	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.31	532.27	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.32	532.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.39	532.35	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.40	532.36	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.68	534.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.69	534.29	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.70	534.30	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.71	534.31	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.76	534.36	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject
FS1322.77	534.37	Juie Q.T. Limited	Reject

Appendix 5: Recommendations to Stream 15 Hearing Panel on Submissions and Further Submissions on Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 6

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
110.2	Alan Cutler	Accept in part	2.5
168.3	Garry Strange	Accept in part	2.5
251.4	PowerNet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
300.3	Rob Jewell	Accept in part	2.5
375.7	Jeremy Carey-Smith	Accept in part	2.5
407.4	Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Accept in part	2.5
430.4	Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
433.46	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in part	2.5
437.13	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
442.6	David and Margaret Bunn	Accept in part	2.5
443.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
452.8	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
456.8	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Accept in part	2.5
580.4	Contact Energy Limited	Accept in part	2.5
600.42	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in part	2.5
608.37	Darby Planning LP	Accept in part	2.5
608.54	Darby Planning LP	Accept in part	2.5
625.12	Upper Clutha Track Trust	Accept in part	2.5
631.3	Cassidy Trust	Accept in part	2.5
669.9	Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	Accept in part	2.5
671.3	Queenstown Trails Trust	Accept in part	2.5
694.21	Glentui Heights Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
696.15	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
712.11	Bobs Cove Developments Limited	Accept in part	2.5
755.9	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Accept in part	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
805.40	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in part	2.5
806.94	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
836.19	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Accept in part	2.5
836.20	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Accept in part	2.5
836.21	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2292.15	M McGuinness	Accept in part	2.5
2292.8	M McGuinness	Accept in part	2.5
2307.5	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in part	2.5
2307.6	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in part	2.5
2307.7	Crown Investment Trust	Accept in part	2.5
2308.11	Jon Waterston	Accept in part	2.5
2314.13	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in part	2.5
2315.13	R G DAYMAN	Accept in part	2.5
2316.13	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in part	2.5
2317.13	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in part	2.5
2318.13	C BATCHELOR	Accept in part	2.5
2319.13	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in part	2.5
2320.11	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in part	2.5
2378.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
2378.4	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
2378.5	Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
2386.19	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in part	2.5
2449.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2449.3	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2475.2	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
2475.3	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
2479.2	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2479.3	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in part	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2487.18	BSTGT Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2488.2	Juie QT Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2488.3	Juie QT Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2489.3	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in part	2.5
2489.4	Ladies Mile Consortium	Accept in part	2.5
2490.2	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in part	2.5
2490.3	Morven Residents Association Incorporated	Accept in part	2.5
2500.2	Philip Smith	Accept in part	2.5
2500.3	Philip Smith	Accept in part	2.5
2501.2	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in part	2.5
2501.3	Phillipa Archibald	Accept in part	2.5
2505.2	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
2505.3	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
2509.2	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	2.5
2509.3	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	2.5
2525.2	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2525.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2529.51	Len McFadgen	Accept in part	2.5
2529.52	Len McFadgen	Accept in part	2.5
2550.2	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2550.3	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2553.4	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in part	2.5
2553.5	GW Stalker Family Trust (Springbank)	Accept in part	2.5
2562.2	Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf	Accept in part	2.5
2562.3	Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf	Accept in part	2.5
2577.2	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in part	2.5
2577.3	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Accept in part	2.5

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2580.2	John Edward Griffin	Accept in part	2.5
2580.3	John Edward Griffin	Accept in part	2.5
2584.7	Slopehill Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2607.2	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in part	2.5
2607.3	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Accept in part	2.5

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS1015.101	608.37	Straterra	Accept in part	2.5
FS1034.195	608.37	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	Accept in part	2.5
FS1034.212	608.54	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	Accept in part	2.5
FS1034.42	600.42	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	Accept in part	2.5
FS1040.28	580.4	Forest and Bird	Accept in part	2.5
FS1050.24	430.4	Jan Andersson	Accept in part	2.5
FS1077.28	433.46	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	Accept in part	2.5
FS1082.21	430.4	J and R Hadley	Accept in part	2.5
FS1084.5	430.4	Wendy Clarke	Accept in part	2.5
FS1085.5	608.54	Contact Energy Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1085.6	836.19	Contact Energy Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1086.7	430.4	J Hadley	Accept in part	2.5
FS1087.5	430.4	Robyn Hart	Accept in part	2.5
FS1089.23	430.4	Mark McGuinness	Accept in part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS1092.4	251.4	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.17	110.2	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.265	407.4	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.282	430.4	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.332	433.46	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.434	456.8	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.569	608.37	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.629	625.12	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.726	836.21	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.743	437.13	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1097.91	251.4	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1099.4	430.4	Brendon and Katrina Thomas	Accept in part	2.5
FS1115.3	251.4	Queenstown Wharves Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1117.181	433.46	Remarkables Park Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1129.4	430.4	Graeme Hill	Accept in part	2.5
FS1133.5	430.4	John Blair	Accept in part	2.5
FS1146.22	430.4	Lee Nicolson	Accept in part	2.5
FS1154.8	608.37	Hogans Gully Farm Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
FS1158.4	608.37	ZJV (NZ) Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
FS1160.12	437.13	Otago Regional Council	Accept in part	2.5
FS1209.42	600.42	Richard Burdon	Accept in part	2.5
FS1229.33	836.21	NXski Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS1282.21	375.7	Longview Environmental Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS1347.92	625.12	Lakes Land Care	Accept in part	2.5
FS2708.2	2490.2	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in part	2.5
FS2708.3	2490.3	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Accept in part	2.5
FS2709.2	2490.2	Adele Robins	Accept in part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2709.3	2490.3	Adele Robins	Accept in part	2.5
FS2715.2	2475.2	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in part	2.5
FS2715.3	2475.3	Graeme Morris Todd, John William Troon, Jane Ellen Todd, and Michael Brial	Accept in part	2.5
FS2719.172	2584.7	BSTGT Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2721.38	2500.2	Shotover Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2721.39	2500.3	Shotover Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2722.38	2500.2	Speargrass Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2722.39	2500.3	Speargrass Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2725.17	2319.13	Guenther Raedler	Accept in part	2.5
FS2725.43	2317.13	Guenther Raedler	Accept in part	2.5
FS2732.14	2307.5	Tom Hardley	Accept in part	2.5
FS2732.15	2307.6	Tom Hardley	Accept in part	2.5
FS2732.16	2307.7	Tom Hardley	Accept in part	2.5
FS2734.100	2509.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2734.34	2449.2	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2734.35	2449.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2734.99	2509.2	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2740.93	2529.51	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2740.94	2529.52	Crosby Developments Limited (Hawthorne Triangle)	Accept in part	2.5
FS2741.134	2529.51	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in part	2.5
FS2741.135	2529.52	Crosby Developments Limited (Northridge)	Accept in part	2.5
FS2743.101	2525.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2743.102	2525.3	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2743.2	2509.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2743.3	2509.3	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2747.22	2500.2	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
FS2747.23	2500.3	Slopehill Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
FS2749.106	2525.2	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	2.5
FS2749.107	2525.3	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	2.5
FS2749.3	2449.3	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	2.5
FS2765.46	2489.3	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2765.47	2489.4	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2769.46	2386.19	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	2.5
FS2770.98	2529.51	Philip Smith	Accept in part	2.5
FS2770.99	2529.52	Philip Smith	Accept in part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2782.49	2487.18	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2782.52	2449.2	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2782.53	2449.3	Glencoe Station Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.104	2316.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.126	2317.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.151	2318.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.172	2319.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.212	2449.2	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.213	2449.3	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.72	2314.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2783.84	2315.13	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2784.96	2449.2	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
FS2784.97	2449.3	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in part	2.5
FS2787.115	2319.13	P Chittock	Accept in part	2.5
FS2787.37	2315.13	P Chittock	Accept in part	2.5
FS2787.63	2316.13	P Chittock	Accept in part	2.5
FS2787.89	2317.13	P Chittock	Accept in part	2.5
FS2795.12	2505.2	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2795.13	2505.3	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2795.93	2307.5	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2795.94	2307.6	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2795.95	2307.7	Boxer Hills Trust	Accept in part	2.5
FS2796.14	2505.2	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2796.15	2505.3	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2796.92	2307.5	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2796.93	2307.6	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5
FS2796.94	2307.7	Trojan Helmet Limited	Accept in part	2.5

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report and recommendations of Independent Commissioners
regarding mapping of Wakatipu Basin and Arrowtown
(includes Stage 1 submissions not previously heard)

Report 18.2 – Mapping Introduction

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Rachel Dimery

Trevor Robinson

Quentin Smith

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND AND APPROACH	1
1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE MAPPING REPORTS.....	1
1.3 STATUTORY FRAMEWORK	3
2. OVERALL COMMENTS.....	3
3. RECOMMENDATIONS	4

Appendix 1: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions on Mapping Where Submitter did not Appear

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and approach

1. Report 18.1 sets out our recommendations regarding Chapter 24. It provides an overview of the general approach taken¹, including the zoning principles which we considered, where relevant, in preparing our recommendations on submissions.
2. The abbreviations used in this report are those used in Report 18.1.
3. When the Stream 13 Hearing Panel made recommendations on the mapping submissions in the Queenstown area in Stage 1, those submissions relating to land within the Wakatipu Basin, including Arrowtown, and on the Crown Terrace were deferred to be heard with submissions on the zonings within the Wakatipu Basin notified in Stage 2. The Stream 13 Panel also deferred any recommendations on parts of property holdings around the edges of the Wakatipu Basin where the property was subject to a Stage 1 zoning (generally Rural), but in part subject to a Stage 2 zone. It also included the land within ONLs or ONFs within the Wakatipu Basin notified in Stage 1 (such as Slope Hill, Lake Hayes and Morven Hill).
4. A consequence of this situation is that, while our reports and recommendations are focused on those sites subject to submissions, we also recommend that the Council confirm the zoning of land which was notified in August 2015, but not subject to either submissions or decisions on Stage 1 zoning in May 2018, nor subject to a Stage 2 zoning notified in November 2017. These areas are included in the set of Planning Maps, which will accompany these reports when the Council considers our recommendations, but not specifically identified in these reports. The extent of the area at issue is shown on Figure 1 below.
5. We also note that some parts of the Wakatipu Basin were rezoned one of the Open Space and Recreation Zones in Stage 2. These areas included Coronet Forest and reserve lands on the banks of the Shotover and Kawarau Rivers. Submissions on those zonings have been heard and dealt with in Stream 15 (Report 19.6). In addition, submissions lodged by Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited² seeking the rezoning of the river flats portion of the Bridesdale land has been dealt with in Stream 15, while those parts of the same submissions seeking relocation of the ONL boundary and rezoning for urban purposes have been dealt with in these reports (Report 18.11).

1.2 Structure of the Mapping Reports

6. We were grateful to the Council staff for their detailed analysis of submissions presented in their Section 42A Reports. We did, however, form the view that analysing submissions by Landscape Character Unit (LCU) resulted in some unnecessary duplication. For example, the X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust³ submission related to land in two adjoining LCUs. For this reason, we have grouped our recommendations according to the areas we describe below, as shown in Figure 1. We have prepared a separate report (Reports 18.3 -18.11 inclusive) for each of the nine areas shown on Figure 1. There remain a few instances where submissions straddle two different areas

¹ See Section 2

² Submissions 655 and 2391

³ Submission 2619

based on our groupings. Where this is the case, we have noted this at the start of each report and have referred the reader to the report the submission is addressed in.




Figure 1: Areas used when considering submissions

7. A total of 272 submissions sought map amendments in this Hearing Stream. Of those, 146 were submissions lodged in Stage 1 that had not been heard pending the notification of Stage 2. While many of those submissions were overtaken by the introduction of the Rural Amenity Zone and the Lifestyle Precinct, there remained Stage 1 submissions on the following:
 - a. Location of ONL/ONF boundaries;
 - b. Location of Urban Growth Boundaries;
 - c. Zoning of land within and adjacent to the urban area of Arrowtown not affected by Stage 2; and
 - d. Zoning of land either side of Ladies Mile, in Lake Hayes Estate, and along the true left bank of the Kowarau River, that was not affected by Stage 2 zonings.

8. Submissions relating to zoning, the location of boundaries for ONLs and ONFs and the location of mapped Landscape Features are discussed within the report that corresponds with each area (e.g. submissions relating to Area A – Western Basin are discussed in Report 18.3). We note that we have recommended a name change for Landscape Features to Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features. The reasons for this change are explained in Report 18.1. To avoid confusion, we have continued to refer to Landscape Features in our discussion in this report and Reports 18.3 -18.11.

9. In considering each group of submissions, we have carefully considered the submissions and evidence presented at the hearing. As outlined in Report 18.1, in cases where the submission did not contain supporting material and no evidence was presented at the hearing, we have generally recommended the submission be rejected unless evidence was presented by Council officers on which to base our recommendations. Where the Council officers recommended acceptance of such submissions, we have discussed them in the relevant report. Otherwise, our recommendations on the submissions for which we received no supporting evidence (and any relevant further submissions) are set out in Appendix 1 to this report and we discuss them no further.
10. Within each of Reports 18.3 to 18.11 we discuss the submissions in groups as far as possible, as frequently we were faced with several submissions seeking zoning amendments on adjacent sites.

1.3 Statutory framework

11. We have followed the approach outlined in Section 2.1 of Report 18.1 in considering the submissions.
12. The PDP is required to give effect to any relevant national policy statements. We have discussed the NPSFM and NPSET in Report 18.1 (in Sections 2.8 and 3 respectively). The NPSUDC is also relevant to our assessment of a limited number of submissions. These submissions relate to land where urban zonings are sought: variously, on the margins of the Arrowtown urban area, in the Ladies Mile area, west of the Shotover River and at Ayrburn Farm (Reports 18.10, 18.11, 18.3 and 18.5 respectively).
13. We heard no expert evidence disputing Ms Vanstone's assessment⁴ that the PDP meets the requirements of the NPSUDC in terms of its provision of total feasible development capacity⁵. We are therefore satisfied that irrespective of the recommended zoning of land that we are considering, the NPSUDC has already been given effect to through the decisions on Stage 1 of the PDP.

2. Overall comments

14. As we discussed in Report 18.1⁶, we are of the view that the cumulative effect of amending the zoning pattern, so as to apply a materially greater area of Precinct to land within the Wakatipu Basin than that notified, would erode the rural character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin and undermine the PDP Strategic Direction set out in Chapters 3, 4 and 6. The tipping point at which the cumulative effects would become too much was an important consideration for us.
15. In broad terms, the areas we recommend be rezoned Precinct have been concentrated in areas that are able to absorb a degree of change. In arriving at our recommendations, we consider it is important to maintain the interplay between openness and built form. It did not follow that every piece of land capable of absorbing further development has been recommended to be rezoned. As we noted in Report 18.1, we have assessed in every case whether the overall tipping point for the Basin would be reached, and if not, whether a tipping point for the local discrete area would be reached.

⁴ A Vanstone, Section 42A Report at [5.10] discussing submissions 451, 492, 655 (Ladies Mile)

⁵ A Vanstone, Section 42A Report at [5.11 to 5.13]

⁶ In Section 2.1

16. Our approach to submissions seeking site-specific zonings is as set out in Section 2.3 of Report 18.1. We have set out in Section 2.8 of Report 18.1 our assessment of how intensification of land uses in the catchment of Lake Hayes should be approached, and in Section 2.9 of Report 18.1, how we approached effects of increased traffic likely to be consequential on any increase in development. We do not repeat all that here or in Reports 18.3 to 18.11, but all those factors form part of our reasoning.

3. Recommendations

17. Our recommended changes to the PDP maps are set out in detail in Reports 18.3 – 18.11 that accompany this report. We have not reproduced our recommendations on zoning and map notations here.
18. Our reports also provide comment on various anomalies and strategic issues for Council's consideration. For convenience, we have identified those issues below, together with our recommendations on these issues:
 - a. In Section 2.6 of Report 18.1, we identify a scope issue arising from amendments to ONL and ONF boundaries. As a result of our recommendations, small areas of land on the Wakatipu Basin planning maps will be zoned Rural with a Rural Character Landscape notation.⁷ We recommend that Council consider promulgating a variation to rezone the land affected as Rural Amenity Zone where appropriate.
 - b. In Section 3.6 of Report 18.1, we discuss the potential for the restricted discretionary activity status of subdivision and development in the Precinct to be treated as a de facto controlled activity. We recommend Council consider developing a set of non-statutory guidelines for subdivision design in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.
 - c. In Report 18.6, we note there is a small area of land zoned Rural Residential within the ONL. We recommend that Council consider including this as any other such anomalies in future variations to the district plan.
 - d. In Report 18.7, we discuss the land on McDonnell Road in LCU24 South Arrowtown.⁸ We observe that the location of the urban growth boundary on McDonnell Road is problematic given the development of the Arrowtown Retirement Village. We recommend Council undertake a structure planning exercise in this area.
 - e. In Report 18.10, we discuss the zoning of the Arrow Irrigation Depot at 31 Bush Creek Road⁹. We recommend that Council include this land in Stage 3 of the review of the District Plan.
 - f. In Report 18.11, we discuss the zoning of the land along Ladies Mile. We recommend Council complete the structure planning of this area and promote a variation to the district plan to give effect to the structure plan. We observe that the community would benefit from greater transparency on the likely sequencing and timing of future urban development in this area.

⁷ See recommendations on ONL/ONF boundaries in Reports 18.4, 18.6, 18.8, 18.9

⁸ See Section 3

⁹ See Section 3

For the Hearing Panel

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nugent", written in a cursive style.

Denis Nugent, Chair

Dated: 15 February 2019

Appendix 1: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions on Mapping Where Submitter did not Appear

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
25.1	Mrs S M Speight	Reject
37.1	Olga Thomas	Reject
88.2	Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust	Accept in part
99.1	Elizabeth Winstone	Reject
132.2	Rupert & Elizabeth Le Berne Illes	Reject
132.5	Rupert & Elizabeth Le Berne Illes	Reject
154.1	Neralie Macdonald	Reject
155.1	Linsey Whitchurch- Kopa	Reject
177.6	Universal Developments Limited	Accept
177.7	Universal Developments Limited	Accept
180.2	Nigel Ker	Accept
181.1	Alistair and Christine Thomas	Reject
181.2	Alistair and Christine Thomas	Reject
189.1	Anne Gormack	Reject
190.1	Angus Small	Reject
190.2	Angus Small	Reject
199.10	Craig Douglas	Reject
199.11	Craig Douglas	Reject
199.16	Craig Douglas	Reject
199.22	Craig Douglas	Reject
199.9	Craig Douglas	Reject
204.1	Arthur Gormack	Reject
204.2	Arthur Gormack	Reject
210.1	John Lindsay	Reject
210.2	John Lindsay	Reject
221.2	Susan Cleaver	Accept in part

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
221.6	Susan Cleaver	Accept in part
239.2	Don Moffat	Reject
239.4	Don Moffat	Reject
244.1	Tania Flight	Accept in part
244.3	Tania Flight	Accept in part
261.2	June Watson	Reject
264.1	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.10	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.12	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.2	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.3	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.4	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.6	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.7	Philip Winstone	Reject
264.8	Philip Winstone	Reject
265.2	Phillip Bunn	Accept in part
265.8	Phillip Bunn	Accept in part
266.1	Judith Mahon	Reject
266.2	Judith Mahon	Accept in part
276.1	Jane Hazlett	Accept in part
277.3	Alexander Reid	Reject
306.1	Sara Clark	Reject
317.1	Elvene C Lewis	Reject
317.3	Elvene C Lewis	Accept
319.1	Jon G Newson	Reject
341.1	Peter Mathieson	Reject
341.2	Peter Mathieson	Reject
358.3	Melissa Vining on behalf of Quintin & Cathy McCarthy	Accept in part

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
423.2	Carol Bunn	Accept in part
423.7	Carol Bunn	Accept in part
445.1	Helwick Street Limited	Accept
528.11	Shotover Country Limited	Reject
528.8	Shotover Country Limited	Reject
528.9	Shotover Country Limited	Reject
569.1	Russell Heckler	Reject
569.2	Russell Heckler	Reject
578.1	Keith Milne	Reject
597.1	John Duncan Lindsay	Accept in part
618.1	Heather Guise	Reject
646.1	G W (Bill) Crooks	Reject
648.1	Gillian Kay Crooks	Accept in part
648.2	Gillian Kay Crooks	Reject
648.2	Gillian Kay Crooks	Reject
651.3	David & Vivki Caesar	Reject
752.1	Michael Farrier	Reject
752.4	Michael Farrier	Reject
814.1	Julie P Johnston	Accept in part
814.2	Julie P Johnston	Accept in part
824.1	Barbara Derrett	Accept in part
824.2	Barbara Derrett	Accept in part
831.1	Angela Caldwell	Accept in part
850.1	R & R Jones	Reject
850.6	R & R Jones	Reject
853.1	Nicola Richards	Reject
2030.1	Murray Doyle	Accept
2030.2	Murray Doyle	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
2049.1	Don Andrew	Reject
2097.1	Dalefield Trustee Limited	Accept
2106.1	Andrew Green	Reject
2129.1	Denis Shaun Moloney	Accept
2144.1	Cassidy Trust	Reject
2147.1	Nick Hurle	Accept
2167.1	Jan Andersson	Accept
2171.1	Patricia Nancekivell	Accept
2196.1	Gerald and Janice Siddall	Accept
2207.2	Wayne and Mi Ae McKeague	Reject
2231.26	Bruce McLeod	Reject
2231.5	Bruce McLeod	Reject
2234.2	Wendy Clarke	Accept in Part
2240.2	Taramea Ltd	Reject
2240.3	Taramea Ltd	Reject
2243.3	Stewart Mahon	Reject
2244.3	Anthony Ward	Reject
2244.5	Anthony Ward	Reject
2246.1	J & L Bagrie	Accept in Part
2248.1	D Gallagher	Reject
2248.2	D Gallagher	Reject
2249.1	Ms M K Greenslade	Reject
2249.2	Ms M K Greenslade	Reject
2251.1	R & J Kelly	Accept in Part
2253.1	D M Stanhope & G Burdis	Accept in Part
2261.3	Ann Hamilton	Accept in Part
2268.3	Lyn Hamilton	Accept in Part
2273.1	T McQuilkin and A P McQuilkin Family Trust	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
2298.1	P & J McLeod	Reject
2298.2	P & J McLeod	Reject
2300.1	R and S McLeod	Reject
2300.2	R and S McLeod	Reject
2301.3	Peter John Dennison and Stephen John Grant	Reject
2323.6	Anna and Peter Elms and Smith	Reject
2326.1	Gerry Oudhoff and James Hennessy	Reject
2334.1	Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davies & Veritas (2013) Limited	Accept
2338.1	Robert Ffiske & Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Limited	Accept
2343.1	Tom and Lee Hazlett	Reject
2343.4	Tom and Lee Hazlett	Reject
2355.8	Phillip Bunn	Reject
2356.8	Steven Bunn	Reject
2363.1	Phil Leydon	Reject
2380.1	Lake Hayes Equestrian Ltd	Accept
2410.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
2419.2	Jillian Egerton & Cook Allan Gibson Trustee Company Limited	Reject
2424.1	Bendall Family Land Trust	Accept
2433.1	Rene Kampman	Reject
2437.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
2442.16	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part
2445.3	C Walker	Reject
2464.40	Ray Ferner	Accept in Part
2471.3	Rock Supplies NZ Limited	Reject
2477.4	Timothy Roberts	Reject
2482.1	WK & FL Allen	Reject
2488.54	Juie QT Limited	Reject

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
2495.4	Young Changemakers - Wakatipu Youth Trust Advisory Group	Accept in Part
2496.1	AEM Property (2017) Ltd	Accept in Part
2504.2	Arcadian Triangle Limited (Arcadian)	Accept
2505.56	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject
2511.1	Shaping our Future	Accept in Part
2525.54	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject
2529.49	Len McFadgen	Reject
2550.54	Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject
2551.1	Graham Grant	Reject
2554.1	Henry and Ann van Asch	Reject
2562.4	Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf	Accept in Part
2577.54	Kirstie Jean Brustad	Reject
2604.1	Turi Edmonds	Accept in Part
2607.54	. Goldcrest Farming Limited	Reject

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1061.11	177.6	Otago Foundation Trust Board	Accept
FS1061.12	177.7	Otago Foundation Trust Board	Accept
FS1071.111	850.1	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Accept
FS1071.116	850.6	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Accept
FS1071.99	239.2	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	Accept
FS1189.6	177.6	FII Holdings Ltd	Reject
FS1189.7	177.7	FII Holdings Ltd	Reject
FS1195.5	177.6	The Jandel Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS1195.6	177.7	The Jandel Trust	Reject
FS1271.10	177.6	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	Accept
FS1271.11	177.7	Hurtell Proprietary Limited and others	Accept
FS2702.1	2607.1	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.10	2607.10	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.11	2607.11	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.12	2607.12	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.13	2607.13	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.14	2607.14	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.15	2607.15	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.16	2607.16	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.17	2607.17	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.18	2607.18	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.19	2607.19	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.2	2607.2	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.20	2607.20	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.21	2607.21	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.22	2607.22	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.23	2607.23	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.24	2607.24	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.25	2607.25	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.26	2607.26	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.27	2607.27	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.28	2607.28	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.29	2607.29	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.3	2607.3	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2702.30	2607.30	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.31	2607.31	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.32	2607.32	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.33	2607.33	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.34	2607.34	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.35	2607.35	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.36	2607.36	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.37	2607.37	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.38	2607.38	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.39	2607.39	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.4	2607.4	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.40	2607.40	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.41	2607.41	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.42	2607.42	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.43	2607.43	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.44	2607.44	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.45	2607.45	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.46	2607.46	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.47	2607.47	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.48	2607.48	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.49	2607.49	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.5	2607.5	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.50	2607.50	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.51	2607.51	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.52	2607.52	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.53	2607.53	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.54	2607.54	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.6	2607.6	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2702.7	2607.7	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.8	2607.8	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2702.9	2607.9	Whiskey Dowling Trust	Reject
FS2703.1	2607.1	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.10	2607.10	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.11	2607.11	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.12	2607.12	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.13	2607.13	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.14	2607.14	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.15	2607.15	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.16	2607.16	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.17	2607.17	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.18	2607.18	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.19	2607.19	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.2	2607.2	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.20	2607.20	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.21	2607.21	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.22	2607.22	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.23	2607.23	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.24	2607.24	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.25	2607.25	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.26	2607.26	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.27	2607.27	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.28	2607.28	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.29	2607.29	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.3	2607.3	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.30	2607.30	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.31	2607.31	Baker Family Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2703.32	2607.32	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.33	2607.33	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.34	2607.34	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.35	2607.35	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.36	2607.36	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.37	2607.37	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.38	2607.38	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.39	2607.39	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.4	2607.4	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.40	2607.40	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.41	2607.41	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.42	2607.42	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.43	2607.43	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.44	2607.44	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.45	2607.45	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.46	2607.46	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.47	2607.47	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.48	2607.48	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.49	2607.49	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.5	2607.5	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.50	2607.50	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.51	2607.51	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.52	2607.52	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.53	2607.53	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.54	2607.54	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.6	2607.6	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.7	2607.7	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2703.8	2607.8	Baker Family Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2703.9	2607.9	Baker Family Trust	Reject
FS2706.2	2126.2	Tim Proctor	Reject
FS2721.1	2248.1	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.10	2249.4	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.11	2249.5	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.12	2249.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.14	2296.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.16	2296.4	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.17	2296.5	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.18	2296.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.19	2300.1	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.20	2300.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.22	2300.4	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.23	2300.5	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.24	2300.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.25	2298.1	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.26	2298.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.28	2298.4	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.29	2298.5	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.3	2248.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.30	2298.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.4	2248.4	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.5	2248.5	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.6	2248.6	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.7	2249.1	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2721.8	2249.2	Shotover Trust	Reject
FS2722.1	2248.1	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.10	2249.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2722.11	2249.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.12	2249.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.14	2296.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.16	2296.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.17	2296.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.18	2296.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.19	2300.1	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.2	2248.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.20	2300.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.22	2300.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.23	2300.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.24	2300.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.25	2298.1	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.26	2298.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.28	2298.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.29	2298.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.30	2298.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.4	2248.4	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.5	2248.5	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.6	2248.6	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.7	2249.1	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2722.8	2249.2	Speargrass Trust	Reject
FS2729.1	2607.1	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.10	2607.10	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.11	2607.11	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.12	2607.12	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.13	2607.13	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.14	2607.14	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2729.15	2607.15	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.16	2607.16	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.17	2607.17	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.18	2607.18	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.19	2607.19	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.2	2607.2	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.20	2607.20	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.21	2607.21	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.22	2607.22	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.23	2607.23	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.24	2607.24	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.25	2607.25	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.26	2607.26	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.27	2607.27	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.28	2607.28	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.29	2607.29	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.3	2607.3	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.30	2607.30	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.31	2607.31	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.32	2607.32	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.33	2607.33	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.34	2607.34	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.35	2607.35	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.36	2607.36	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.37	2607.37	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.38	2607.38	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.39	2607.39	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.4	2607.4	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2729.40	2607.40	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.41	2607.41	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.42	2607.42	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.43	2607.43	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.44	2607.44	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.45	2607.45	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.46	2607.46	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.47	2607.47	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.48	2607.48	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.49	2607.49	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.5	2607.5	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.50	2607.50	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.51	2607.51	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.52	2607.52	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.53	2607.53	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.54	2607.54	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.6	2607.6	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.7	2607.7	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.8	2607.8	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2729.9	2607.9	Carl Johnston & Vanessa Sharp	Reject
FS2731.1	2554.1	Tim Hardley	Accept
FS2732.1	2496.1	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part
FS2732.107	2275.32	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part
FS2732.71	2276.32	Tom Hardley	Accept in Part
FS2734.32	2231.26	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject
FS2734.5	2243.3	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation
FS2734.6	2576.1	Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited	Reject
FS2745.19	2295.19	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.2	2295.2	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.20	2295.20	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.22	2126.2	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.3	2295.3	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.34	2101.1	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.37	2301.3	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.57	2231.5	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.78	2231.26	Juie QT Limited	Reject
FS2745.86	2234.2	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part
FS2765.1	2246.1	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject
FS2765.14	2253.1	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject
FS2765.8	2251.1	Glenpanel Developments Limited	Reject
FS2769.1	2106.1	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject
FS2769.2	2281.1	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject
FS2769.3	2281.2	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Reject
FS2791.2	2126.2	Peter John Dennison and Stephen Grant	Reject

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report and recommendations of Independent Commissioners
regarding mapping of Wakatipu Basin and Arrowtown
(includes Stage 1 submissions not previously heard)

Report 18.7
Area E – Eastern Basin

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Rachel Dimery

Trevor Robinson

Quentin Smith

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PRELIMINARY	1
1.2 OVERVIEW.....	1
1.3 SUBMISSIONS COVERED IN THIS REPORT	2
2. WATERFALL PARK AREA.....	3
3. MCDONNELL ROAD.....	4
4. MILLBROOK RESORT ZONE EXTENSIONS	6
4.1 MILLBROOK COUNTRY CLUB LIMITED EVIDENCE.....	6
4.2 UNDERDOWN TRUST AND ARCHIBALD PROPERTIES.....	7
4.3 EXTENSIONS SOUGHT TO NORTH AND EAST.....	8
5. QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST – JOPP STREET, ARROWTOWN	9
6. 508 ARROWTOWN-LAKE HAYES ROAD, ARROWTOWN	10
7. BESPOKE RESORT ZONES	12
7.1 INTRODUCTION.....	12
7.2 HOGANS GULLY ZONE.....	13
7.3 HILLS RESORT ZONE	14
7.3.1 <i>Landscape Evidence</i>	14
7.3.2 <i>Economic Evidence</i>	15
7.3.3 <i>Planning Evidence</i>	15
7.4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	16
8. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Appendix 1: Waterfall Park Zone Structure Plan	
Appendix 2: Millbrook Resort Zone Structure Plan	
Appendix 3: Amendments to Chapter 43 Millbrook Resort Zone	


1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preliminary

1. This report needs to be read in conjunction with Reports 18.1 and 18.2. Report 18.1 sets out the overall hearing process for Stream 14 and the approach we have taken to assessing the submissions in terms of the statutory requirements. In addition, it contains the Stream 14 Hearing Panel's recommendations on Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin and the various variations to the text in Stage 1 of the PDP notified in conjunction with Chapter 24.
2. The abbreviations we use in the report are set out in Report 18.1, as is the list of persons heard.
3. Report 18.2 set out the background to the zoning issues dealt with in Stream 14 and explains how we divided the area subject to our deliberations for the purposes of preparing the recommendation reports.

1.2 Overview

4. Figure 1 below shows the location of the area we have called the Eastern Basin.



Area E – Eastern Basin

Figure 1: the Eastern Basin

5. This area comprises LCUs 23 Millbrook (other than the small area south of the Waterfall Park Zone identified below), 22 The Hills, 24 South Arrowtown, 15 Hogans Gully and the portion of LCU 17 Morven Ferry north of State Highway 6. This includes the part of LCU 23 referred to in the hearings as 'the wedge', for which Waterfall Park Zone was sought. This area excludes the part of LCU 23 south of the Waterfall Park Zone that applies to part of the property known as Ayrburn Farm. That part of LCU 23 is dealt with in Report 18.5. Although encompassed by LCUs 23 and 24, the Millbrook Resort Zone, Waterfall Park Zone (both of which were dealt with in

Stage 1 and are beyond challenge) and the Arrowtown South Special Zone (in the ODP and excluded from the PDP) are not part of this area.

6. Excluding those parts of this area covered by three settled zoned discussed above, this area was generally zoned Rural Amenity in Stage 2, with some areas of Open Space and Recreation Zones, notably the Millbrook Reserve and the Arrowtown Golf Course. The Open Space and Recreation Zones have been dealt with in Stream 15.
7. The Millbrook Resort, Hills Golf Course and scattered rural residential uses dominate roughly half of this area. The land to the south of Arrowtown and the Hills Golf Course has a mix of rural and rural residential uses. The Arrowtown urban area adjoins this area to the north and northeast.
8. The number of approved building platforms yet to be built upon exceeds the number of existing buildings.
9. The notified version of Chapter 24 listed the capability of this area to absorb additional development as follows:

LCU Number	LCU Name	Capability to Absorb Additional Development
15	Hogans Gully	Moderate
17	Morven Ferry	Moderate-Low
22	The Hills	Moderate
23	Millbrook	Moderate: majority of unit High: triangular area at far eastern end of the unit
24	Arrowtown South	High

1.3 Submissions Covered in this Report

10. The submissions at issue in this area can be grouped as follows:
 - a. Submissions relating to the zoning of the land east of the Waterfall Park Zone, including the “wedge” that split that zone in two¹;
 - b. Submissions seeking Precinct sub-zone on sites in McDonnell Road²;
 - c. Submissions seeking to be rezoned Millbrook Resort Zone, which can be split into three groups:
 - i. Relating to those sites completely surrounded by Millbrook Resort Zone³;
 - ii. Those sites accessed off Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road⁴;
 - iii. The site located at 1124 Malaghans Road⁵;
 - d. Submissions seeking extension of the Arrowtown urban zoning⁶;

¹ Submissions 2320 and 2388 (opposed by FS2710, FS2772, FS2773)

² Submissions 2386 (supported by FS2769) and 2400 (supported by FS2795, FS2796)

³ Submissions 2501 (supported by FS2773, FS2720, FS2723, FS2724) and 2580 (supported by FS2720, FS2723, FS2724)

⁴ Submissions 2444 (opposed by FS2773) and 2512 (opposed by FS2773). Submissions 2413 and 2419 also related to all or parts of this area and while they were not represented at the hearing, the legal submissions and evidence in support of Submissions 2444 and 2512 covered the matters raised in the submissions.

⁵ Submission 2513 (opposed by FS2773)

⁶ Submissions 2299 and 2397 (supported by FS2716, FS2796)

e. Submissions seeking bespoke resort zones⁷.

11. We discuss the submissions in those groups, in that order.

2. WATERFALL PARK AREA

12. Mr Goldsmith, counsel for Waterfall Park Developments Ltd⁸, told us that the area described as the 'wedge' is an historical zoning anomaly that probably reflected previous land holdings, and submitted that it should be incorporated within the Waterfall Park Zone. There was also a submission⁹ relating to the neighbouring land between Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the Waterfall Park Zone, which requested Precinct with an average lot size of 4,000m². These requests are shown on Figure 2 below

13. Ms Gilbert described the 'wedge' as an artificial cut out and could see no reason not to zone this area Waterfall Park. She also recommended that part of the land between Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the 'wedge' be rezoned Precinct. She did not consider it appropriate from a landscape perspective to apply Precinct to the steeper slopes to the west and south.

14. Mr Langman accepted Ms Gilbert's evidence on landscape issues, but opposed the wedge being zoned Waterfall Park, as he considered there was insufficient information on infrastructure capacity and ecology. He supported Precinct in respect of part of the land adjacent to the 'wedge', as recommended by Ms Gilbert.




Figure 2: The 'wedge' is annotated 'Rezone Waterfall Park Zone' and the land the subject of Submission 2320 is annotated 'Rezone Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct'. (Source: B. Gilbert, Evidence in Chief at Figure 75)

⁷ Submissions 2313 (opposed by FS2794) and 2387 (supported by FS2701, FS2716, FS2733, FS2769)

⁸ Submission 2388

⁹ Submission 2320

15. Mr Brown disagreed with Mr Langman’s opinion on the ‘wedge’ on the basis that ecological and infrastructure issues were appropriately dealt with in the evidence of Dr Goldsmith and Ms Richards.
16. We adopt Mr Brown’s reasons and find that the most appropriate zone for the ‘wedge’ is Waterfall Park Zone and that the Structure Plan in Chapter 42 should be amended to this area as open space and visitor. We attach as Appendix 1 a copy of the recommended amended Waterfall Park Structure Plan.
17. Mr Brown provided very brief evidence in support of the rezoning of the adjacent land to Precinct¹⁰. While there was agreement between Mr Langman and Mr Brown at least in relation to the suitability of the upper flat part of the site for Precinct zoning, neither of them considered the issue of water quality in Lake Hayes which we discussed in Section 2.8 of Report 18.1. This area is not within a reticulated wastewater scheme. Consistent with our conclusions in Report 18.1, we do not recommend this land be rezoned Precinct in the absence of a reticulated wastewater scheme.
18. For completeness, we note that the “wedge” also lies outside the area of reticulated wastewater, but the remainder of the Waterfall Park Zone is contained within a wastewater scheme. Most of the area of the “wedge” will remain open space, but we consider it would be appropriate to include the small area of visitor activities be included within the existing scheme.

3. MCDONNELL ROAD

19. We heard evidence concerning two sites in McDonnell Road where the submitters sought the land be zoned Precinct¹¹. These areas are shown on Figures 3 and 4 below.

¹⁰ J Brown, EIC on behalf of Lake Hayes Investments Limited & Ors, at paragraph 8.4

¹¹ Submissions 2386 and 2400



Figure 3: Site sought to be rezoned by Banco Trustee & Ors (Submission 2400)



Figure 4: Site sought to be rezoned by Boxer Hills Trust (Submission 2386)

20. The Boxer Hills Trust also requested a variation on the minimum site size to enable development to 2500m², but still with an average density of 1ha.
21. The evidence presented for Boxer Hills Trust and Banco Trustees Limited was comprehensive. Ms Pflüger and Mr Skelton presented landscape evidence, while Mr Brown and Mr Geddes presented planning evidence.
22. Dame Elizabeth and Mr Murray Hanan, the neighbouring landowners to the Banco Trustees' land, tabled submissions opposing rezoning of the site, emphasising in particular the role of McDonnell Road as the boundary between urban development on the one side, and rural backdrop on the other.

23. As noted in section 3.19 of Report 18.1, when we discussed the impact of the Retirement Village development with Ms Pflüger and Mr Skelton, they both highlighted the impact this had on their respective assessments. Ms Pflüger commented that the first cut is the deepest and Mr Skelton told us that in a lot of ways the horse had bolted.
24. Ms Gilbert advised in her rebuttal evidence that she did not oppose Ms Pflüger's evidence. However, she raised concerns about Mr Skelton's argument that rural living areas can be up-zoned to accommodate urban development at a future date.
25. Mr Langman acknowledged that from a landscape perspective, Precinct was not opposed in the WB Landscape Study in this area, as that study identified LCU24 South Arrowtown as having a high capacity to absorb additional development. Mr Langman did not, however, consider that Precinct was the most appropriate zone for land that may potentially be urban in the future, as in his view, the fragmentation of land would make future urbanisation difficult¹².
26. The position is complicated by the Retirement Village development that was occurring immediately to the south of the Boxer Hills Trust land at the time of our hearing. That development was approved under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Act 2013 and clearly will have an urban character once completed. It means, in our view, that even though, the location of the urban growth boundary along McDonnell Road has (as the Hanans emphasised in their submissions) only recently been confirmed by the Environment Court, regarding that road as a hard boundary precluding all development beyond it is now problematic at best. In light of this, we think that it would be prudent for Council to address this situation by undertaking a structure planning exercise for this area.
27. Against that background, we considered that a Future Urban Zone might have been appropriate, but no party to the hearing suggested that we had scope to recommend this, and we did not identify any basis for the contrary view. As we discuss in Report 18.11, we think that submitters are entitled to rely on the WB Landscape Study and it is untenable to expect that this land be reserved for some indeterminate time. If anything, the submitters in this case were on stronger ground than those at Ladies Mile, because we had no evidence of any Council resolution that would support the view that urban development of this land was more than a possibility. We note that it is still open to Council to withdraw this land from the PDP review if it deems that course to be appropriate.
28. As it stands, however, we consider Precinct is appropriate in respect of the Banco Trust land and Boxer Hills Trust land and recommend those sites be rezoned.

4. MILLBROOK RESORT ZONE EXTENSIONS

4.1 Millbrook Country Club Limited Evidence

29. As we noted above in Section 1.3, several submitters requested that their land be rezoned Millbrook Resort Zone. For the most part, Millbrook Country Club Limited opposed these requests¹³.

¹² M Langman, Section 42A Report at paragraph 62.4

¹³ FS2773

30. We discussed the submissions with Mr Craig, who gave landscape evidence on behalf of Millbrook Country Club Limited. He told us that the Underdown Trust¹⁴ and Archibald¹⁵ properties that appear on the planning maps as a small island of Rural Amenity zoned land entirely surrounded by Millbrook Resort Zone land, had large mature trees and an historic building, which would all contribute to the Millbrook ethic to retain historic buildings and enhance them. In contrast, Mr Craig was critical of the level of development sought by the other submitters who had requested to include additional land in the Millbrook Resort Zone. For example, he pointed out that the density sought by the submitters was at far greater densities than that applied over the recent ‘Dalgleish Farm’ block that had recently been rezoned to Millbrook Residential Zone. He concluded that the existing character and amenity of Millbrook cannot be delivered to the proposed sites via the District Plan standards alone¹⁶.

31. Mr Edmonds described the requests thus;

“Any ad hoc additions will not add to or supplement any of the established facilities or provide any benefit to the functioning of the resort. The ‘add-on’ areas almost without exception do not have access from within the resort (Griffin, Archibald and Egerton excluded), and so will not have any physical connection, and simply will not feel part of that.”¹⁷

32. Mr Edmonds concluded that the requests should be rejected. The exception to this was the Underdown Trust and Archibald properties, which he considered appropriate, subject to their utilising access from internal Millbrook roads and accepting covenants to incorporate the design guidelines.

4.2 Underdown Trust and Archibald Properties

33. These properties are completely surrounded by Millbrook Resort Zone and are accessed off Middlerigg Lane. We were advised by Mr Langman at the hearing that he supported the Archibald and Underdown Trust (nee Griffin) properties being incorporated in the Millbrook Resort Zone, subject to there being an agreement with Millbrook Country Club. On 26 July 2018 we were advised¹⁸ that such an agreement had been reached and were provided with a set of plan provisions to amend Chapter 43 Millbrook Resort.

34. We are satisfied that the properties could be developed in a way to successfully integrate into the resort and would fulfil the objectives for the Millbrook Resort Zone. In particular, the closure of the Middlerigg Lane access upon development would assist in integrating the development with the resort. We therefore find that Millbrook Resort Zone is the most appropriate zone for this land.

35. As well as rezoning these two sites, giving effect to these requests requires an amendment to the Millbrook Resort Structure Plan and amendments to Chapter 43. The recommended amendments are attached in Appendices 2 and 3 respectively.

¹⁴ Successor to Submission 2580 (Griffin)

¹⁵ Submission 2501

¹⁶ A. Craig, Rebuttal Evidence at 22

¹⁷ J. Edmonds, Evidence in Chief at 101

¹⁸ Provided under cover of a Memorandum of Counsel dated 26 July 2018

4.3 Extensions Sought to North and East

36. These two areas were heard together as the submissions by Spruce Grove Trust¹⁹ related to both areas. We were not satisfied that these areas were suitable to be rezoned Millbrook Resort Zone. Objective 43.2.1 of the PDP (now beyond challenge) focusses on integration of activities within the Millbrook Resort Zone. The definition of “resort” (also now beyond challenge) likewise identifies a resort, among other things, as an “integrated and planned development”. Counsel for Spruce Grove Trust and Boundary Trust, Mr Leckie, accepted that it was a valid question to consider whether the land could integrate with Millbrook and that it was more than just coherence of design. We also discussed the density of the development with several witnesses, including Ms Leith, Ms Smetham, Ms Gilbert and Mr Langham. We agree with Mr Langman that the density sought was not dissimilar to an urban density and was not capable of being offset by open space, given the subject land has no association with, nor is it integrated with, the adjacent Millbrook development.
37. We think that Mr Langman is correct: even if this land could be included in the Millbrook Zone from a landscape perspective, we still need to be satisfied that the subsequent development would integrate into the Millbrook development. We do not believe that this would be the case. In both locations the submitters’ proposals involved direct connection to the adjoining road (Malaghans Road for the northern site and Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road for the eastern group) rather than linkage through the Millbrook Resort private road system. In addition, there appeared to be no possibility of the additional sites being incorporated into the Millbrook visitor accommodation arrangements, or the golf courses. Finally, while accepting that they are preliminary and indicative, we consider the indicative Structure Plans produced by Ms Smetham²⁰ demonstrate that the likely outcome in each location would amount to a small urban enclave. As the development would not constitute a resort as defined, such enclaves would be contrary to the Strategic Direction Objectives and Policies which seek to limit urban development to being located within an urban growth boundary.
38. We considered whether one or both sites might be rezoned Precinct. The northern site is subject to a consent granted by the Environment Court for 4 residential building platforms²¹. When we asked Ms Leith whether we should not take our cue regarding the capacity of the site to accommodate development from that decision, she sought to confine it to the context of a resource consent application under the ODP Rural General Zone. While that is technically correct, our reading of the Environment Court decision was that the Court undertook the ‘holistic’ assessment of the situation Ms Leith and Mr Leckie, as counsel, urged on us as part of our inquiry. Having considered the evidence we heard in this hearing, we consider that the existing consent probably represents the maximum development potential of the site. We note also that that site is within the Lake Hayes catchment. Indeed, the lower part of the site is close to Mill Creek. We would not be minded to change the notified Rural Amenity Zone for the northern site.
39. Parts of the eastern site are outside of the Lake Hayes catchment, so there is no absolute impediment to zoning this land Precinct. Mr Leckie, in answer to our questions, confirmed that we would have jurisdiction to apply the Precinct sub-zone, but his clients were not seeking that.

¹⁹ Submissions 2512 and 2513

²⁰ N Smetham, Summary of Evidence

²¹ *Spruce Grove Trust v QLDC* [2011] NZEnvC 147

Having reviewed the options, we have concluded that, as the total area of the block is a little over 5ha containing 5 existing dwellings, and density in the Precinct limits residential units to an average of 1 per hectare, no practical purpose would be served by rezoning this land. It would also avoid the anomaly of leaving a single residential site zoned Rural Amenity north of Butel Road surrounded by Millbrook Resort Zone on all sides. That site was not the subject of any submission.

40. We therefore recommend that this land retain Rural Amenity Zone as notified, as this would be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the plan

5. QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST – JOPP STREET, ARROWTOWN

41. Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust²² requested that the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone be applied to some 6.8 hectares of land on the southern side of Jopp Street, together with the corresponding extension of the Urban Growth Boundary. Mr Place recommended that this submission be accepted in his Section 42A Report, subject to some bespoke provisions governing access and linkage to adjacent track networks that he had drafted. His concerns mainly arose from the submission seeking to rezone land along Centennial Avenue which is presently part of the Arrowtown Golf Course.



Figure 3: Lot 2 DP 300390 shown outlined in yellow

42. Ms J Scott advised us that the Trust had been in discussions about the property since 2009. She also advised that the Trust was solely focussed on Lot 2 DP 300390 (as shown in Figure 3) and no longer sought rezoning of part of the golf course. Mr Williams told us that he was satisfied that given the smaller area, the provisions in Chapter 27 were adequate to secure an appropriately designed subdivision layout.

²² Submission 2299. Submission 2511 also sought the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 300390 for housing but was not represented at the hearing.

43. Mr Place advised us in his reply evidence that he no longer considered it necessary to apply bespoke provisions, given the much smaller area of land to be zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential.
44. We observed on our site visit that, as can be seen in Figure 3 above, the northern side of Jopp Street contains established residential properties. We agree with Mr Place that it would be a 'seamless extension to the existing urban landscape'²³. We also find that extension of the urban growth boundary to include this site would not compromise its integrity, or make it less defensible. Rather the contrary. Given the site is surrounded on its south and west side by the Arrowtown Golf Club (zoned Community Purposes (Golf Course), that zoning being beyond challenge with the withdrawal of the Trust's submission affecting it), this site currently presents as an anomaly sitting outside the urban growth boundary. We therefore find that the most appropriate zone for this land to be Lower Density Suburban Residential, and that this land should be included in the urban growth boundary. This zone best gives effect to the strategic direction of the PDP, as it will provide additional land for housing in a high growth area.

6. 508 ARROWTOWN-LAKE HAYES ROAD, ARROWTOWN

45. A Feeley, E Borrie & LP Trustees Limited²⁴ requested Lower Density Suburban Residential zoning of the triangular shaped block of land at 508 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road (where the Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road meets McDonnell Road) and that the urban growth boundary be amended to include this land. Mr Feeley told us that while he and his family live on the property and do not propose leaving it, the land is available to assist in coping with Arrowtown's growth.
46. Mr Kyle gave planning evidence for the submitter. He proposed an amendment to the proposal to request Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone apply over part of the site fronting McDonnell Road and that the balance of the site be zoned Rural Residential Zone – Arrowtown West Sub Zone, with a building restriction area fronting Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and in the vicinity of the elevated rocky outcrop near the south-western corner of the site, all as shown in Figure 4 below.




Figure 4: Zoning as proposed in J. Kyle, Evidence in Chief at 1.30

²³ L. Place, Section 42A Report at 11.15

²⁴ Submission 2397, supported by FS2716, FS2796

47. Mr Kyle's evidence highlighted the differences between the findings of the WB Landscape Study and the landscape evidence of Ms Mellsop (for Council). He noted that the WB Landscape Study classified the site as having a high potential to absorb change and that the study concluded that the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village and associated residential development on the Hills and Millbrook golf courses had impacted on Arrowtown's containment²⁵.
48. Mr Kyle set out the details of the site-specific provisions he recommended be included in the Rural Residential Zone relating to density, setbacks, landscaping, fencing and vehicle access on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. He noted that the large stand of pine trees on the McDonnell Road boundary of the site were in the process of being removed and as a result views across the site will be more open. He considered that the use of the Rural Residential Zone to be appropriate as:
- a. it would avoid the use of a site specific 'special zone';
 - b. the current framework in Chapter 22 allows bespoke provisions for specific sites or areas;
 - c. it would enable a similar density to that proposed by the submitter (5 residential units in 23,035m²)²⁶.
49. He did not favour using the Precinct sub-zone for the western part of the site as he considered the land was capable of being developed more intensively than that sub-zone enabled without giving rise to adverse environmental effects. He did, however, consider that setbacks and landscaping requirements greater than the Rural Residential Zone standard would be required²⁷.
50. Mr Kyle appended a comprehensive Section 32AA Evaluation in support of the rezoning proposal, which included a servicing report and visual simulations. He concluded that the proposal is the most appropriate way to give effect to the relevant objectives and policies of the PDP.
51. Ms Mellsop told us in her rebuttal evidence that we should treat the visual simulations with caution. She considered the layout and form of buildings shown on the Rural Residential Zoned area to be doubtful given the minimum lot sizes. In term of the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zoned part of the site, she considered the dwellings would be likely to be significantly more prominent than the simulations suggested given the zone provisions do not control external appearance or fencing. Because Mr Kyle appended the simulations to his planning evidence, Ms Mellsop's expert views were effectively uncontradicted in this regard.
52. Mr Place and Ms Mellsop told us that this block of land sits at the 'gateway' to Arrowtown. Mr Place described it as *forming 'a significant area and visually prominent part of the open rural landscape at Arrowtown's primary gateway.'* He considered that any form of urban development and associated planting would significantly alter the sense of openness. While we think that this rather overstates matters, we do think that the Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road frontage needs careful consideration. In our view, however, McDonnell Road was already compromised when urban development was permitted to come down off the escarpment, quite apart from the implications of the Retirement Village proceeding further south that we have discussed above. For these reasons, we also have difficulty with Ms Mellsop's conclusion that the development on this land would not appear as a 'cohesive residential form'²⁸. We think it would mirror the development on the eastern side of McDonnell Road, as it would be subject

²⁵ J. Kyle, Evidence in Chief at 2.4 and 2.5

²⁶ J Kyle, EiC at paragraph 1.27

²⁷ Ibid at paragraphs 1.28 – 1.29

²⁸ H. Mellsop, Rebuttal Evidence at 7.7

to the same zoning provisions as that development. The more difficult question is how a defensible edge might be identified that prevents expansion of any urban development onto the Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road frontage.

53. We consider that the McDonnell Road frontage of the site is suitable for urban development from a landscape perspective, if properly controlled. We also think that it is past time that the Council undertook a comprehensive assessment of the Arrowtown urban growth boundary as far south as the Retirement Village, as was recommended in the WB Landscape Study. While we note that the WB Landscape Study did consider this land to be an anomaly and excluded it from the recommendation for a structure plan²⁹, in the absence of landscape evidence from the submitter in support of the proposed provisions, we are in a somewhat unsatisfactory position. We agree with Mr Kyle that a building restriction around the rock feature on McDonnell Road would be appropriate, but consider that further work is needed to assess the visual amenity effects on Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road, particularly given Ms Mellsop's caution to us regarding the visual simulations that were supplied. In the absence of supporting landscape evidence on this issue, we are not satisfied that the provisions and zoning as proposed by Mr Kyle would be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the PDP.
54. We note that we do not have scope to recommend a Future Urban Zone and therefore recommend the site remain Rural Amenity Zone as notified; that being the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the PDP given the alternatives open to us.

7. BESPOKE RESORT ZONES

7.1 Introduction

55. Two submissions requested stand-alone zones³⁰: the Hogan Gully Zone and the Hills Resort Zone. The cases for the submitters were supported by extensive evidence, as listed in Section 1.4 of Report 18.1. The key issues related to landscape and planning issues and we have therefore not discussed the other evidence at length.
56. In relation to infrastructure, we note that Council's infrastructure evidence did not oppose the proposed Hills Resort Zone but did oppose the Hogans Gully Zone. However, Mr Vail, who gave infrastructure evidence for Hogan Gully Farms Limited, provided provisioning letters from Council to confirm wastewater and water supply services could be provided with the provision of financial contributions.
57. Mr Smith opposed both zones from a transport perspective. That position was contested by Mr Bartlett and Mr Penney. Our findings on the capacity of the Shotover Bridge, and its implications for development of the Basin east of the Shotover River are addressed in Report 18.1.
58. Mr Todd, counsel for Hogans Gully Farms Limited, argued that the Council's experts had overstated the cumulative adverse effects. He highlighted the economic benefits that would accrue from golf tourism and that the ecological restoration proposed would have significant ecological and natural conservation benefits. Mr Todd urged us to not give preference to the resource consent process over the Hogans Gully Zone. He submitted that this was not an

²⁹ WB Landscape Study at 5.34 and 6.16

³⁰ Submissions 2313 and 2387 respectively

effective way of managing the land and suggested to us that, if the use of land is in accordance with the statutory instruments, it should be provided for through rezoning³¹.

59. Ms Wolt, counsel for Trojan Helmet Limited, submitted that the Hills Resort Zone is the most appropriate and that the Council's evidence did not seriously challenge this. She noted that Mr Colegrave's evidence quantified the benefits and when weighed with the costs, the Hills Resort Zone was the optimal outcome. We asked Ms Wolt about how we should approach the issue of cumulative effects and she said we needed to determine each submission on its merits. She also cited the landscape evidence of Ms Pflüger that there would not be cumulative effects because all of the stand-alone zones requested would not be viewed together.

60. We discuss each zone in turn and our conclusions.

7.2 Hogans Gully Zone

61. Mr Baxter gave landscape evidence that addressed the proposal and also provided comment on the cumulative effects of the proposal. He summarised the key features of the rules which he had input to including: the 3.8m height limit for dwellings, which would be achieved by horizontal roof forms; rules on cladding and colour; extensive ecological plantings surrounding the dwellings; and natural land shaping up to 1.5 – 2 metres in height³².

62. Mr Baxter was critical of Ms Gilbert and Ms Mellsop's evidence that the proposal would result in an 'urban parkland'. He considered Millbrook Resort to be an accepted part of the landscape of the basin. He considered the cumulative effects of Millbrook, the Hills and Hogan Gully Farm and said:

"From distant views the golf course landscape, even though it is fertilised and manicured, is perceived and reads as a similar colour to surrounding pastoral spaces from those views and is read as a continuation of open space".³³

63. He went on to suggest that the development proposed by the Hogan Gully Zone and Hills Resort Zone would not resemble Millbrook Resort in scale, density or form. He commented that the levels of open space proposed by the two zones would be far in excess of that at Millbrook³⁴. Mr Baxter concluded that the proposed zones would not read as a continuation of urban parkland from Malaghans Road to McDonnell Road and rather, would be consistent with Strategic Objective 3.2.2.1(e).

64. Subsequent to the hearing, we were provided with expertly prepared visual simulations from the top of the zig-zag that we have found helpful in understanding Mr Baxter's evidence.

65. In her reply evidence, Ms Mellsop maintained her view that the proposal '*would substantially alter the character of the visible landscape from the lookout and other elevated viewpoints*'³⁵. She concluded that while people's appreciation of the pleasantness and coherence of views from surrounding roads may not be affected, it would adversely affect the associative and perceptual values of the wider rural amenity of the Basin³⁶. She also recommended that we

³¹ At paragraphs 23 to 25

³² P. Baxter, EIC at paragraph 7

³³ Ibid at paragraph 21

³⁴ Ibid at 28

³⁵ H. Mellsop, Reply Evidence at 8.4

³⁶ Ibid at 8.5

treat the visual simulations with caution, as the assumptions were not clearly stated. In particular, she noted they appeared to assume that all planting and built development would occur at the same time without staging³⁷.

66. Mr Brown gave planning evidence that considered the Hogans Gully Zone and also addressed the cumulative effects when considered with the Hills Resort Zone and Ayrburn Zones³⁸. He concluded that there would not be adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values when considering these proposals alongside the development promoted by the Council³⁹. He reminded us that the Hogans Gully Zone development would be largely invisible from surrounding roads and is only visible from the zig-zag. He emphasised to us that the view from the zig-zag takes in a far wider panoramic view. Relying on the evidence of Mr Vail and Mr Bartlett, he was satisfied with regards to infrastructure servicing and transport effects.
67. Mr Langman advised in his reply evidence that while his concerns had been addressed in part by the revised provisions supplied by Mr Brown following the hearing, he remained of the view, however, that the Rural Amenity Zone is the most appropriate zone. He noted that there was nothing that would prevent the gradual urbanisation of the land and viewed this as a significant concern.

7.3 Hills Resort Zone

7.3.1 Landscape Evidence

68. We received expert landscape evidence from Ms Yvonne Pflüger. As noted in Report 18.1, she told us she considered that the WB Landscape Study was well done and she supported its conclusions.
69. Ms Pflüger provided a detailed evaluation of the landscape characteristics of the site and wider area and an assessment of the visual effects and landscape character effects of the proposed Hills Resort Zone. Her overall conclusion was that adverse effects on landscape character and values can be avoided. She considered the visual amenity of the site to be high and that the proposed development controls would ensure development would be subservient in the landscape and integrated with the golf course.
70. Ms Pflüger, when addressing the issue of cumulative effects, stated:

“As stated above, Millbrook and the Hills Resort Zone will not be readily perceived in the same viewshaft/from the same viewpoint, so it can be concluded that any adverse cumulative visual effects would be limited to a few high-lying viewpoints. I consider that in respect of the developments referred to by Mr Langman (Hogans Fully Farm, Ayrburn, Waterfall Park) it would be impossible to see these developments in their entirety together with the Hills Resort Zone even from elevated viewpoints, since they are located in different visual catchments.”⁴⁰

71. She considered that Ms Gilbert had omitted some important aspects from her assessment, including the retention of over 95% of the land in Millbrook and the Hills Resort as open space; the extent to which topography breaks up and contains views; the proposed mitigation such as

³⁷ Ibid at 8.2 and 8.3

³⁸ We note that Mr Brown had the benefit of having also presented planning evidence in respect of the Hills Zone and Ayrburn Zone and therefore had a thorough knowledge of the three proposals

³⁹ We took this to mean the zones as notified

⁴⁰ Y. Pflüger, Evidence in Chief at 94

controls on buildings and landscaping and the positions where the development would be viewed from together.

72. Ms Pflüger concluded that the proposal would not be perceived as urban sprawl associated with Arrowtown and that the controls would work together to continue to provide the sense of place and identity provided by the existing private golf course.
73. Ms Gilbert's rebuttal evidence acknowledged the design led process that had informed the request for the Hills Resort Zone. She described the proposal as *'the introduction of 150 dwellings into a golf course setting'*⁴¹. She was concerned that the scale and character of the landscape change would significantly alter the identity and sense of place throughout the north eastern portion of the Basin.
74. In her reply evidence, Ms Gilbert maintained her view that the Hills Resort Zone development outcome would *'read as an urban parkland type character that is overtly not rural' and displays relatively domesticated character*⁴².

7.3.2 Economic Evidence

75. Mr Fraser Colegrave provided economic evidence in support of The Hills Resort Zone. He summarised the proposal's economic rationale as:
 - a. it would enable the Hills to gradually improve its financial viability over time;
 - b. it would allow higher and better uses of the land, which would improve economic efficiency in the underlying land market; and
 - c. it would create a compelling tourist destination for wealthy golf visitors and their friends/family, which would generate enduring benefits for the District via increased spending⁴³.
76. We understood his assessment was based on the development of the property under the zone rules proposed as a combination of high-end visitor accommodation and a high quality and limited access golf course⁴⁴.

7.3.3 Planning Evidence

77. Mr Brown gave planning evidence in support of the proposed Hills Resort Zone. He considered that the zone should be preferred to the Rural Amenity Zone as it would better achieve the rezoning principles and would be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose and principles of the Act.
78. Mr Brown considered the cumulative effects of the Hills Resort Zone, Hogans Gully Zone and Ayrburn Zone. His conclusions were the same as we have discussed above in relation to his conclusions in his evidence for the Hogans Gully Zone.
79. Mr Brown did not consider that Council's evidence had given sufficient regard to the 'moderate' rating for LCU 22. He stated that despite this, the land was subject to the same objectives, policies and methods as the various areas in the Basin with a 'Low' or 'Very Low' rating⁴⁵. He was critical of Mr Langman's assessment and suggested that if taken literally, it would mean

⁴¹ B. Gilbert, Rebuttal Evidence at 16.17

⁴² B. Gilbert, Reply Evidence at 10.10

⁴³ F Colegrave, EiC, paragraph 11

⁴⁴ Ibid, paragraph 33

⁴⁵ J. Brown, Evidence in Chief at 97

that no development from anywhere visible from an elevated position would be able to meet Section 7(c)⁴⁶.

80. Mr Langman considered Mr Colegrave's economic evidence in his rebuttal evidence. He agreed that it quantified the economic benefits, but noted it did not address the costs that might be associated with increased infrastructure demand. He also highlighted a concern that if the golf course was not able to maintain its financial viability, this would lead to future pressure for further development⁴⁷.
81. Mr Langman commented on the amended provisions in his reply. He continued to hold the view that the zone represented a density of development that was not appropriate individually or cumulatively. He also thought that the provisions did not sufficiently safeguard the outcome of a resort and considered that the provisions should require the majority of the residences to provide for visitor accommodation to qualify as a resort⁴⁸.
82. We should note also the tabled submissions of Dame Elizabeth and Mr Murray Hanan opposing the proposed Hills development. As with their submission on the Banco Trustees' submission discussed above, their principal issue was in maintaining McDonnell Road as a boundary for development, and maintenance of the rural backdrop beyond it.

7.4 Discussion and Conclusions

83. We have carefully considered the addition of two resort zones in the eastern part of the basin. As we have noted above, we discussed how we might approach our consideration of these and other stand-alone zones in terms of the potential cumulative effects.
84. In his reply evidence, Mr Langman told us that we should consider each request on its individual merits and then made a decision on any cumulative impacts of one or more of the requested zones⁴⁹. We agree that this is the correct approach.
85. Firstly, considering the Hogans Gully Zone, we find that this would not be the most appropriate zone for the site. We think that the landscaping proposed will stand out because it is not where it would naturally be (i.e. in the gullies). We also find that the view from zig-zag is important. The simulations provided by the submitter support both Ms Gilbert's comments in her reply evidence, that it is an artificial configuration driven primarily by the golf course layout⁵⁰, and Ms Mellsop's view that the density of the visible built development would result in a visible spread of intensive rural living. In our view, the development enabled by the zone would be obtrusively visible.
86. We agree with Mr Todd that the 55ha of indigenous planting proposed is a potentially significant ecological benefit that we should take into account. However, in our view, it will not in this instance counter the adverse effects of the proposal. We also think that the benefit is lessened by the way it fails to follow natural patterning, by being located on higher points rather than in the gullies. Even if the restoration had been more well-conceived, we do not think it sufficient to counter the intensive level of rural living that will be clearly visible from a significant

⁴⁶ Ibid at 104

⁴⁷ At 25.13 and 25.14

⁴⁸ M. Langman, Reply Evidence at 21.4 and 21.5

⁴⁹ M. Langman, Reply Evidence at 6.1 to 6.3

⁵⁰ B. Gilbert, Reply Evidence at 10.12

viewpoint. Had the development not been concentrated on the ridgelines and been coupled with revegetation in the gullies we may have reached a different view.

87. Turning now to the Hills Resort Zone, we find that the landscape effects of the proposed development are less than those of Hogans Gully. While Ms Wolt, counsel for Trojan Helmet Limited, sought to rely on unimplemented consents for 10 additional dwellings as part of the 'existing environment', we heard no evidence indicating that those consents are likely to be exercised before they lapse later this year (2019) and we do not consider them relevant to our assessment of the effects of the proposed zone. What is relevant, however, is the fact that the site has already been extensively modified by the existing golf courses and, to a lesser extent, the three dwellings that have been built or which are in the process of being built, along with the golf 'clubhouse' and other golf-related buildings on the site. We acknowledge that the submitter has gone to a lot of effort to make the residential elements it proposes to introduce to that modified environment unobtrusive. We agree with Ms Gilbert's comments in her reply that the revised provisions do not go far enough: there are no detailed design guidelines (the design principles Ms Chin discussed in her evidence are highly conceptual and left us with no clear impression as to the likely end result, other than that it would not have the standardised approach of Millbrook) and buildings would be a controlled activity (related to the previous point, we think at the very least, buildings should be a restricted discretionary activity). However, we also agree with her that should we be minded to enable additional resort land use in the Basin, The Hills is a reasonable candidate from a landscape perspective⁵¹.
88. This raises the question, however, whether The Hills Resort Zone would in fact be a resort, as defined. This is significant because the submitter proposed identification of a series of "Activity Areas" within which residential development was envisaged at urban densities. The largest activity area provided for a maximum of 36 residential units within a 2.7 hectare area.
89. The objectives and policies in Chapters 3 and 4 of the PDP seek to avoid urban development outside the urban development boundaries shown on the planning maps⁵². The definition of "urban development" states that a resort development in an otherwise rural area is not urban development. The definition of resort is:
- "Means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing temporary visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focused on onsite visitor activities."*
90. While The Hills Resort Zone would satisfy the first part of the definition, we heard no evidence that it would principally provide visitor accommodation, although we note that Mr Colegrave's evidence was based on visitor accommodation being a principal component. Rather the contrary; the impression we had was that the intention was that this would be a gated residential community surrounding a golf course.
91. The same is the case with Hogans Gully. Mr Todd, however, sought to argue that it would meet the definition of "resort", because the residential units constructed as part of the development were able to be used for visitor accommodation. We do not think this is sufficient and note that

⁵¹ B Gilbert Reply evidence at 10.23

⁵² See e.g. Policies 3.3.14 and 4.2.1.3.

the same applies to development in the residential zones throughout the District. The definition quoted above focusses on what is actually occurring as a matter of fact; whether the development is principally providing visitor accommodation, not whether it might do so. The importance of this being 'locked in' was emphasized by evidence we heard that the character of Millbrook 'Resort' has changed over time as it has grown in size, such that it would probably not be considered a resort if constructed today.

92. We contemplated the possibility of amending The Hills Resort Zone provisions to express them in terms that would ensure the development met the requirements of a resort (as well as addressing the other issues identified above), but concluded that this is such a fundamental element of the development that we ought not to undertake the redrafting required in the absence of clear evidence that the submitter actually sought to undertake a development within the definition set out above.
93. We have concluded, therefore, that what is proposed is urban development that the strategic chapters of the PDP seek to avoid. In our view, that is decisive, and leads us inexorably to the conclusion that the submission should not be accepted. We considered whether this conclusion puts too much weight on Stage 1 provisions that are the subject of appeal. The key definitions we have relied on are not the subject of appeal, and while the policy approach of avoiding urban development outside urban development boundaries is challenged, it is fundamental to the approach the strategic chapters take to management of urban development. It would be inconsistent for us to take an alternative approach unless and until the Environment Court directs that course.
94. The same conclusion follows for Hogans Gully, although there we have identified additional reasons supporting rejection of the proposed zone. Those additional reasons are important because Hogans Gully sought, in the alternative, imposition of Precinct zoning on the elevated terraces identified for residential development in its proposed zone. The alternative proposal was not fully fleshed out and we were left unclear how it could be reconciled with the information Mr Baxter provided to us on the pattern of residential development. Be that as it may, high density Precinct development (down to 2500m²) would, in our view, have unsatisfactory results. It would not, in particular, maintain or enhance landscape character and visual amenity values in the eastern part of the Basin.
95. We conclude that, whether considered individually or cumulatively, the Hogans Gully Zone and The Hills Resort Zone are not the most appropriate zones for the properties. We consider the most appropriate zone among the options available to us, to be Rural Amenity Zone as notified.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

96. For the reasons given above, we recommend that:
 - a. Submissions 2299, 2388, 2501, 2511 and 2580 be accepted, further submissions in support of those submissions be accepted, and further submissions in opposition be rejected;
 - b. Submissions 2295, 2386 and 2400 be accepted in part, further submissions in support of those submissions be accepted in part, and further submissions in opposition to those submissions be rejected;

- c. Submissions 2281, 2313, 2320, 2387, 2397, 2413, 2419, 2444, 2512, 2513 and 2605 be rejected, further submissions in support of those submissions be rejected, and further submissions in opposition to those submissions be accepted;
- d. The Waterfall Park Zone be extended on to the 'triangle' area separating the north and south parts of the zone, as shown on Figure E1 below;
- e. the Waterfall Park Zone Structure Plan in Section 42.7 and Section 27.13.3 of the PDP be replaced with that included in Appendix 1;
- f. the land at Middlerigg Lane (held in Computer Freehold Registers 594920, 594921 and 416330) be zoned Millbrook Resort Zone as shown on Figure E2 below;
- g. the Millbrook Resort Zone Structure Plan in Section 43.7 and Section 27.13.4 of the PDP be replaced with that included in Appendix 2;
- h. Chapter 43 be amended by including the provisions set out in Appendix 3;
- i. that Lot 2 DP 300390 in Jopp Street, Arrowtown be zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone as shown on Figure E3 below;
- j. the Urban Growth Boundary be moved to include Lot 2 DP 300390 in Jopp Street, Arrowtown, as shown on Figure E3 below;
- k. that 112-116 McDonnell Road be zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct as shown on Figure E4 below;
- l. that the land on McDonnell Road legally described as Lot 2 DP 392663 be zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, as shown on Figure E5 below;
- m. that all other land in Area E retain the zoning and relevant notations as notified.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent, Chair

Dated: 15 February 2019




Figure E1: Recommended extension to Waterfall Zone




Figure E2: Recommended extension to Millbrook Resort Zone




Figure E3: Recommended zoning of Lot 2 DP 300390, Jopp Street and relocation of Urban Growth Boundary





Figure E4: Recommended zoning of 112-116 McDonnell Road, Arrowtown




Figure E5: Recommended zoning of Lot 2 DP 392663, McDonnell Road, Arrowtown

Appendix 1: Recommended Waterfall Park Zone Structure Plan



Appendix 2: Recommended Millbrook Resort Zone Structure Plan



Appendix 3: Recommended Amendments to Chapter 43 Millbrook Resort Zone

Amend provisions in Chapter 43 as below (insertions shown underlined, deletions with ~~strike-through~~)

a. Amend Rules 43.4.10 and 43.4.11:

43.4.10	<p>Buildings</p> <p>a. Village Activity Area</p> <p>b. R1 to R13 <u>and R19</u> of the Residential Activity Area</p> <p>c. The Recreational Facilities Activity Area</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <p>i. The appearance of the building</p> <p>ii. Effects on visual and landscape amenity of the area including coherence with the surrounding buildings</p>	C
43.4.11	<p>Buildings</p> <p>a. R14, R15, and R16 <u>and R20</u> of the Residential Activity Area</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <p>i. The appearance of the building</p> <p>ii. Associated landscaping controls</p> <p>iii. The effects on visual and landscape amenity values of the area including coherence with the surrounding buildings</p>	RD

b. Amend Rules 43.5.4, 43.5.5 and 43.5.6:

43.5.4	<p>Residential Density</p> <p>The maximum number of residential units in the Millbrook Resort Zone shall be limited to 450 <u>458</u>.</p>	NC																								
43.5.5	<p>Residential Density</p> <p>a. In the following parts of the Residential Activity Area the total number of residential units shall not exceed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>i.</td> <td>R13</td> <td>10 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ii.</td> <td>R14</td> <td>6 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iii.</td> <td>R15</td> <td>15 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iv.</td> <td>R16</td> <td>6 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>v.</td> <td>R17</td> <td>7 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>vi.</td> <td>R18</td> <td>1 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>vii.</u></td> <td><u>R19</u></td> <td><u>4 residential units</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>viii.</u></td> <td><u>R20</u></td> <td><u>4 residential units</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>b. In addition there shall be no more than one residential unit per Indicative Residential Site</p>	i.	R13	10 residential units	ii.	R14	6 residential units	iii.	R15	15 residential units	iv.	R16	6 residential units	v.	R17	7 residential units	vi.	R18	1 residential units	<u>vii.</u>	<u>R19</u>	<u>4 residential units</u>	<u>viii.</u>	<u>R20</u>	<u>4 residential units</u>	NC
i.	R13	10 residential units																								
ii.	R14	6 residential units																								
iii.	R15	15 residential units																								
iv.	R16	6 residential units																								
v.	R17	7 residential units																								
vi.	R18	1 residential units																								
<u>vii.</u>	<u>R19</u>	<u>4 residential units</u>																								
<u>viii.</u>	<u>R20</u>	<u>4 residential units</u>																								
43.5.6	<p>Building Height – Residential Activity Areas R1 – R13, <u>R19 and R20</u></p> <p>The maximum height of buildings shall be:</p> <p>a. Visitor accommodation, clubhouses, conference and theatre facilities, restaurants, retail and residential buildings – 8m</p> <p>b. Filming towers – 12m</p> <p>c. All other buildings and structures – 4m</p>	NC																								

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Stream 15 Report

Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding Chapters 25, 29, 31, 38, and Visitor Accommodation

Report 19.3 – Chapter 25 Earthworks

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Sarah Dawson

Calum MacLeod

Robert Nixon

CONTENTS

1. PRELIMINARY.....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 TERMINOLOGY IN THIS REPORT	1
1.3 BACKGROUND	2
1.4 GENERAL SUBMISSIONS	3
1.5 DUPLICATION WITH CONTROLS OVER EARTHWORKS BY ORC, DoC OR OTHER CHAPTERS OF THE PDP	5
1.6 CHANGES FROM PLAN CHANGE 49 TO THE ODP	11
2. SECTION 25.1 - PURPOSE.....	13
3. SECTION 25.2 - OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES	14
3.1 INTRODUCTION	14
3.2 OBJECTIVES - GENERAL	14
3.3 OBJECTIVE 25.2.1	16
3.4 POLICIES 25.2.1.1, 25.2.1.3, 25.2.1.4 & 25.2.1.5.....	17
3.5 POLICY 25.2.1.2.....	18
3.6 OBJECTIVE 25.2.2.....	21
3.7 POLICY 25.2.2.1.....	21
3.8 POLICIES 25.2.2.2 - 25.2.2.3 (RENUMBERED IN THE REPLY VERSION AS POLICIES 25.2.1.6 - 25.2.1.11...)	22
3.9 ADDITIONAL OBJECTIVE AND POLICIES FOCUSED ON ENABLING EARTHWORKS IN SASZ	22
4. SECTION 25.3 - OTHER PROVISIONS AND RULES.....	23
4.1 OVERVIEW.....	23
4.2 ADVICE NOTES.....	23
4.3 GENERAL EXEMPTIONS (OTHER THAN FOR SASZs).....	24
4.3.1 EXEMPTIONS FOR EARTHWORKS ASSOCIATED WITH SUBDIVISION	24
4.3.2 EXEMPTIONS FOR FORESTRY EARTHWORKS IN OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ZONES	25
4.3.3 OTHER EXEMPTIONS	27
4.4 EXEMPTIONS FOR EARTHWORKS IN SASZs.....	28
5. SECTION 25.4 RULES – ACTIVITIES	31
6. SECTION 25.5 RULES – STANDARDS.....	33
6.1 TABLE 25.2 MAXIMUM VOLUME	33
6.1.1 OVERVIEW OF ISSUES	33
6.1.2 MILLBROOK RESORT ZONE	33
6.1.3 BEN LOMOND SUB-ZONE	34
6.2 TABLE 25.3 STANDARDS.....	38
6.2.1 OVERVIEW OF ISSUES	38
6.2.2 STANDARD 25.5.12 - EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES	38

6.2.3	STANDARD 25.5.13 – DEPOSITION OF MATERIAL ON ROADS	40
6.2.4	STANDARD 25.5.14 – DUST CONTROL	40
6.2.5	STANDARD 25.5.19 – EARTHWORKS SETBACKS FROM SITE BOUNDARIES	41
6.2.6	STANDARD 25.5.20 – WATERBODIES	42
6.2.7	STANDARD 25.5.22 - CLEANFILL	45
7.	<u>SECTION 25.6 NON-NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATIONS</u>	<u>46</u>
8.	<u>SECTIONS 25.7 MATTERS OF DISCRETION AND 25.8 ASSESSMENT MATTERS</u>	<u>47</u>
9.	<u>SCHEDULE 25.9 INTERPRETATIVE DIAGRAMS</u>	<u>48</u>
10.	<u>SCHEDULE 25.10 ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY PROTOCOL.....</u>	<u>48</u>
11.	<u>VARIATION TO STAGE 1 PDP CHAPTER 2 DEFINITIONS.....</u>	<u>49</u>
12.	<u>VARIATION TO STAGE 1 PDP CHAPTER 27 SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT</u>	<u>50</u>
13.	<u>VARIATION TO STAGE 1 CHAPTER 41 JACKS POINT ZONE</u>	<u>50</u>
14.	<u>RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 16(2)</u>	<u>50</u>
15.	<u>OVERALL RECOMMENDATION</u>	<u>51</u>

Appendix 1: Chapter 25 and Variations to Chapters 2, 27 and 41 as Recommended

Appendix 2: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions

1. PRELIMINARY

1.1 Introduction

1. This report needs to be read in conjunction with Report 19.1. That report sets out the appearances and procedural matters for Stream 15. It also contains our recommendations on matters applicable generally to all the provisions covered by Stream 15.

1.2 Terminology in this Report

2. The majority of the abbreviations used in this report are set out in Report 19.1. In addition, throughout this report, we use the following abbreviations:

District	Queenstown Lakes District
DoC	Department of Conservation
Federated Farmers	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc
Fish and Game	Otago Fish and Game Council
HNZ	Heritage New Zealand
Jacks Point Group	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Land Holdings Limited ¹ ; and Darby Planning LP ²
JPZ	Jacks Point Zone
Kāi Tahu	Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, Hokonui Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Waihōpai, Te Rūnanga o Awarua and Te Rūnanga o Ōraka-Aparima
Millbrook	Millbrook Country Club
MRZ	Millbrook Resort Zone
NES-PF	National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry
NZSki	NZSki Limited
ONL	Outstanding Natural Landscape as shown on the Planning Maps of the PDP (Decisions Version)
ORC	Otago Regional Council
PC49	Plan Change 49 to the ODP

¹ Submission 2381

² Submission 2376

PDP	Proposed District Plan
Reply Version	The version of Chapter 25 attached to the Reply Evidence of J Wyeth
Skyline	Skyline Enterprises Limited
Treble Cone Group	Treble Cone Investments Limited ³ ; Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP ⁴ ; Darby Planning LP ⁵
Water Plan	Regional Plan: Water for Otago
WBRAZ	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
ZJV	ZJV (NZ) Limited

1.3 Background

3. This report deals with the submissions and further submissions lodged in respect of Chapter 25 Earthworks, the variation to Chapter 2 Definitions notified with Chapter 25, and the variations to Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development and Chapter 41 Jacks Point Zone notified with Chapter 25.
4. Mr Jerome Wyeth, a planning consultant engaged by the Council, prepared a Section 42A Report, rebuttal evidence and a reply statement. This was supported by expert evidence from Mr Trent Sunich, an environmental consultant engaged by the Council. We also had the benefit of evidence from several submitters. Mr Wyeth advised us that he had not had any prior direct involvement in the development of Chapter 25 as notified. His company had prepared a technical report for the Council, to inform the development of the chapter, which he had not been involved with.
5. The hearings proceeded as described in Report 19.1.
6. There were a large number of submissions received on Chapter 25 and the associated variations to Chapter 2, 27 and 41. As stated in Report 1⁶, it is not necessary for the Hearing Commissioners to address each submission individually, rather the Hearing Panel's report can address decisions by grouping submissions. This is the approach taken in this Report. When discussing each section and/or provision, not every aspect of the submissions, as categorised by Council staff, is mentioned. In addition, where the Council's evidence supports a submission and there is no conflicting evidence, we have not specifically referred to that matter in the Report. That is so the Report is not unnecessarily wordy. However, in each case the Hearing Panel has considered all the submissions and further submissions on Chapter 25 and the variations. We set out in Appendix 2 a list of the submissions and further submissions and our recommendation in respect of each one.

³ Submission 2373

⁴ Submission 2384

⁵ Submission 2376

⁶ Report 1 para [52]-[53]

1.4 General Submissions

7. As set out in Report 19.1, where a submission seeking a change to Chapter 25 was only considered in evidence from the Council, without the benefit of evidence from the submitter or from a submitter on a related submission, we have no basis in evidence to depart from the recommendation of the Council's witness and recommend accordingly.
8. Several submissions on PDP (Stage 1) were carried over to be heard in conjunction with Chapter 25 and the variation to Chapter 41 Jacks Point Zone notified with Chapter 25. These were listed and addressed under Issue 14 of the Section 42A Report prepared by Mr Wyeth. The submissions relate to the maximum earthworks volumes, cut and fill height restrictions and set-backs from artificial water bodies in the Jacks Point Zone. The evidence for the Jacks Point Group⁷ was that they generally supported the integration of all earthworks provisions into the standalone Chapter 25. In terms of the specific provisions in Chapter 25 for earthworks in the Jacks Point Zone, general agreement was reached between Mr Wyeth (through the amendments he recommended) and the evidence for the Jacks Point Group⁸. Accordingly, we have not needed to address these submissions further in this report.
9. Before discussing the provisions in Chapter 25 and the variations, and the submissions on those provisions, we will discuss two general matters raised in several submissions:
 - whether it is appropriate for earthworks to be managed through Chapter 25 of the PDP, when there are already adequately managed by ORC, DoC or through other chapters of the PDP; and
 - whether or not the PDP can, or should, include earthworks provisions that are more stringent than those in Plan Change 49 to the ODP (PC49).
10. Some submissions supported Chapter 25 generally⁹; in relation to specific zones¹⁰; or in relation to a broad range of provisions¹¹. As we are recommending some changes to the provisions, we recommend these submissions be accepted in part.
11. Some submissions opposed Chapter 25 and requested that the ODP earthworks provisions are retained¹², on the basis that they were recently made operative under PC49. The ODP is being replaced, in stages, by the PDP. Even if we were to recommend rejection of Chapter 25 in its entirety, the provisions for earthworks would not revert to those under the ODP. On this basis, we recommend that these submissions be rejected. However, we note that aspects of the approach under the ODP have been specifically requested as amendments to Chapter 25, including: exclusion of the Ski Area Sub-Zones (SASZs); retaining earthworks volume thresholds from the ODP; and deletion of some new standards included in notified Chapter 25. We address these aspects later in this Report, as we consider each Chapter 25 provision.
12. Some submitters suggested alternative approaches to dealing with impacts from earthworks in the District. These included Council website notification of locations and time of major earthworks to better inform the public¹³; not requiring earth bunds and mounds screening

⁷ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 17

⁸ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 106-108

⁹ For example: Submissions 2019 and 2495

¹⁰ Refer J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 6.2-6.5

¹¹ For example: Submissions 2455, 2618, 2446, 2484, 2540, 2242, 2194, 2195, 2478, 2538 and 2442

¹² For example: Submissions 2448, 2465, 2552, 2560 and 2549

¹³ Submission 2495

dwellings¹⁴; and regular water testing above and below site development boundaries as part of resource consent conditions¹⁵. We agree with Mr Wyeth¹⁶ that it is outside the scope of the PDP to require the Council to notify the public about earthworks. We note and accept Mr Wyeth's statement¹⁷ that there is no requirement in the PDP for screening dwellings with bunds. We also agree with Mr Wyeth's evidence that requirements for water quality monitoring for developments involving earthworks are best determined on a case-by-case basis through the resource consent processes required through Chapter 25, rather than generic requirements being specified in the PDP. We consider the Matters of Discretion and Assessment Matters included in 25.7 and 25.8 of Chapter 25 would enable such conditions to be imposed. On this basis, we recommend these submissions be rejected.

13. Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited¹⁸ requested that, in the event that the decisions on Stage 1 of the PDP agree to the creation of the Glendhu Station Zone, those provisions are incorporated into Chapter 25. The proposed Glendhu Station Zone was rejected through the PDP Stage 1 Decisions¹⁹. Trojan Helmet Limited²⁰ also requested specific earthworks provisions for its proposed The Hills Zone. This rezoning request has been considered in Hearing Stream 14 and it has been recommended that it be rejected²¹. Chapter 25 does not, therefore, include separate earthworks provisions for these areas. We recommend that these submissions be rejected.
14. ORC²² asked that Chapter 25 better recognises and gives effect to the relevant objectives and policies of the Proposed RPS, specifically Objectives 3.1 and 3.2. The submission stated that the Proposed RPS contains a number of objectives and policies related to recognising, protecting and enhancing areas of significant vegetation and habitats, and indigenous vegetation generally. ORC recognised that the notified Chapter 25 gives some effect to these issues in its assessment matters (25.8.6 (c)), but states that the assessment matters need to also cover terrestrial areas. We did not hear evidence on behalf of ORC at the hearing. Mr Jerome Wyeth²³ addressed this submission in his Section 42A Report, summarising the relevant Proposed RPS provisions and recommending amendments to better give effect to it. We accept Mr Wyeth's amendments and do not consider any additional amendments are required. We recommend the submission is accepted in part.
15. Mr Wyeth addressed the submission²⁴ from of Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, Hokonui Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Waihōpai, Te Rūnanga o Awarua and Te Rūnanga o Ōraka-Aparima (Kāi Tahu). This seeks a number of amendments to the PDP to better provide for the cultural values, rights and interests of Kāi Tahu and better achieve the purpose of the Act. The submission from Kāi Tahu was generally supported by three further submissions. Mr Wyeth summarised the amendments sought by Kāi Tahu and agreed that the PDP needs to recognise Kāi Tahu's cultural values and interests. He noted that Chapter 5 specifically relates to Kāi Tahu's values and interests and the strategic directives in

¹⁴ Submission 2133

¹⁵ Submission 2140

¹⁶ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 20.34

¹⁷ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 20.35

¹⁸ Submission 2382

¹⁹ Report 16.16

²⁰ Submission 2387

²¹ Report 18.7

²² Submission 2497

²³ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 6.8-6.9

²⁴ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 6.16-6.22

that chapter need to be given effect to throughout the PDP chapters, including Chapter 25. Although Mr Wyeth considered that Chapter 25 already includes a number of relevant provisions, he agreed that improvements could be made. He recommended improved linkages between Chapters 5 and 25, and greater consistency and specificity in the way sites of significance to Kāi Tahu are referred to. We did not hear evidence on behalf of Kāi Tahu at the hearing. We accept Mr Wyeth's amendments to the Purpose of Chapter 25, Policy 25.2.1.2, and Rule 25.4.5. We recommend the submission from Kāi Tahu is accepted in part.

16. A group of submitters²⁵ made general submissions seeking that SASZs be exempt from all earthworks rules in Chapter 25, particularly where the ski areas are located on conservation or public lands; or where there is overlap with controls from ORC²⁶. We address these submissions below in relation to duplication with controls over earthworks by ORC and/or DoC, as well as later in this Report where we consider each of the Chapter 25 provisions.

1.5 Duplication with Controls over Earthworks by ORC, DoC or other Chapters of the PDP

17. As stated above, a group of submitters with interests in the District's ski areas made submissions seeking that SASZs be exempt from the earthworks rules in Chapter 25, on the grounds that earthworks are already adequately controlled by the Department of Conservation (DoC) where the ski areas are on conservation land; by ORC through the Otago Regional Plan: Water (the Water Plan); or through other chapters of the PDP, such as Chapter 33. Before we consider submissions on the detailed provisions of Chapter 25 (including within SASZs), we will generally consider whether it is appropriate for earthworks to be managed through Chapter 25 of the PDP, rather than the alternatives of management by ORC, DoC or through other chapters of the PDP.
18. We received legal submissions on this matter from Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the group of submitters²⁷ (other than for NZSki Limited (NZSki) and Skyline Enterprises Limited (Skyline)). She submitted that it was generally less efficient, and unnecessary, to duplicate regulation in the District Plan where that is otherwise adequately managed through Regional Plans. In addition, it was her submission that other regulation over earthworks, as a result of the underlying nature or tenure of a landholding (such as licences or leases with Land Information New Zealand, or concessions from DoC), mean that earthworks in such areas should not be subject to additional, unnecessary regulation, unless there is evidence of the need to control specific effects. Ms Baker-Galloway referred us to section 75 of the Act, requiring the district plan to give effect to an RPS, and not be inconsistent with a regional plan, indicating that this would be ensured by avoiding duplication of controls.
19. Mr Wakefield also addressed us on these matters in his opening and reply representations / legal submissions for the Council²⁸.
20. Firstly, in relation to overlap with ORC functions, he stated the Council recognised the management of the effects on water quality (i.e. sedimentation) is a function that primarily rests with regional councils under section 30 of the Act. However, he submitted that the management of earthworks, and effects associated with earthworks (i.e. arising from land use activities), are a function of both the Council and ORC, engaging directly with the Council's

²⁵ Submissions 2454, 2493, 2466, 2494, 2581, 2492, 2373, 2384 and 2376

²⁶ Notified Chapter 25 included an exemption from all except Rules 25.5.12 to 25.5.14, 25.5.20 and 25.5.21

²⁷ Maree Baker-Galloway, Legal submissions for the Treble Cone Group and for the Real Journeys Group

²⁸ M Wakefield, Opening Representations / Legal Submissions for the Council, paragraphs 7.2-7.15; and Reply Representations / Legal Submissions for the Council, paragraphs 5.7-5.11

functions under section 31 of the Act. He stated that, while there may be overlaps between their respective functions, in certain cases duplication is an appropriate outcome to ensure proper regulation of activities.

21. Mr Wakefield's opening and reply submissions referred us to two decisions of the Environment Court²⁹ which identified the potential for such an overlap. He submitted the *Telecom* case recognised that there might be overlapping jurisdiction between regional and district councils provided each is acting within its respective functions under the Act; and this position was supported by the *Wanaka Landfills* case. He submitted the latter decision disagreed that "*there is nothing in the Act that suggests the potential for overlap of the control of activities in a river bed in the manner contemplated by QLDC*" and refused to make a declaration that QLDC has "*no legal jurisdiction to consider and decide the effects of gravel extraction activities in the river bed*". It was his submission that the Council was not striving to create unnecessary duplication, but provide for district-wide regulation where a matter is not being adequately managed elsewhere.
22. Mr Wakefield also referred us to the Proposed RPS which he submitted requires the Council to manage the potential effects of erosion and sedimentation from land use activities through its district plan. He referred us to Policies 3.1.7 (Soil Values) and 3.1.8 (Soil Erosion), and Method 4.1.4 which states that city and district plans "*will set objectives, policies and methods to implement*" those policies "*by including provisions to manage the discharge of dust, and silt and sediment associated with earthworks and land use*". Mr Wakefield submitted that it is reasonable and appropriate for the Council to seek to manage the effects of earthworks, particularly given the significance the PDP places on protecting amenity values associated with the District's lakes and rivers.
23. Secondly, in relation to duplication with the concessions process under the Conservation Act 1987, Mr Wakefield referred us to a previous Report of a separate PDP Hearings Panel regarding the clearance of indigenous vegetation within SASZ³⁰. It was Mr Wakefield's submission to us that the previous Panel found there was no evidence presented to it that gave it confidence any concession approval required from DoC would amount to a duplication of Resource Management Act processes. However, we think Mr Wakefield may have misunderstood what the Panel was saying in that report. The Panel stated that there was little to be gained from duplicating approval processes under the Conservation Act with consent requirements under the Resource Management Act. The Panel went on to state that it had no evidence that approvals under the Land Act or the Reserves Act would amount to duplication with resource consent processes³¹. In the case of earthworks, it was the Council's position that there is no evidence the DoC concession process will adequately assess the risks of sediment discharge from earthworks.
24. Evidence on the matter of duplication of functions was provided by Mr Sean Dent for NZSki and Skyline; Mr Ralph Henderson for the Treble Cone Group; and Mr Ben Farrell for the Real Journeys Group; and well as by Mr Wyeth for the Council.
25. It was Mr Dent's evidence³² that earthworks and the subsequent discharge of sediment are adequately controlled by the ORC through the Water Plan; and often controlled by DoC

²⁹ *Telecom New Zealand Limited v Environmental Protection for Children Trust* C36/2003; and *Wanaka Landfills Limited v Queenstown-Lakes District Council* [2010] NZEnvC 299

³⁰ Report 4A: Stream 2 Rural, dated 30 March 2018, paragraphs 1637-1648

³¹ *ibid*, at paragraph 1645

³² S Dent, EiC, paragraphs 48-65

through lease terms or concession requirements. He accepted the Council has relevant functions in terms of section 31 of the Act but, in his opinion, the processing of resource consents for earthworks by the Council would represent an expensive duplication of the concessions and approvals issued by DoC (and the ORC where consent is triggered under the Water Plan). Mr Dent referred us to the protocol developed between NZSki and DoC for the rehabilitation of natural alpine environments following ski area development. He also provided us with an example of a concession issued by DoC for works within ski areas. He informed us about a development proposal involving major earthworks within a ski area, that he was involved with, which he considered required unnecessary duplication of assessment and approvals from DoC, ORC and the Council. Mr Dent also referred us to the previous Panel's Report on Chapter 33, which accepted that, in the case of approvals for indigenous vegetation clearance granted by DoC on Public Conservation Land, exemptions from Council consenting requirements for the same activity may be appropriate.

26. Mr Henderson³³ agreed that the Council is able to regulate the effects of earthworks through the PDP, but he did not consider it is likely to be more effective than the existing regulation through the Water Plan, and the duplication will be less efficient. He did not, however, provide any evidence to support this opinion. In answer to the Panel's questions, he agreed that the standards in the PDP provide a more focussed and specific direction for managing earthworks than relying on the ORC Water Plan discharge rules. Mr Henderson also pointed us to the clearance of indigenous vegetation rules in Chapter 33 of the PDP. It was his opinion that any earthworks clearance in a SASZ would also require resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance, and further regulation through the proposed earthworks rules would result in an inefficient duplication of process.
27. Mr Farrell³⁴ acknowledged that regional and district council are able to duplicate / overlap provisions and responsibilities, provided there is no conflict between them.
28. We also note the evidence we received from Mr Nigel Paragreen, from Otago Fish and Game Council (Fish and Game)³⁵. Fish and Game had supported the Council's stricter approach to earthworks management through Chapter 25. We will refer further to Mr Paragreen's evidence later in this Report. Here we pay particular attention to his recent examples of adverse effects from sediment discharges into waterways in the District³⁶, regardless of the ORC Water Plan and/or its enforcement. He expressed a wariness at the Council leaving the management to "*someone else*". In his opinion, management of the effects of earthworks is a key function of the Council and that, given his recent experiences, now is not the time to reduce regulatory involvement.
29. Mr Wyeth³⁷ also acknowledged the overlap in functions under the Act between regional and district councils, but considered this was unavoidable in order to manage earthworks and associated adverse effects. He noted that sediment entrained in stormwater runoff from an earthworks site can lead to a range of adverse effects, including on roads, neighbouring properties, stormwater networks, ecosystems and downstream waterbodies. In his view, there was no 'hard and fast' demarcation of the adverse effects from earthworks and the associated management responsibilities. Mr Wyeth also pointed to the District's highly valued lakes and rivers, with typically very high amenity, as articulated in the Strategic Directions of

³³ R Henderson, EiC, paragraphs 88-91

³⁴ B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 22

³⁵ Submission 2455

³⁶ N Paragreen, Evidence, paragraphs 3-4, and answers to questions from the Panel

³⁷ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, Section 7

Chapter 3, and the resulting need for a comprehensive management approach from both the ORC and the Council.

30. It was Mr Wyeth's firm opinion³⁸ that Method 4.1.4 of the Proposed RPS (combined with Policies 3.1.7 & 3.1.8) places an obligation on territorial authorities to manage the effects of erosion and sedimentation from land use activities through district plans. In the absence of a dedicated regional earthworks or soil conservation plan, it was Mr Wyeth's opinion that the Proposed RPS indicates it is intended that sediment associated with land use is to be managed primarily by district plans. He considered that Chapter 25 implements Method 4.1.4.
31. In relation to the Water Plan, it was Mr Wyeth's evidence that it does not manage land use activities for soil conservation or water quality purposes, but instead manages the discharge of sediment from disturbed land. He considered this differs from the approach taken by other regional councils in New Zealand which manage large scale earthworks (often through land plans)³⁹. He noted that the controls in the Water Plan focus on the point at which the sediment enters water, rather than the land disturbance activity itself, giving limited opportunity to proactively manage potential effects.
32. In relation to DoC approvals, in Mr Wyeth's opinion⁴⁰, the Conservation Act 1987 and the Act have different purposes and require different considerations through their approval processes. He considered there would need to be clear grounds to exempt activities from the Act's requirements on the basis that environmental effects would be adequately addressed through the concession process. In terms of the recommendation of the previous Hearing Panel relating to indigenous vegetation clearance, he noted that Panel concluded that there was little to be gained from duplicating the two processes. However, he did not have confidence or certainty that the same situation would apply with earthworks approvals.
33. Following receipt of the ski area concession example from Mr Dent, Mr Wyeth reviewed⁴¹ the DoC officer report and the concession (with its conditions). However, whilst it referred to sediment management, Mr Wyeth would have expected a more detailed set of conditions to manage erosion and sediment run-off from such large-scale earthworks. He did not consider Mr Dent's example provided sufficient evidence that adverse effects associated with earthworks would be appropriately managed through a DoC concession process. Mr Wyeth also pointed out that DoC supported the provisions in the notified PDP, with no evidence from DoC requesting that earthworks on public conservation land be exempt. He considered that, while there may be some duplication, this can be managed through the respective agencies working together to align their processes.
34. In relation to an overlap with the indigenous vegetation clearance rules in Chapter 33, Mr Wyeth⁴² considered that Chapter 33 has quite a distinct and separate focus from Chapter 25. Chapter 33 focuses on the protection, maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values; whereas Chapter 25 focusses on the adverse effects and benefits of earthworks. He stated that Chapter 33 only regulates earthworks within identified Significant Natural Areas; and the rules for indigenous vegetation clearance in alpine environments specifically do not manage the effects of earthworks. In Mr Wyeth's opinion, there would be

³⁸ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 4.26-4.27

³⁹ Appendix 3 to the Section 32 Report reviewed approaches to managing earthworks in regional and district plans.

⁴⁰ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 5.2-5.8

⁴¹ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, paragraphs 6.1-6.6

⁴² J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 3.5-3.10

limited duplication in the matters to consider when preparing and assessing applications for consent under each Chapter.

35. In considering this issue, we start by accepting the position of the parties that, in principle, the provisions of Chapter 25 that seek to manage adverse effects associated with earthworks (as land use activities) fall within the Council's functions under section 31. We agree with the submissions of Mr Wakefield that management of earthworks, and effects associated with earthworks (arising from land use activities), are a function of both the Council and ORC. This may result in an overlap of functions between the regional and district councils, but there is no jurisdictional barrier to that, provided each is acting within its respective functions under the Act. We also accept the submissions from Mr Wakefield that it is reasonable and appropriate for the Council to seek to ensure that the effects of earthworks are adequately managed, in particular given the significance the PDP places on protecting the values associated with the District's lakes and rivers.
36. We have then addressed consistency with the higher order statutory documents, in this case the Proposed RPS. As described in Report 19.1, Ms Scott, for the Council, provided the Panel with a memorandum⁴³ advising the status of the Proposed RPS, and providing us with relevant Environment Court consent orders and draft consent order documentation relating to Chapter 3. We understand there are also two outstanding appeals awaiting decisions from the Court. Having reviewed that information, we are satisfied that Policy 3.1.8, which relates to minimising soil erosion, is subject to only a minor change in the consent memorandum on Chapter 3 (yet to be signed off by the Court). Method 4.1.4 does not appear to be subject to appeal, and there are no proposals to modify it in the consent memorandum. Although we note that the Regional Council did not make this method operative on 14 January 2019.
37. We are satisfied that Policy 3.1.8 is a relevant policy in the Proposed RPS to be implemented through Chapter 25. Policy 3.1.8 reads as follows (the underlined words are subject to the consent memorandum):

Policy 3.1.8 Soil erosion

Minimise soil erosion resulting from activities, by undertaking all of the following:

- a) Using appropriate erosion controls and soil conservation methods;*
- b) Maintaining vegetative cover on erosion prone land;*
- c) Remediating land where significant soil erosion has occurred;*
- d) Encouraging activities that enhance soil retention.*

As Policy 3.1.8 is now beyond further challenge, we consider we must have sufficient regard to it to ensure the PDP will give effect to it once the RPS is operative.

38. Method 4.1.4, which applies to this policy, clearly requires territorial authorities to “set objectives, policies and methods to implement policies in the RPS as they relate to the ... District Council areas of responsibility.”, and states that those objectives, policies and methods are to implement the following “Policies 3.1.7, 3.1.8 and 5.4.1: by including provisions to manage the discharge of dust, silt and sediment associated with earthworks and land use.” Given the plain reading of these provisions, we agree with the evidence of Mr Wyeth that Method 4.1.4, combined with Policy 3.1.8, places an obligation on the Council to include objectives, policies and methods in the district plan to minimise soil erosion, through managing the effects of dust,

⁴³ Memorandum of Counsel for Queenstown Lakes District Council Advising Panel and Submitters of PORPS Status, 22 August 2018

silt and sediment associated with earthworks and land use. We consider that, not to do so, would not give effect to, or implement, the Proposed RPS.

39. The Panel accepts that the methods in the district plan, as required by Method 4.1.4, are not limited to rules. The RPS gives some discretion to the Council as to how it gives effect to the policy and what methods it considers most appropriate. However, any alternative methods would need to give effect to Policy 3.1.8 and Method 4.1.4 and ensure that soil erosion from land use activities is minimised.
40. We have taken into account the policies set out by Mr Wyeth⁴⁴ from the two relevant iwi management plans⁴⁵. We agree with Mr Wyeth that these policies are relevant to district plans. They seek to maintain water in the best possible condition, and to discourage activities that increase the silt loading in waterways.
41. We referred above to the significance the PDP places on protecting the values associated with the District's lakes and rivers. Chapter 3 Strategic Directions includes numerous objectives and policies which seek to protect the District's natural environments, ecosystems, natural character and nature conservation values of waterways, outstanding natural landscapes and natural features, and Ngai Tāhu values⁴⁶. In particular, Strategic Policies 3.3.19 and 3.3.26, which must be implemented throughout the PDP, read as follows:

3.3.19 Manage subdivision and / or development that may have adverse effects on the natural character and nature conservation values of the District's lakes, rivers, wetlands and their beds and margins so that their life-supporting capacity and natural character is maintained or enhanced.

3.3.26 That subdivision and / or development be designed in accordance with best practice land use management so as to avoid or minimise adverse effects on the water quality of lakes, rivers and wetlands in the District.

We consider these Strategic Policies, in combination with the other Strategic Objectives and Policies identified by Mr Wyeth, give a strong direction to Chapter 25 in terms of the Council's obligation to ensure that earthworks are undertaken in a way that minimises soil erosion, sediment generation and other adverse effects, including on water quality, landscape and natural character.

42. We have considered the alternative methods put forward by Mr Henderson, Mr Dent and Mr Farrell, for giving effect to the RPS and implementing the Strategic Directions of the PDP, and Mr Wyeth's responses to those methods. We considered the provisions of the Water Plan and have reviewed the concession documentation provided by Mr Dent. We accept the evidence of Mr Wyeth in relation to the alternative of reliance on the ORC and its Water Plan, or on DoC approvals under the Conservation Act for public conservation land.

⁴⁴ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, pages 12 & 13

⁴⁵ *The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Tauira*: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008; and *Kāi Tahu ki Otago* Natural Resource Management Plan 2005

⁴⁶ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, pages 14 & 15, set out objectives and policies from Chapter 3 Strategic Directions which he considered particularly relevant to Chapter 25. We agree with the objectives and policies identified by Mr Wyeth and with his evidence that all other chapters in the PDP must align with, and help implement, the Strategic Directions.

43. We agree with Mr Wyeth that the Water Plan focusses on managing the discharge of sediment from disturbed land, at the point sediment enters a waterbody; but it does not directly manage the land disturbance activities themselves for soil conservation or water quality purposes. We consider this approach to be largely reactive and retrospective, in relation to unanticipated discharges to waterbodies from earthworks. It is limited in its ability to implement a proactive, anticipatory approach, to ensure that earthworks are managed in a way that such discharges, and their effects, are minimised. This appears to us to be the role of the district plan through land use controls, as required by Method 4.1.4. We do not consider the provisions of the Water Plan would be sufficient, or effective, to ensure that Policy 3.1.8 of the RPS is given effect to, or to implement the relevant Strategic directions of the PDP. We are satisfied that Chapter 25 (subject to our specific recommendations to follow), provides a more appropriate and effective method than reliance on the Water Plan for achieving these objectives. We do not consider that this results in duplication with ORC processes, but rather they complement one another.
44. We also agree with Mr Wyeth that the Conservation Act 1987 and the Act have different purposes and require different considerations through their approval processes. We do not have any confidence or certainty from the information provided to us that adverse effects associated with earthworks would be appropriately managed through a DoC concession process. While there may be some duplication, we consider this can be managed through the respective agencies working together to align their processes.
45. Finally, we agree with Mr Wyeth that the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in Chapter 33 have a distinct and separate focus from Chapter 25. Chapter 33 focuses on the protection, maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values; whereas Chapter 25 focusses on the adverse effects and benefits of earthworks. We do not consider that reliance on consents under Chapter 33 would be sufficient, or effective, to ensure that Policy 3.1.8 of the RPS is given effect to, or to implement the relevant Strategic directions of the PDP.
46. Having considered the alternative methods put before us, we are satisfied that Chapter 25 (subject to our specific recommendations to follow) provides the more appropriate and effective method for achieving these objectives. In terms of efficiency, we do not consider Chapter 25 results in unnecessary or undue duplication with ORC or DoC processes (or other requirements of the PDP), but rather they complement each other. We consider not including controls over earthworks in the PDP (and relying on these alternative processes) would be a significant risk in terms of adverse effects on water quality, landscape, natural character, biodiversity and amenity values (amongst other adverse effects).

1.6 Changes from Plan Change 49 to the ODP

47. It was put to us, by the group of submitters with interests in the ski areas, that a change from the exemptions for ski area earthworks in Plan Change 49 (PC49) to the ODP is not only contrary to case law, it is not justified. Before we consider submissions on the detailed provisions of Chapter 25 (including within SASZs), we will generally consider whether or not the PDP can, or should, include earthworks provisions that are more stringent than those in PC49.
48. The legal submissions from Ms Baker-Galloway⁴⁷, on behalf of the Treble Cone and Real Journeys Groups, submitted that subjecting earthworks within SASZs to greater regulation as

⁴⁷ Legal submissions from Maree Baker-Galloway, for the Treble Cone Group, paragraphs 13-16. The legal submissions on behalf of the Real Journeys Group were the same

compared with the ODP (PC49) is contrary to case law which supports a less restrictive regime that meets the purpose of the Act and the objectives of a Plan⁴⁸. In addition, she submitted that such an approach is not justified in the sense that it represents a fundamental change to the (recently) approved Operative earthworks chapter. Ms Baker-Galloway pointed out that the Operative earthworks chapter was only made operative on 30 June 2016. She questioned the need for /efficiency of completely reviewing that chapter again, particularly as she considered it was not clear from the Section 32 Reports what effects have changed such as to justify the need to change the regulation.

49. Ms Baker-Galloway provided us with quotes from the Commissioner's Report on PC49 which accepted that earthworks in SASZs should be exempt from the PC49 provisions, carrying over this exemption from the previous plan provisions. She submitted that the situation has not changed in the last 2 years, and that we would be justified in coming to the same conclusion as the PC49 Commissioner. Having reviewed the Commissioner's Report on PC49, we considered Ms Baker-Galloway was selective in the interpretation she provided to us. She did not disclose the circumstances that led the Commissioner to make the recommendation he did, in particular that all parties involved agreed to exempt the SASZs from the PC49 earthworks provisions and there was no evidence before the Commissioner to enable him to consider the costs and benefits / effectiveness and efficiency of this approach compared with alternative approaches. However, in answer to questions from the Panel, Ms Baker-Galloway accepted that there is no legal bar to this Panel reconsidering the provisions in PC49. She also agreed that the district-wide audit of current earthworks management, undertaken for the Council by 4Sight Consulting⁴⁹ as part of the Council's Section 32 evaluation of alternative approaches for the PDP, is a relevant matter for us to consider when evaluating the PC49 provisions.
50. In his Reply representations / legal submissions for the Council⁵⁰, Mr Wakefield responded to the submissions from Ms Baker-Galloway on PC49. In its opening legal submissions for Stream 15, the Council had addressed a similar situation in relation to a recently approved plan change for signs (PC48). Mr Wakefield submitted that the same analysis applies in respect of PC49. The Council's opening submissions set out a number of factors that go to whether it is reasonable to have regard to, and place some weight on, a decision recently issued by the Court in relation to the same matter now being heard as part of a plan change hearing, including:
- the relatively recent consideration by the Court of very similar issues;
 - the level of scrutiny by the Court in relation to the provisions and alternatives; and
 - the Council's intention to effectively integrate the plan change approach into the structure and style of the plan.
51. It was Mr Wakefield's submission that there are several reasons why placing reliance on PC49 should be approached with caution, namely:
- Although PC49 was determined recently, it was determined by a Commissioner appointed by the Council and did not have Court scrutiny;
 - The Council has now notified and recommended a different planning approach for a range of matters across the PDP (both Stages 1 and 2), which it has justified in terms of Section 32 of the Act;

⁴⁸ Refer to Report 19.1, Section 2.1

⁴⁹ 4Sight Consulting. Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan: Assessment of Thresholds for Earthworks. September 2017

⁵⁰ Reply Representations / Legal Submissions for the Council, dated 15 October 2018

- The proposed earthworks provisions in Chapter 25 do not “reinvent the wheel” for the entire approach to regulating earthworks. Instead, as noted by Mr Wyeth, the proposed provisions build on and seek to improve the operative earthworks provisions, in order to give effect to the new higher order directions included in Stage 1.

The Panel also notes here that the new higher order direction in the Proposed RPS has also become beyond challenge since PC49 was considered.

52. Mr Wakefield’s legal submissions in reply were supported by reply evidence from Mr Wyeth⁵¹, who explained that the PDP has been developed in a different planning context to PC49. He considered it was timely for the Council to reconsider the earthworks provisions, including the exemption for SASZ in PC49, in the context of the Strategic Directions of the PDP. Mr Wyeth stated that the notified Chapter 25 provided considerable flexibility for ski areas, but he did not support a complete return to the approach in PC49.
53. We have considered the submissions from Ms Baker-Galloway and Mr Wakefield, and the evidence from Mr Wyeth. We agree that there is no legal bar to this Panel reconsidering the provisions in PC49. We accept the caution expressed by Mr Wakefield regarding relying heavily on the provisions of PC49, given it was decided by a Commissioner sitting alone, with little opposing evidence and, therefore, no need for the Commissioner to carefully weigh the evidence. We agree with Mr Wakefield that the evidence from Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich set out the background research undertaken by the Council in preparing the notified Chapter 25, including a district-wide audit of earthworks management, and the Council’s Section 32 evaluations of alternative approaches. On this basis, we are satisfied that the PDP can include earthworks provisions that are more stringent than those in PC49. Whether or not any particular provision is more appropriate than the equivalent in PC49 will be the subject of our evaluation of the evidence in terms of the statutory tests and Section 32 of the Act, as set out in the balance of this Report.

2. SECTION 25.1 - PURPOSE

54. Other than from Mr Wyeth and Ms Kim Reilly from Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc (Federated Farmers)⁵² (whom we refer to below), we did not hear any specific evidence on the amendments sought by submitters to the Chapter 25 Purpose. Mr Wyeth’s evidence⁵³ addressed the specific amendments sought by some submitters⁵⁴. Resulting from his consideration of submissions, he recommended amendments and additions to the Chapter Purpose through the updated version attached to his Reply evidence (the Reply Version). He also included amendments resulting from his consideration of the Kāi Tahu submission that we have discussed earlier in this Report. We accept Mr Wyeth’s evidence on these matters. We recommend his changes to the Chapter Purpose in the Reply Version be accepted, and the submissions accepted accordingly.
55. Ms Reilly lodged a statement of evidence in support of Federated Farmers’ submission, although she was unable to attend the hearing to present this to us. Having read Mr Wyeth’s evidence, Ms Reilly⁵⁵ supported the recommended addition from Mr Wyeth relating to smaller scale earthworks in rural areas. Federated Farmers’ submission had also requested that reference to waterbodies be deleted from the Chapter Purpose. Ms Reilly’s evidence

⁵¹ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 14

⁵² Submission 2540

⁵³ J Wyeth, EiC, paragraphs 20.21-20.29

⁵⁴ Submissions 2442, 2540 and 2457

⁵⁵ K Reilly, EiC

expressed concern at the Purpose referring to the impacts of earthworks on water quality. In her opinion, the ORC (through its Water Plan) sets out the water quality responsibilities of rural resource users, and she considered matters relating to water quality would be better addressed through the Water Plan alone. We have already discussed the inter-related roles of the ORC and the Council in managing the effects of earthworks activities. We have found this is a shared function and that Chapter 25 provides a more appropriate and effective method than reliance on the ORC's Water Plan alone for achieving the PDP's objectives. We do not consider this results in duplication with ORC processes, but rather they are complementary processes. We recommend that this aspect of the submission from Federated Farmers be rejected.

3. SECTION 25.2 - OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

3.1 Introduction

56. The notified Chapter 25 included 2 objectives and twelve policies. Objective 25.2.1 and its five policies related to management of adverse effects from earthworks on the environment, landscape and amenity values. Objective 25.2.2 related to both recognising the benefits from earthworks for social, cultural and economic wellbeing of people and communities; as well as ensuring that people and communities are protected from adverse effects such as land stability and nuisance effects. Several of its seven policies referred to the latter aspect.

57. Mr Wyeth's evidence considered the amendments sought by submitters. He recommended⁵⁶ amendments to, and reconfiguring of, the notified objectives and policies through the updated versions of Chapter 25 attached to his evidence. We have considered his evidence, as well as the submissions themselves, and the evidence from submitters presented to us at the hearing. We have used the version attached to Mr Wyeth's Reply evidence as the basis for our consideration of the relevant submissions (the Reply Version).

3.2 Objectives - General

58. The notified Objectives 25.2.1 and 25.2.2 read as follows:

25.2.1 *Objective – Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the environment, and maintains landscape and visual amenity values.*

25.2.2 *Objective – The social, cultural and economic well being of people and communities benefit from earthworks while being protected from adverse effects.*

59. Mr Wyeth considered there would be benefits in terms of plan clarity from moving the direction in Objective 25.2.2, and its associated policies, relating to "*protection of people and communities (and infrastructure)*" to Objective 25.2.1. He considered this would assist with plan interpretation and implementation without changing the underlying intent and effect of the notified objectives and policies. Objective 25.2.2 and its remaining Policy 25.2.2.1, would then be clearly focussed on recognising the benefits of earthworks, addressing relief sought by several submitters⁵⁷. In the Reply Version, Objectives 25.2.1 and 25.2.2 read as follows:

⁵⁶ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 10.5-10.9

⁵⁷ For example, the Real Journeys Group, the Treble Cone Group, and Submissions 2388, 2575, 2468 and 2462

25.2.1 *Objective – Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the environment, protects people and communities, and maintains landscape and visual amenity values.*

With eleven supporting policies, including relocated notified Policies 25.2.2.2 – 25.2.2.7.

25.2.2 *Objective – The social, cultural and economic well being of people and communities benefit from earthworks.*

With one remaining supporting Policy 25.2.2.1.

60. We accept Mr Wyeth’s evidence on this reconfiguration. Subject to the specific wording amendments we discuss below, we recommend the reconfiguration of the objectives and policies included in the Reply Version of Chapter 25 be accepted and the submissions accepted accordingly.
61. Fish and Game⁵⁸ supported Objectives 25.2.1 and 25.2.2 and all supporting policies, requesting they be retained, on the basis that they provide an appropriate framework to protect environmental values, maintain landscape and visual amenity values, while also allowing people and communities to benefit from earthworks. We received evidence from Mr Paragreen on behalf of Fish and Game⁵⁹. We have previously referred to Mr Paragreen’s evidence regarding recent examples of adverse effects from sediment discharges into waterways in the District from land development earthworks. It was his opinion that, at the moment, adverse effects on waterways from sediment discharge in Wanaka are not being “minimised” and are greater than they have ever been. He supported a strong approach to minimising adverse effects being taken through Chapter 25.
62. Support for both objectives and their policies also came from Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC)⁶⁰ and Heritage New Zealand (HNZ)⁶¹. Mr John Kyle, on behalf of QAC, stated in his evidence⁶² that he generally supported the amendments suggested by Mr Wyeth and considered they would appropriately address the adverse effects of earthworks. Ms Denise Anderson gave evidence on behalf of HNZ. She expressed⁶³ general support for the revised chapter attached to Mr Wyeth’s evidence. Her one outstanding matter did not relate to the objectives and policies. In her evidence for Federated Farmers, Ms Reilly also supported⁶⁴ Mr Wyeth’s recommended amendments to Objectives 25.2.1 and 25.2.2.
63. The Oil Companies⁶⁵, Paterson Pitts⁶⁶ and Federated Famers⁶⁷ supported Objective 25.2.1 and requested it be retained. They considered it was appropriate for the objective to focus on minimising adverse effects of earthworks, rather than avoiding adverse effects, as this is not

⁵⁸ Submission 2495

⁵⁹ N Paragreen, Evidence, paragraphs 3-5

⁶⁰ Submission 2618

⁶¹ Submission 2446

⁶² J Kyle, EIC, paragraph 8.3.1

⁶³ D Anderson, EIC, paragraph 5.2

⁶⁴ K Reilly, EIC, paragraphs 14 & 27

⁶⁵ Submission 2484 lodged jointly by Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited. The statement from Mr John McCall on behalf of the Oil Companies supported the recommendations of Mr Wyeth in relation to the objectives and policies.

⁶⁶ Submission 2457

⁶⁷ Submission 2540

possible in all instances. The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)⁶⁸ supported Objective 25.2.2 and its policies (some of which Mr Wyeth transferred to Objective 25.2.1). Mr Anthony MacColl gave evidence for NZTA. He supported⁶⁹ Mr Wyeth’s recommendations including his amendments.

64. On the basis that we generally recommend the objectives and policies contained in the Reply Version of Chapter 25 are accepted (subject to our specific considerations below), we recommend these submissions in support of the objectives and policies be accepted.

3.3 Objective 25.2.1

65. Remarkables Park Limited (RPL)⁷⁰ and Queenstown Park Limited (QPL)⁷¹ opposed the use of “*minimise*” in Objective 25.2.1 and requested that it be replaced with “*avoid, remedy and mitigate*”. We have noted above the support for “*minimise*” from other submitters.
66. Legal submissions on behalf of RPL and QPL were presented by Ms Rachel Ward. It was her submission⁷² that the requirement to “*minimise*” adverse effects creates uncertainty for plan users, in that it requires a reduction of an adverse effects to an indeterminable level. Even a minor effect may be able to be minimised further. Council officers could challenge whether or not an effect is sufficiently minimised. She submitted that this provides a “quasi-avoidance” regime. Ms Ward supported the concept of “*management*” as being more appropriate, as it lies at the heart of the Act and involves weighing often conflicting considerations to determine, overall, an appropriate outcome in the circumstances.
67. Mr Timothy Williams gave evidence on behalf of RPL and QPL⁷³. In his opinion, the use of the words “*minimise*” and “*protect*” in Mr Wyeth’s amended objective set too high a test, whereas “*management*” with “*remediation or mitigation*” would better reflect a practical and workable approach to earthworks. He acknowledged that “*minimise*” might be the most appropriate approach at a particular policy level, but not across the board at an objective level. He preferred the objective to refer to – “*manage effects on the environment ...*”.
68. Mr Wyeth responded to the legal submissions and the evidence of Mr Williams in both his Rebuttal and Reply evidence, in relation to both Objective 25.2.1 and Policy 25.2.1.2 (which we discuss later in this Report). Mr Wyeth disagreed⁷⁴ with Mr Williams that the word “*minimise*” precludes mitigation and remediation as management options for earthworks, as a range of actions to avoid, mitigate or remediate may be involved, so that the residual adverse effects are the smallest extent practical⁷⁵. It was Mr Wyeth’s opinion⁷⁶ that the word “*manages*” does not provide sufficient clear direction as to how adverse effects of earthworks are intended to be managed. In his Reply evidence⁷⁷, Mr Wyeth noted that “*minimise*” is used in the Strategic Directions Chapters of the PDP, is supported by other submitters, and is used

⁶⁸ Submission 2538

⁶⁹ A MacColl. EIC, paragraphs 5.2-5.3

⁷⁰ Submission 2468

⁷¹ Submission 2462

⁷² Legal submissions from Rachel Ward, paragraphs 4.1-4.4

⁷³ T Williams, EIC, paragraphs 5.1-5.6

⁷⁴ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraph 6.3

⁷⁵ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 9.10, where he provides the plain meaning of “*minimise*” being to reduce (something) to the smallest possible amount or degree.

⁷⁶ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 6.4 & 6.7

⁷⁷ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 15

in other national regional and district planning documents without (in his experience) creating the issues in practice suggested by Ms Ward and Mr Williams.

69. We have considered the evidence of Mr Williams and Mr Wyeth, and the legal submissions from Ms Ward, as to the use of the words “*minimise*” or “*manage*” in Objective 25.2.1. We agree with the evidence of Mr Wyeth that it is the role of an objective to express a clear direction or outcome, as to how adverse effects of earthworks are to be managed. We consider the use of the word “*manage*” does not provide this direction. It does not give any indication as to the purpose, outcome, extent or nature of the “*management*” required. We do not consider this is good practice wording for a plan objective.
70. In addition, we have considered the relevant Strategic Direction in Chapter 3. The relevant objectives and policies provide direction such as “avoid or minimise adverse effects on water quality”; “maintain/sustain/preserve or enhance life-supporting capacity and natural character (of waterbodies); “maintain or enhance water quality”; “protect Kāi Tahu values”⁷⁸. We consider these give a strong direction to Chapter 25 in relation to sediment generation and other adverse effects, including on water quality, landscape, natural character and Ngāi Tahu values. In order to implement the higher order strategic direction, we agree with Mr Wyeth that the objectives in Chapter 25 need to take this direction further by providing clarity as to the outcomes to be achieved. We do not consider that using the word “manage” in Objective 25.2.1 would achieve this direction, nor give sufficient certainty that the strategic direction in Chapter 3 would be achieved. We consider the wording recommended by Mr Wyeth to be more appropriate and more effective in achieving the higher order strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3. We recommend it be accepted and the submissions from RPL and QPL be rejected.
71. Submissions from DoC⁷⁹ and the Real Journeys Group also sought wording amendments to Objective 25.2.1, however, we received no evidence from them on this matter. Accordingly, we accept Mr Wyeth’s recommended wording for this objective in the Reply Version of Chapter 25, and recommend these submissions be rejected.

3.4 Policies 25.2.1.1, 25.2.1.3, 25.2.1.4 & 25.2.1.5

72. Submissions were received on these policies from a range of parties. However, apart from Mr Wyeth, we heard little evidence relating to them.
73. In her evidence for Federated Farmers, Ms Reilly supported⁸⁰ Policy 25.2.1.1. She supported its practical focus on minimising effects of earthworks, rather than avoidance, which she stated is not always achievable.
74. Ms Reilly also commented on Policy 25.2.1.3, which Federated Farmers sought to be deleted. She considered the wording of this policy – “*avoid, where practicable, or remedy or mitigate adverse visual effects of earthworks on visually prominent slopes, natural landforms and ridgelines*”, would entrap standard farming activities such as the maintenance or formation of farm tracks. She considered it would also require landowners to identify all “*visually prominent slopes, natural landforms and ridgelines*”. As Ms Reilly was unable to attend the hearing, we were unable to question her further on this policy. Mr Wyeth responded to Ms Reilly in his Rebuttal evidence⁸¹. He noted that the policy only becomes a relevant

⁷⁸ Strategic Objectives 3.2.4.1, 3.2.4.3, 3.2.4.4, 3.2.5.1 & 3.2.7.1 and Strategic Policies 3.3.21 & 3.3.26

⁷⁹ Submission 2242

⁸⁰ K Reilly, EiC, paragraph 12-14

⁸¹ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 7.1-7,3

consideration when one of the earthworks standards is exceeded (for example: 1000m³ volume threshold in the Rural Zone) and a consent is required. We also note that the maintenance of existing tracks is specifically excluded from the application of the Chapter 25 by Rule 25.3.4.5g. It was Mr Wyeth's opinion that the assessment of effects required for a consent application would enable consideration of this policy without undue mapping or cost implications, or constraints on existing farming activities. We accept the evidence of Mr Wyeth. We agree this policy would not be relevant for farming activities that are exempt from consent requirements, such as maintenance of existing tracks, and earthworks less than 1000m³ in volume. We are not persuaded by Ms Reilly's evidence that it would result in unnecessary costs and consenting requirements for standard farming activities. We recommend that Federated Farmers' submission on Policy 25.2.1.3 be rejected.

75. Millbrook Country Club (Millbrook)⁸² requested that Policy 25.2.1.5 be amended to provide clarity and not repeat assessment matters. In his evidence for Millbrook, Mr John Edmonds stated⁸³ his view that the policy is unnecessary and provides no beneficial assistance or direction. Mr Wyeth agreed⁸⁴ in part that the policy is covered by the Assessment Matters in 25.8 or the other policies. However, he considered the policy still provides useful direction on the need to recognise both the constraints and opportunities of the site and surrounding environment when designing earthworks. We were not persuaded by Mr Edmonds' limited evidence on this policy and accept the evidence of Mr Wyeth that, although its usefulness is limited, it still provides helpful direction when considering resource consents for large-scale earthworks. We recommend this submission from Millbrook be rejected.

3.5 Policy 25.2.1.2

76. Policy 25.2.1.2 addresses management of the effects of earthworks on the valued resources of the District. From the Reply Version, it reads as follows:

25.2.1.2 Manage the adverse effects of earthworks to avoid inappropriate adverse effects and minimise other adverse effects to:

- a. Protect the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;*
- b. Maintain the amenity values of Rural Landscapes;*
- c. Protect the values of Significant Natural Areas and the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands;*
- d. Minimise the exposure of aquifers, in particular the Wakatipu Basin, Hāwea Basin, Wanaka Basin and Cardrona alluvial ribbon aquifers;*

Advice note: *These aquifers are identified in the Otago Regional Plan: Water for Otago 2004.*

- e. Protect Māori cultural values, including wāhi tapu and wāhi tūpuna and other sites of significance to Māori;*
- f. Protect the values of heritage sites, precincts and landscape overlays from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and*
- g. Maintain public access to and along lakes and rivers.*

77. DoC⁸⁵ supported the policy and requested that it be retained as it would protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from adverse effects.

⁸² Submission 2295

⁸³ J Edmonds, EiC, paragraph 14

⁸⁴ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 9.34-9.35

⁸⁵ Submission 2242

78. The Real Journeys Group requested that the notified policy be amended to ensure the matters are identified as “values” rather than “resources”, better reflecting the range of matters included in the policy. A number of submitters⁸⁶ requested that Policy 25.2.1.2 be amended to replace “protect” with “minimise” as they considered “protect” was overly restrictive. Similarly, Federated Farmers requested that “protect” be replaced with “maintain or enhance”. Paterson Pitts requested that clause b. of the notified policy be amended by deleting the reference to other identified amenity landscapes, as it was unclear what landscapes were being referred to.
79. Having considered this group of submissions, Mr Wyeth agreed that the notified Policy 25.2.1.2 could be refined to better reflect the direction in Objective 25.2.1 and better align with sections 6 and 7 of the Act. He agreed with the suggestion from the Real Journeys Group to refer to the values of the resources, rather than the features themselves. He agreed with Paterson Pitts and amended the wording of clause b. to refer to Rural Landscapes which are mapped⁸⁷. In addition, Mr Wyeth recommended rewording the introductory lines of the policy to focus on managing adverse effects from earthworks, rather than protecting the identified valued resources themselves; and refining the first words of each clause to better align with the Act. Mr Wyeth’s recommended amendments are included in the Reply Version set out above.
80. With the changes recommended by Mr Wyeth, Mr Henderson for the Treble Cone Group⁸⁸ and Ms Reilly for Federated Farmers⁸⁹ supported the amended wording of Policy 25.2.1.2.
81. As with his evidence on Objective 25.2.1, Mr Williams for RPL and QPL⁹⁰ supported restricting the wording of Policy 25. 2.1.2 to “*Manage the adverse effects of earthworks ..*” (followed by the series of clauses) and removing the words referring to avoidance or minimising adverse effects. Mr Williams noted that the introductory wording of Policy 25.2.1.2 is followed by a number of sub-clauses dealing with specific identified valued resources, with varying degrees of management control for each. He considered the first part of the policy could be better worded to acknowledge the management of adverse effects, but then letting each of the sub-clauses address the particular degree of management. Mr Williams also pointed out that clause b. relating to amenity values of Rural Landscapes, and clause g. relating to public access, both included the words “maintain and enhance” in the notified policy. In his opinion, the use of “enhance” does not sit comfortably with a proposal for an earthworks activity, where typically it is the maintenance of amenity or public access that is to be achieved, and enhancement would be an unnecessary requirement. Mr Williams supported the deletion of the words “*and enhance*” from both of these clauses.
82. We have partly discussed Mr Wyeth’s evidence in response to Mr Williams above, as it related to Objective 25.2.1. In that discussion, we agreed that the use of the word “*manage*” would not provide a clear direction or outcome as to how adverse effects of earthworks are to be managed. We also found that “*manage*” would not achieve the strong direction contained in the Strategic Objectives and Policies, nor give sufficient certainty that the strategic direction

⁸⁶ Including the Treble Cone Group and associated Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382; Submissions 2468 and 2462)

⁸⁷ We note that these are now mapped as Rural Character Landscapes in PDP (Decisions Version)

⁸⁸ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 66

⁸⁹ K Reilly, EiC, paragraph 19

⁹⁰ T Williams, EiC, paragraphs 5.4-5.6

in Chapter 3 would be achieved. In addition, in relation to Policy 25.2.1.2, Mr Wyeth stated⁹¹ that the reference to “*inappropriate adverse effects*” (from the notified version of the policy) should be read in the context of the clauses that follow. In his view, these clauses provide added direction that inappropriate adverse effects are those effects that do not protect or maintain the values and areas referred to in those clauses, and that it is these adverse effects that should be avoided. Mr Wyeth considered this wording provides clearer direction than the wording recommended by Mr Williams. Mr Wyeth did, however, agree with Mr Williams about the reference to “*enhance*” in clauses b. and g., and recommended their deletion.

83. For the Real Journeys Group, Mr Farrell⁹² generally supported Mr Wyeth’s recommended amendments to Policy 25.2.1.2, except he considered the word “help” should be added to the end of the introductory two lines, in order to prevent the policy being too onerous. Mr Wyeth did not agree⁹³ with Mr Farrell on this matter, stating that the inclusion of the qualifier “help” is unnecessary and would inappropriately ‘water down’ the policy. In his opinion, Policy 25.2.1.2 is intended to focus on protecting the values that contribute to the outstanding and significant nature of the District’s features, landscapes and areas. He considered the structure of the policy, with the phrase “*avoid inappropriate adverse effects and minimise other adverse effects*” in the introductory lines, makes it clear that absolute avoidance of adverse effects is not required to protect these values. However, on reflection, Mr Wyeth considered that the use of the word “*protect*” (as notified) in relation to heritage sites, precincts and landscape overlays may be overly restrictive, and he recommended a qualification be added to clause f.
84. The remaining disagreements are between Mr Wyeth, Mr Farrell and Mr Williams. Otherwise, all the planning evidence and associated legal submissions support the amended wording for Policy 25.2.1.2 recommended by Mr Wyeth in the Reply Version.
85. The Panel has considered the evidence of Mr Williams and Mr Wyeth regarding this introductory wording for Policy 25.2.1.2. As we have stated above, we do not agree that just referring to the “management” of adverse effects would be effective in achieving Objective 25.2.1 or the higher order strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3. In saying that, we also acknowledge Mr Williams’ concern about interpreting the somewhat convoluted wording of Policy 25.2.1.2. We agree with Mr Wyeth that the reference to “*inappropriate adverse effects*” should be read in the context of the clauses that follow, meaning that inappropriate adverse effects are those effects that do not protect or maintain the values and areas, as referred to in the following clauses. It is our understanding that this is generally consistent with the way that similar wording has been interpreted in higher order planning documents, such as Policies 13 and 15 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. However, we consider the addition of the words “*in a way that*” at the end of the opening phrase of the policy would further clarify the connection between this opening phrase and the subsequent clauses, and allow it to be more readily interpreted in the way Mr Wyeth explained.
86. In relation to Mr Farrell’s final suggested amendment, we did not find his evidence sufficiently detailed or persuasive and we prefer the approach of Mr Wyeth. We agree with Mr Wyeth that the structure and detailed wording of the policy has now been considerably improved from the notified version, and it is clear from the wording of the policy that absolute avoidance of adverse effects is not required to protect the identified values.

⁹¹ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 6.6-6.9

⁹² B Farrell, EiC, paragraphs 19-20

⁹³ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 4.1-4.3

87. As a result, we recommend that Mr Wyeth’s recommended Policy 25.2.1.2 in the Reply Version is accepted, subject to minor rewording, and that the associated submissions are accepted, other than those from the Real Journeys Group, RPL and QPL which are accepted in part.

3.6 Objective 25.2.2

88. We have previously discussed most of the submissions on Objective 25.2.2, when we considered the reconfiguration of this objective and its associated policies, with Objective 25.2.1. We have recommended the reconfiguration of the objectives and policies included in the Reply Version be accepted and the submissions accepted accordingly. There are two remaining submissions on Objective 25.2.2 for us to consider.

89. Federated Farmers⁹⁴ supported Objective 25.2.2 in part, but requested the wording be amended to provide for “appropriate management” rather than “protection” from adverse effects. This aspect of the notified objective referred to “*the wellbeing of people and communities*” being “*protected from adverse effects*”. Mr Wyeth’s reconfiguration of this Objective resulted in this part being transferred to Objective 25.2.1, with the relevant wording being slightly reconfigured to read – “*Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that ... protects people and communities, ...*”. With the amendments from Mr Wyeth, Ms Reilly’s evidence supported⁹⁵ the Reply Version of Objective 25.2.2.

90. Ian Dee⁹⁶ requested Objective 25.2.2 be strengthened to reduce the destruction of soil during earthworks. Mr Dee was concerned at the destruction of soil structure and physical properties that have taken thousands of years to form. He did not present evidence to us. Mr Wyeth addressed this submission but did not consider any amendments were needed as a result. We accept Mr Wyeth’s evidence on this, and recommend this submission be rejected. We recommend that Objective 25.2.2 included in the Reply Version be accepted.

3.7 Policy 25.2.2.1

91. Following Mr Wyeth’s recommended configuration, this would be the only policy remaining under Objective 25.2.2, focussing on enabling earthworks that are necessary to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities. In the Reply Version, Policy 25.2.2.1 read as follows:

- 25.2.2.1 Enable earthworks that are necessary to provide for people and communities wellbeing, having particular regard to the importance of:*
- a. Nationally and Regionally Significant Infrastructure;*
 - b. tourism infrastructure and activities, including the continued operation, and provision for future sensitive development of recreation and tourism activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones and the vehicle testing facility within the Waiorau Ski Area Sub Zone;*
 - c. minimising the risk of natural hazards;*
 - d. enhancing the operational efficiency of farming including maintenance and improvement of track access and fencing; and*
 - e. the use and enjoyment of land for recreation, including public walkways and trails.*

92. Several submissions⁹⁷, particularly those from the infrastructure companies, supported Policy 25.2.2.1 and asked that it be retained.

⁹⁴ Submission 2540

⁹⁵ K Reilly, EiC, paragraph 27

⁹⁶ Submission 2327

⁹⁷ For example Submissions 2242, 2194, 2195, 2478, 2538, 2442 and 2540)

93. A large number of submissions⁹⁸ requested that Policy 25.2.2.1 be amended to remove the notified reference to being “*Subject to Objective 25.2.1*”. In the notified version of this policy, Policy 25.2.2.1 was stated as being subject to Objective 25.2.1, such that the enabling of earthworks necessary to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities was subject to the direction in Objective 25.2.1 regarding the management of adverse effects from earthworks. Mr Wyeth agreed⁹⁹ with these submitters that the words “*subject to Objective 25.2.1*” should be removed from Policy 25.2.2.1. He stated that his understanding of the intent of the PDP, and from his experience in interpreting objectives and policies, is that all the relevant objectives and policies are to be read together, with appropriate weighting give to each depending on the subject matter and the level of direction given. In conjunction with his recommendations for reconfiguring the two objectives and their policies, Mr Wyeth considered that removing these words from Policy 25.2.2.1 would help ensure there is an appropriate balance between the policies under the two objectives. We accept the evidence on this matter from Mr Wyeth, with support from the evidence of Ms Reilly¹⁰⁰, Mr Henderson¹⁰¹ and Mr Farrell¹⁰². We agree with Mr Wyeth’s understanding as to how the objectives and policies should be interpreted. We recommend that the words “*Subject to Objective 25.2.1*” be removed from the notified Policy 25.2.2.1, and that these submissions be accepted.

94. Millbrook sought further recognition of tourism infrastructure in Policy 25.2.2.1b., in particular that golf tourism be referred to. Mr Wyeth did not recommend any amendments as a result of this submission, and in his evidence, Mr Edmonds¹⁰³ accepted Mr Wyeth’s recommended policy wording. We, therefore, recommend that this submission from Millbrook be rejected.

95. As a result, we recommend that the Reply Version of Policy 25.2.2.1 be accepted.

3.8 Policies 25.2.2.2 - 25.2.2.3 (renumbered in the Reply Version as Policies 25.2.1.6 - 25.2.1.11

96. Other than on the matter of relocating these policies under Objective 25.2.1, we received very little evidence regarding them. Transpower New Zealand Limited supported Policy 25.2.2.2; Paterson Pitts supported Policy 25.2.2.3; and Federated Farmers supported Policy 25.2.2.7. We accept the evidence from Mr Wyeth on these policies¹⁰⁴ and recommend they be retained in Chapter 25, but relocated to sit under Objective 25.2.1, as we have discussed earlier. We recommend these submissions in support be accepted.

3.9 Additional Objective and Policies focussed on Enabling Earthworks in SASZ

97. NZSki submitted that, in contrast to the ODP, notified Chapter 25 did not contain specific objectives and policies for the SASZs that support the notified exemptions from some of the rules for earthworks in those areas. The submission from NZSki provided recommended wording for a new objective and two supporting policies. Mr Wyeth¹⁰⁵ did not consider it was necessary or appropriate to include a specific set of objective and policies for earthworks in the SASZs. In his opinion, the Chapter 25 objectives and policies apply across the District and

⁹⁸ For example: the Real Journeys Group; the Treble Cone Group and associated Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382; and Submissions 2388, 2575, 2468, 2462 and 2295

⁹⁹ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 10.16-10.17

¹⁰⁰ K Reilly, EiC, paragraph 29

¹⁰¹ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 66

¹⁰² B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 18

¹⁰³ J Edmonds, EiC, paragraph 15

¹⁰⁴ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 10.20-10.25

¹⁰⁵ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 8.6 & 8.27

are focussed on managing adverse effects of earthworks regardless of the zone, which also provided for the benefits of earthworks. He recommended the submission from NZSki be rejected. We also note that Policy 25.2.2.1 includes specific recognition of the importance of *“tourism infrastructure and activities, including the continued operation, and provision for future sensitive development of recreation and tourism activities in Ski Area Sub Zones.* We consider this to be sufficient recognition of the importance of SASZs and the earthworks required for their continued operation and future development. Mr Dent gave evidence for NZSki. Having considered Mr Wyeth’s opinion on this matter, Mr Dent agreed that the objectives and policies apply across the District and it is not necessary to add further provision to specifically identify the SASZs. We, therefore, recommend this submission be rejected.

4. SECTION 25.3 - OTHER PROVISIONS AND RULES

4.1 Overview

98. Section 25.3 includes a variety of general provisions and rules that apply within Chapter 25, including:

- Cross-references to other Chapters of the PDP where earthworks are also addressed, with explanation as to how they relate to each other;
- Advice notes regarding ORC provisions;
- Other Advice notes drawing attention to other relevant matters, both within the PDP and from other documents or statutes;
- General rules for earthworks associated with subdivision, including some exemptions;
- General rules for earthworks within SASZs, including some exemptions;
- How the volume and area of earthworks are to be calculated;
- Exemptions for some earthworks within the Rural, Gibbston Character and Rural Lifestyle Zones within approved building platforms;
- General exemptions from all rules and standards for earthworks associated with specified activities.

99. Before we consider the submissions on this section, the Panel notes that the format and headings for Section 25.3 are not consistent with the decided Stage 1 Chapters. A generally consistent approach was taken to these sections containing general provisions and rules, and this has not been picked up or recommended by the Council for these Stage 2 Chapters. We consider it would be beneficial for consistent understanding and interpretation of the PDP, if these sections in each Chapter were generally consistent. Accordingly, we have amended Section 25.3 in accordance with clause 16(2), without changing the intent and content of the Section.

4.2 Advice Notes

100. Mr Wyeth has recommended substantial changes to the layout and wording of the Advice Notes in Section 25.3 in response to submissions¹⁰⁶, or as minor or structural changes¹⁰⁷ that do not change the intent and effect of the provisions. These changes include:

- clarifying the paragraphs which describe the relationships between Chapter 25 and earthworks (and effects from earthworks) managed under Chapters 26, 30, 33 and 36;
- widening the range of activities listed as being subject to the Water Plan in the advice notes relating to the ORC’s provisions;
- adding an advice note regarding recorded archaeological sites;

¹⁰⁶ The Real Journeys Group; the Treble Cone Group and associated Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382; and Submissions 2194, 2195, 2478, 2442, 2497, 2618, 2446 and 2484

¹⁰⁷ In accordance with Clause 16(2)

- adding an advice note referring to the NES-PF which applies to earthworks associated with plantation forestry;
- rationalising the extensive list of notified advice notes into:
 - those that are district wide information as to how the provisions in the different Chapters relate to each other, moving these under 25.3.1 District Wide;
 - those that are truly Advice Notes for Chapter 25; and
 - those that are general rules (the calculation of earthworks volume and area), moving these under 25.3.3 General Rules.

101. We heard little evidence on these matters, other than from Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich¹⁰⁸. In the main, Mr Wyeth recommended the submissions be accepted.
102. Mr Farrell¹⁰⁹ for the Real Journeys Group considered that Mr Wyeth’s initial amendments (to the general rules clarifying the relationships between Chapters) were still unclear and suggested some further amendments. The Panel also questioned the wording suggested by Mr Wyeth in his Rebuttal version of Chapter 25. Mr Wyeth reconsidered this in his Reply evidence and made further amendments, which we now consider are sufficiently clear and precise.
103. We recommend these submissions be accepted and Mr Wyeth’s amendments be generally adopted, although as we stated above, we have recommended changes to the format and headings for Section 25.3 for consistency with the decided Stage 1 Chapters.

4.3 General Exemptions (other than for SASZs)

4.3.1 Exemptions for Earthworks associated with Subdivision

104. The relationship between Chapter 25 and subdivision consent applications that involve earthworks under Chapter 27 is set out in General Rule 25.3.4.1 and in Rule 27.3.2.1 (which was varied through Stage 2). The notified Rule 25.3.4.1 provided exemptions for earthworks associated with controlled and restricted discretionary activity subdivisions from earthworks standards relating to volume (Table 25.2), cut and fill (Rules 25.5.16 & 25.5.17). Mr Wyeth explained that the rationale for this exemption (from the Section 32 Report) is that the effects from these aspects of earthworks can be managed as part of the overall assessment of subdivision design and construction, however, other standards (such as setbacks from waterbodies) should be complied with irrespective of the reason for the earthworks.
105. Submitters¹¹⁰ sought that the exemption for subdivision earthworks be widened – to apply to all subdivisions, and to extend to other standards in Chapter 25; and that the related cross-references in both Chapters 25 and 27 should be clear and consistent. During questioning, the Panel also identified a number of issues associated with the relationship between the earthworks provisions in Chapter 25 and earthworks associated with subdivision.
106. Mr Wyeth¹¹¹ agreed with these submitters that the relationship between the two chapters, in terms earthworks associated with subdivision, is not clear and that the wording could be improved and made consistent between Chapters 25 and 27. Mr Wyeth considered this

¹⁰⁸ In relation to the method for calculating earthworks volumes, T Sunich, EiC, paragraphs 6.13-6.14. No evidence was presented on behalf of the Treble Cone Group opposing Mr Sunich’s opinion on this matter.

¹⁰⁹ B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 21

¹¹⁰ The Treble Cone Group and associated Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382; and Submission 2311

¹¹¹ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, 8.28-8.47

relationship further in his Reply evidence¹¹². Given the limited scope available for amendments through the submissions, Mr Wyeth recommended minor amendments to Rule 25.3.4.1 to make a clearer distinction between subdivision consents under Chapter 27 and earthworks land use consents under Chapter 25. We accept Mr Wyeth's evidence on this matter. We recommend his amendments to Rule 25.3.4.1 and that these submissions be accepted. For the sake of consistency, we also recommend that the same, or closely similar, wording should be applied to Rule 27.3.2.1.

107. Mr Wyeth also agreed that all subdivisions, irrespective of the activity status, should be exempt from the volume, cut and fill standards, on the basis that there is no clear connection between the activity status and the need for compliance with these standards. We accept his evidence on this matter and recommend the submissions be accepted.
108. Mr Wyeth did not agree that subdivisions involving earthworks should be exempt from all earthworks standards. It was Mr Wyeth's preference that all Chapter 25 standards should be applied to earthworks associated with subdivision, including the volume, cut and fill standards. He referred to the evidence of Mr Sunich¹¹³ that it is established good practice throughout New Zealand to have a standalone set of earthworks rules to manage all earthworks activities through separate consent processes, irrespective of whether the earthworks are associated with subdivision or not. In his opinion, this recognises the unique set of effects from earthworks, that can occur at various stages of development. He also referred to Mr Sunich's recent review of erosion and sediment control practices for a cross-section of residential developments in the District, and that current practice was found to be limited and below best practice adopted elsewhere in New Zealand. However, Mr Wyeth acknowledged there was no scope in the submissions to apply all Chapter 25 standards to earthworks associated with subdivisions. Given his overall opinion, Mr Wyeth remained opposed to further exemptions for subdivisions. Mr Henderson gave evidence¹¹⁴ on this matter for the Treble Cone Group and associated submitters¹¹⁵. Having considered Mr Wyeth's evidence and his recommended amendments, he concluded that Mr Wyeth's amendments to Rule 25.3.4.1 were appropriate. We did not hear evidence from Streat Developments Limited on this matter and recommend its submission be rejected, with no further exemptions from the Chapter 25 standards being applied to earthworks associated with subdivision.

4.3.2 *Exemptions for Forestry Earthworks in Open Space and Recreation Zones*

109. Skyline¹¹⁶ requested that earthworks for forestry activities in the Open Space and Recreation Zones, including the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, be exempt through Rule 25.3.4.5. Mr Dent gave evidence¹¹⁷ supporting this exemption, on the grounds that earthworks for this activity are able to be undertaken without consent via an approved Outline Plan under the existing designation for Ben Lomond; and that notified Chapter 38 provides for harvesting and management of forestry as a controlled activity in the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone with Council retaining control over earthworks (as well as soil erosion, sediment generation and run-off). In his opinion, making forestry earthworks a restricted discretionary activity in Chapter 25 defeats the purpose of the controlled activity status for the overall activity in Chapter 38.

¹¹² J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 9

¹¹³ T Sunich, EiC, paragraphs 4.2-4.4

¹¹⁴ R Henderson, EiC, paragraphs 72-74 & 93

¹¹⁵ Treble Cone Group and Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382

¹¹⁶ Submission 2493

¹¹⁷ S Dent, EiC, paragraphs 111-117

110. Mr Jeffrey Brown provided rebuttal evidence, on behalf of ZJV (NZ) Limited (ZJV), to the evidence from Mr Dent on this matter. Mr Brown disagreed with Mr Dent that earthworks associated with forestry harvesting and management should be exempt from the earthworks rules and standards. In his opinion, the earthworks required for forest harvesting may involve large cuts and fills, on steep land, to create access for machinery. He considered this has the potential to adversely affect land resources and the other users of the Ben Lomond Reserve. He considered an assessment of the effects of earthworks should be a necessary component of the forestry harvesting consenting process.
111. In addressing the submission¹¹⁸, Mr Wyeth noted that rules relating to forestry activities in the PDP are now largely superseded by the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF), which will manage earthworks, erosion and sedimentation associated with plantation forestry. Mr Wyeth acknowledged, however, these national standards would not apply in open space and recreation zones in urban areas (which he considered would include the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone). In his Rebuttal evidence¹¹⁹, Mr Wyeth stated that Mr Dent had provided no evidence to support this submission, either for the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone or for the Open Space and Recreation Zones as a whole. He retained his position that it is inappropriate to include specific exemptions for forestry earthworks in Rule 25.3.4.5.
112. We agree with Mr Wyeth that where a recently-introduced national regulation has established specific provisions for forestry earthworks, the PDP should not duplicate, and cannot circumvent, those national standards¹²⁰. Outside urban areas, the NES-PF now includes national rules relating to plantation forestry activities, which over-ride any provisions in the PDP. In other areas, or for forestry earthworks that fall outside the NES-PF, the PDP may include rules, and the NES-PF allows a plan to impose stricter rules in areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes and in significant natural areas.
113. We note that the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone falls substantially within an ONL. We consider that a full exemption from Chapter 25 for forestry earthworks in such an area would not be consistent with achieving the PDP's objectives and policies for ONL. The Section 32 Report prepared for the notified Chapter 25 considered the benefits and costs, effectiveness and efficiency of the notified range of exemptions in Rule 25.3.4.5. It stated that the exemptions are identified to facilitate small-scale activities that would have no, or only negligible, adverse effects. It concluded that the provisions would ensure that the effects from these activities are no more than minor and avoided as far as practicable. The rules were not considered to be overly-restrictive and commensurate with the sensitivity of the District's environment. We agree with Mr Wyeth that the evidence from Mr Dent is insufficient for us to consider¹²¹ an additional exemption for forestry earthworks in the Open Space and Recreation Zones or on Ben Lomond. We do not have evidence of the potential for adverse effects, and the costs and benefits involved, in order for us to properly assess their efficiency and effectiveness in achieving the relevant objectives and policies. We also agree with Mr Brown that such effects could be adverse on Ben Lomond. Accordingly, we recommend this submission from Skyline be rejected.

¹¹⁸ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 8.67-8.71

¹¹⁹ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 5.19-5.21

¹²⁰ We note that Mr Wyeth has recommended including an Advice Note in 25.3.3 referring to the NES-PF, which we agree is appropriate

¹²¹ In terms of s32AA of the Act

4.3.3 Other Exemptions

114. Various other submitters either supported the exemptions from the earthworks provisions contained in Rules 25.3.4.4 and 25.3.4.5, or sought additional exemptions. These are summarised in the evidence of Mr Wyeth¹²² and we will not repeat them here. Mr Wyeth responded to each of the requests for extended exemptions¹²³. In terms of smaller scale farming activities, he considered that the volume thresholds for earthworks in the Rural Zone are set at a level that would enable day-to-day farming activities without a consent being required. He agreed that there should be further clarification that the exemption for maintenance of existing tracks, also applies to recreational tracks / trails. He also noted that there are no volume limits, or cut and fill standards, for earthworks associated with the construction and maintenance of roads within a legal road. The remaining disagreements between Mr Wyeth and submitters related to exemptions for planting (in addition to riparian planting) and the scale of cut and fill exemptions for earthworks associated with fencing.
115. Ms Fiona Black gave evidence¹²⁴ for the Real Journeys Group regarding the exemption sought for planting. Notified Rule 25.3.4.5f.¹²⁵ provided an exemption from the earthworks rules for planting riparian vegetation. Ms Black requested that this be extended to all planting, and not just riparian. She gave an example, and photographs, of an extensive restoration project Real Journeys is undertaking at Walter Peak, planting over 12,000 native trees and shrubs, with more to come throughout the 115 ha property. It was her opinion that such restoration projects should be able to proceed without the need for resource consent for the earthworks. Mr Wyeth responded to this submission¹²⁶ stating that the submitter had not provided any clear reasons why earthworks associated with planting should be exempt from the earthworks rules and, in his opinion, there was no policy justification for doing so. He considered that the focus of the exemption should remain on riparian planting. Whilst we acknowledge the point raised by Ms Black, we do not consider we have sufficient information regarding the costs and benefits of making this change to be able to undertake an evaluation in terms of s32AA of the Act. We are mindful that large areas of the District are identified as ONLs and ONF's and that the implications of such a change for achieving the PDP's landscape objectives and policies would need to be carefully considered. Accordingly, we recommend that this submission be rejected.
116. Mr Williams gave evidence for QPL¹²⁷ regarding earthworks exemptions for the maintenance and construction of fence lines. Notified Rule 25.3.4.5m.¹²⁸ provided an exemption from the earthworks rules for fencing in the rural zones, provided any cut or fill does not exceed 1 metre in height and any land disturbance does not exceed 1 metre in width. Mr Williams sought that the provisos be extended to relax the 1 metre cut threshold, to a maximum of 2 metres width but not exceeding an average of 1 metre along the length of the fence line. He considered this would be a more practical and useful exemption. Mr Williams gave examples from fence lines QPL is developing on hill slopes on its property, where it is difficult to form an adequate bench for the fence line within a 1 metre width and where the 1m cut height is so restrictive as to largely prohibit the construction of new fences. As an alternative, Mr Williams suggested a controlled activity status for fencing that exceeds the exemption thresholds.

¹²² J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 8.48-8.58

¹²³ *ibid*, paragraphs 8.59-8.66

¹²⁴ F Black, EiC, paragraph 48

¹²⁵ Rule 25.3.4.5e. in the Reply Version

¹²⁶ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 8.66

¹²⁷ T Williams, EiC, paragraphs 5.9-5.16

¹²⁸ Rule 25.3.4.5l. in the Reply Version

117. Mr Wyeth responded to Mr Williams in his Rebuttal and Reply evidence. He considered¹²⁹ the exemption for fencing in Rule 25.3.4.5 (from all Chapter 25 rules and standards) is appropriate and noted that fencing that exceeds the exemption is not prohibited and neither will it necessarily require a consent. Beyond the exemption threshold, if earthworks associated with fencing meet the earthworks volume threshold for the zone (1000m³ in the Rural Zone) as well as the other standards in Rule 25.5, it would not require a consent. With respect to the alternative controlled activity regime, Mr Wyeth expressed concern¹³⁰ that this would require amendments to the earthworks volume, cut and fill thresholds in Tables 25.2 and 25.3, so that non-compliance is a controlled activity for fencing earthworks, whereas it is a restricted discretionary for all other earthworks. He considered this distinction would be difficult to justify from an effects' perspective, and on the evidence presented by Mr Williams.
118. Having considered the legal submissions and evidence on behalf of QPL and the responses from Mr Wyeth, we find that we agree with Mr Wyeth. We consider the notified exemption for fencing in Rule 25.3.4.5 is sufficient. We have not received sufficient justification from Mr Williams to satisfy us regarding the nature and scale of effects on the environment from a wider exemption (which would be from all Chapter 25 standards), or that it would be more appropriate (efficient or effective) in achieving the objectives and policies of Chapters 3 and 25, in particular Objective 25.2.1 and Policies 25.2.1.1 to 25.2.1.4. We accept Mr Wyeth's evidence that there is an appropriate pathway for fencing earthworks that do not meet the exemption, either as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity. In terms of the controlled activity approach, we received insufficient evidence from Mr Williams as to how this would be integrated into the Chapter 25 provisions, or how it would more appropriately achieve the relevant objectives and policies. We recommend that this submission be rejected.

4.4 Exemptions for Earthworks in SASZs

119. As stated earlier in this Report, a group of submitters¹³¹, with interests in ski areas, made general submissions seeking that SASZs be exempt from the earthworks rules in Chapter 25, particularly where the ski areas are located on conservation or public lands; or where there is overlap with controls from ORC. We have already found that Chapter 25 (subject to our specific recommendations for any amendments) provides a more appropriate and effective method for achieving the relevant Strategic directions of the PDP, compared with relying on controls and approvals from ORC or DoC, or under other Chapters of the PDP. We were satisfied that Chapter 25 does not result in unnecessary or undue duplication with ORC or DoC processes (or with other requirements of the PDP), but rather they complement each other. We consider there would be a significant risk from not including controls over earthworks in the PDP (and relying on those alternative processes) in terms of adverse effects on water quality, landscape, natural character, biodiversity and amenity values (amongst other adverse effects). We are also satisfied that the PDP can include earthworks provisions that are more stringent than those in PC49, which provided a wide-ranging exemption from earthworks rules for SASZs.
120. We now turn to whether or not a full exemption for earthworks within SASZs, from all rules and standards in Chapter 25, is more appropriate than the partial exemption included in Rule 25.3.4.2 of the notified chapter¹³². We evaluate the evidence on these alternatives in terms

¹²⁹ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 6.10-6.12

¹³⁰ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 16

¹³¹ Submissions 2454, 2493, 2466, 2494, 2581, 2492, 2373, 2384 and 2376

¹³² Rule 25.3.4.2 of the Notified Chapter provided an exemption for earthworks within the SASZ from all rules and standards except Rules 25.5.12 to 25.5.14, that control erosion and sediment, deposition of material on roads, and dust; Rule 25.5.20, setbacks from waterbodies; and Rule 25.5.21, exposing

of the statutory tests and Section 32 of the Act, bearing in mind that we have already found that controls through the ORC Water Plan, DoC approval processes and/or rules in other chapters of the PDP do not provide appropriate alternatives.

121. Mr Wyeth¹³³ provided a summary of the submissions received on Rule 25.3.4.2. We will not repeat that here, other than to note that DoC¹³⁴ supported the notified exemptions for SASZs in this rule, and the submissions seeking a wider exemption came predominantly from NZSki, the Real Journeys Group and the Treble Cone Group. The evidence and legal submissions from these submitters focussed predominantly on the alternative approaches we have already considered. Mr Henderson's evidence for the Treble Cone Group¹³⁵ on this matter supported the exemption for SASZs, on the basis of inefficient duplication of process with ORC, DoC and/or other PDP controls. Mr Farrell's evidence for the Real Journeys Group¹³⁶ on this matter focussed only on the matter of overlapping QLDC and ORC responsibilities. NZSki's submission was specific that an exemption for earthworks in a SASZ should only apply within public conservation land administered by DoC. Accordingly, Mr Dent's evidence¹³⁷ predominantly focussed on overlap with DoC approval processes¹³⁸. We have considered this evidence earlier in this Report and have not considered it further here.
122. We have considered the legal submissions on a full exemption for SASZs from Ms Baker-Galloway, on behalf of the Real Journeys Group and the Treble Cone Group, these submissions being very similar¹³⁹. Ms Baker-Galloway informed us that the exception from earthworks rules and standards in SASZs is intended to recognise the benefits of earthworks for the continued operation and development of ski areas, and the substantial contribution ski fields make to the social and economic well being of the District. She stated that earthworks are a necessary part of the development and ongoing operation of these areas, and that the exemption should be broad enough to enable and encompass all earthworks likely to be undertaken during the operation of modern ski-fields, which are now year-round alpine resorts. She pointed to some 'unique' factors relating to earthworks in SASZs, such as the need to undertake earthworks near waterbodies for snow making, reservoirs, diversion of streams, etc.
123. As we mentioned earlier, Ms Baker-Galloway referred us to case law which supports a less restrictive regime that meets the purpose of the Act and the objectives of a Plan. She also pointed to inefficiencies, in terms of drafting difficulties, uncertainty, potential costs and issues with enforcement, if the notified standards are applied within SASZs, making this level of regulation unnecessary and a complete exemption more appropriate.
124. With respect to dust controls in SASZs under Standard 25.5.14, it was Mr Dent 's evidence¹⁴⁰ that there are no operational issues relating to dust at NZSki's ski fields. The ski fields are generally located above 1300 masl and there are no sensitive receivers immediately adjacent

groundwater. We note, however, that Mr Wyeth has recommended deleting Rule 25.5.13, relating to deposition of material on roads, and this rule is shown as deleted in the Reply Version.

¹³³ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 8.3-8.13

¹³⁴ Submission 2242

¹³⁵ R Henderson, EiC, paragraphs 88-91

¹³⁶ B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 22

¹³⁷ S Dent, EiC, paragraphs 48-65, 84-97

¹³⁸ We have considered Mr Dent's evidence relating to dust management within SASZs, Sean Dent, EiC, paragraphs 77-83

¹³⁹ Legal Submissions from Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Real Journeys Group, paragraphs 16-20; and on behalf of the Treble Cone Group, paragraphs 6-12

¹⁴⁰ S Dent, EiC, paragraphs 77-83

to these SASZs that would typically be affected by nuisance effects from dust emissions beyond the SASZ boundaries. He considered the application of this standard would only ever be retrospective and would result in enforcement difficulties. We discuss this further later in this Report when we evaluate the specific wording of this Standard.

125. Mr Nigel Paragreen presented a written statement¹⁴¹ to the hearing on behalf of Fish and Game and answered questions from the Panel. As we noted earlier, Fish and Game had supported the Council's stricter approach to earthworks management through Chapter 25. The Panel asked Mr Paragreen about his experience with earthworks management within SASZs and the potential for adverse effects on the environment. He informed us that he was assessing a couple of applications relating to ski fields at the time of our hearing. He considered that earthworks associated with ski fields do have the potential for significant effects in the high country. He stated that the areas involved contain very sensitive ecosystems that merit protection under the Act and the PDP. On behalf of Fish and Game, he expressed his opposition to the Council having no involvement with managing earthworks in SASZs through the PDP.
126. Mr Wyeth responded to these submissions and the evidence. In his Section 42A Report¹⁴² he stated that he did not dispute the substantial contribution from ski fields to the social and economic wellbeing of the District, and that earthworks are a necessary part. As a result, he considered it was appropriate for the PDP to enable development and a range of activities within the SASZs, as recognised through the Chapter 21 Rural Zone provisions for SASZs. In terms of earthworks, he considered an enabling approach is achieved through exempting earthworks in SASZs from the majority of rules and standards in Chapter 25. He considered the exemptions from the volume, area, cut and fill thresholds provide considerable flexibility to ski field operators, recognising that the volume of earthworks required at ski fields can be significant, but that adverse effects can largely be internalised within the SASZs. However, Mr Wyeth could see no compelling reason why earthworks within SASZs should be exempt from standards that are designed to manage and minimise the adverse effects of earthworks that may extend beyond the sub-zones or to sensitive areas, including riparian areas and waterbodies. In his opinion, these are standards that should apply equally throughout the District, regardless of the zone or activity involved.
127. Mr Wyeth pointed us to the purpose of SASZs in Chapter 21 Rural, which refers to effects of development within the SASZs being cumulatively minor. He considered there is a risk that exempting all earthworks within the SASZs from all rules and standards in Chapter 25 may result in adverse effects that are cumulatively more than minor, or which extend beyond the boundary of these areas or into sensitive areas.
128. Mr Wyeth also referred¹⁴³ to the Section 32 Report that sets out the rationale for the approach to SASZs. It states that the notified option permitted earthworks for activities within SASZs, except where there is potential for environmental effects on water bodies and roads. As we noted earlier in relation to earthworks in Open Space and Recreation Zones, the Section 32 Report concluded the provisions are both effective and efficient, with the levels of control commensurate with the sensitivity of the environment, and that they would ensure the effects from these activities are no more than minor and avoided as far as practicable.

¹⁴¹ N Paragreen, Evidence

¹⁴² J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 8.14-8.19

¹⁴³ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraph 8.2

129. We have considered the evidence before us, the legal submissions and our previous findings regarding alternative approaches to managing effects within the SASZs. Like Mr Wyeth, we do not dispute the substantial contribution from ski fields to the social and economic wellbeing of the District, and that earthworks are a necessary part of their ongoing operation and development. We consider that the considerable flexibility provided in notified Chapter 25, with exemptions from the majority of the rules and standards for earthworks in SASZs, appropriately recognises the scale of earthworks required in ski areas and that their adverse effects can, for many aspects, be managed internally or through the consents required for activities in the SASZs under the Rural Zone provisions. However, we agree with Mr Wyeth that we have received no evidence from the submitters which provides compelling justification for exempting earthworks within SASZs from standards that are designed to manage and minimise the adverse effects of earthworks that may extend beyond the sub-zones or to sensitive areas, including riparian areas and waterbodies.
130. We agree with Mr Wyeth and Mr Paragreen that the SASZs are located in sensitive alpine environments and in the heads of water catchments, where management of erosion, sediment runoff and water quality are important, as well as management of effects on landscape and natural character and biodiversity values. We have referred earlier in the Report to the significance the PDP places on protecting the values associated with the District's lakes and rivers. The Strategic Directions include numerous objectives and policies which seek to protect the District's natural environments, ecosystems, natural character and nature conservation values of waterways, outstanding natural landscapes and natural features, and Ngai Tāhu values. We have found these give a strong direction to Chapter 25, in terms of the Council's obligations for managing the effects of earthworks. This is reflected in the objectives and policies for Chapter 25 which apply across the District, seeking to ensure that adverse effects on the environment are minimised, landscape and visual amenity values maintained, and people and communities protected, whilst enabling earthworks that are necessary to provide for the well being of people and communities.
131. We consider there would be a significant risk if no controls over earthworks in SASZs were included in Chapter 25, in terms of adverse effects on water quality, landscape, natural character, biodiversity and amenity values (amongst other adverse effects). We are not satisfied on the evidence before us that having no controls over earthworks in SASZs would be effective in achieving the relevant strategic and rural objectives and policies. We are satisfied that Chapter 25 contains appropriate flexibility for earthworks within SASZs, to enable their ongoing operation and development, and in a manner that recognises their importance to the well being of people and communities in the District. We do not consider that compliance with important District-wide environmental standards relating to erosion and sediment control, dust management, setbacks from waterbodies, and groundwater would result in unnecessary or undue inefficiencies. We consider that Chapter 25 (subject to our specific recommendations for amendments) provides a more appropriate and effective method for achieving the relevant Strategic directions of the PDP and the objectives of Chapter 25. We, therefore, recommend the submissions seeking full exemption from all earthworks rules in the SASZ be rejected.

5. SECTION 25.4 RULES – ACTIVITIES

132. Chapter 25 includes Table 25.1, which lists different earthworks activities and their activity status. Rule 25.4.1 provides for most earthworks, that comply with the standards in Tables 25.2 Maximum Volumes and 25.3 Standards, as permitted activities. Earthworks that do not comply with the maximum volume standards in Table 25.2 are specified in Rule 25.4.2 as

restricted discretionary activities¹⁴⁴. The activity status for not complying with each standard in Table 25.3 is specified in that table (in the Reply Version, they are all restricted discretionary activities). Table 25.1 also lists a small number of specific earthworks activities that are not permitted in accordance with Rule 25.4.1, including earthworks associated with cleanfill facilities and landfills; earthworks that affect sites of significance to Kāi Tahu or heritage features and settings; and earthworks within identified sites of Kāi Tahu importance.

133. Federated Farmers¹⁴⁵ requested the activity status for earthworks for the construction or operation of a landfill is changed from discretionary to restricted discretionary activity in Rule 25.4.4. Ms Reilly addressed this in her evidence for Federated Farmers¹⁴⁶. She noted that both cleanfill and landfill are important in the rural areas for the cost-effective disposal of clean waste. She considered that any concerns regarding control would be covered by the matters of discretion in Section 25.7 and did not accept that discretionary activity status was required to address the management of potential adverse effects. Mr Wyeth responded to this submission, stating that landfills introduce contaminants and a range of adverse effects that need to be considered and managed on a case-by-case basis. It was his opinion that this is best achieved through a discretionary activity resource consent process. We agree with Mr Wyeth that landfills can have a wide range of potential adverse effects, that require broad consideration, and their appropriateness depends on their scale, purpose, location and management. Landfill covers a much wider range of activities than on-farm disposal facilities for clean waste, as referred to by Ms Reilly. We agree with Mr Wyeth that the management of landfills, and the earthworks associated with their construction or operation, are appropriately addressed as a discretionary activity as proposed in Chapter 25. We note that this is consistent with the discretionary activity status applied to a landfill activity¹⁴⁷ itself in Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities. We recommend that this submission is rejected.
134. Heritage New Zealand¹⁴⁸ and the Real Journeys Group both sought amendments to Rule 25.4.5 relating to earthworks that affect sites of significance to Kāi Tahu or heritage features and settings. Mr Wyeth responded to those submissions in his Section 42A Report¹⁴⁹ and recommended changes to this rule which satisfied the submitters¹⁵⁰, other than one outstanding matter addressed in evidence by Ms Denise Anderson for Heritage New Zealand¹⁵¹. This appears to have been a misunderstanding by Mr Wyeth as to the specific relief sought by Heritage New Zealand regarding earthworks within the setting or extent of place of a listed heritage feature in Chapter 26.8. Mr Wyeth addressed Ms Anderson's concern in his Rebuttal evidence¹⁵² and the Reply Version now includes the wording she suggested. We recommend that this submission from Heritage New Zealand be accepted.

¹⁴⁴ In the Reply Version of Chapter 25 attached to Mr Wyeth's Reply evidence

¹⁴⁵ Submission 2540

¹⁴⁶ K Reilly, EiC, paragraphs 37-40

¹⁴⁷ Within the definition of "waste management facilities"

¹⁴⁸ Submission 2446

¹⁴⁹ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 11.46-11.51

¹⁵⁰ D Anderson, EiC, paragraph 5.2; B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 18

¹⁵¹ D Anderson, EiC, paragraphs 5.3-5.8

¹⁵² J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, section 8

6. SECTION 25.5 RULES – STANDARDS

6.1 Table 25.2 Maximum Volume

6.1.1 Overview of Issues

135. Following the analysis from Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich on behalf of the Council, and their recommended amendments to Table 25.2 contained in the Reply Version, the only matters where we had conflicting evidence between submitters and the Council’s witnesses related to requests by Millbrook Country Club¹⁵³ regarding the Millbrook Resort Zone (MRZ) (Rule 25.5.5) and Skyline¹⁵⁴ regarding the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone of the Informal Recreation Zone (Rule 25.5.1).

6.1.2 Millbrook Resort Zone

136. Millbrook requested amendments to the maximum volume thresholds applying to different areas within the MRZ, as shown on the Millbrook Structure Plan. The maximum volume in the notified Chapter 25 was 300m³ across the zone. Millbrook considered it would be more efficient and practical to create a separate rule for the MRZ with separate thresholds for the different areas within the zone, as is provided for the Jacks Point Zone. Millbrook sought an increased maximum volume threshold to 500m³ for several areas, and no threshold to apply to the Golf Course and Open Space, Recreation Facilities and Helipad Activity Areas. The submission pointed out that golf holes need to be regularly re-conditioned or re-routed and the golf resort needs to continue operating while the earthworks are undertaken effectively and efficiently.

137. Mr John Edmonds gave evidence on this matter on behalf of Millbrook¹⁵⁵. He was satisfied with Mr Wyeth’s recommendation to increase the maximum volume to 500m³ across all the MRZ activity areas. However, he continued to remain concerned at the inequity between Millbrook and Jacks Point where the maximum volume threshold was notified as 1000m³ in the Open Space and Landscape areas and no limit within some other subzones (including the Golf Course). Mr Edmonds stated that the MRZ has always been exempt from earthworks rules, both in the operative plan, and the plan amended by Variation 8 or Plan Change 49. Unlike Mr Wyeth, Mr Edmonds did not find any rationale for distinguishing the situation at Jacks Point from that at Millbrook, and noted that the MRZ and the Jacks Point Zone (JPZ) were bundled together for the purpose of Chapter 31 Signage¹⁵⁶.

138. In relation to the Golf Course and Open Space, Recreation Facilities and Helipad Activity areas, Mr Wyeth responded to the submission and to Mr Edmonds’ evidence in his Section 42A Report¹⁵⁷ and Rebuttal evidence¹⁵⁸. He noted that the earthworks volume thresholds for the JPZ in Chapter 25 had been carried over from the notified PDP Stage 1 Chapter 41 for JPZ, by way of a PDP Stage 2 Variation to Chapter 41, with no change in the maximum volume thresholds within the activity areas. Mr Wyeth expected that the earthworks volume limits for the different activity areas at Jacks Point would have been specifically considered as part of preparing Chapter 41. No earthworks limits were included in the notified Chapter 43 for the MRZ in Stage 1 of the PDP.

¹⁵³ Submission 2295

¹⁵⁴ Submission 2493

¹⁵⁵ J Edmonds, EiC, paragraphs 16-23

¹⁵⁶ Our recommendations on Chapter 31 mean that, in large part, the provisions relating to Jacks Point Zone are not the same as those for Millbrook Resort Zone.

¹⁵⁷ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 12.38-12.41

¹⁵⁸ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, section 9

139. Mr Wyeth did not consider an unlimited earthworks threshold was appropriate for the golf course and other open space and recreation areas in the MRZ, given the outcomes sought for the zone and its location adjacent to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ) which has a maximum volume threshold for earthworks of 400m³. In the interests of ensuring the adverse effects of larger scale earthworks are appropriately managed, and limiting the number of sub-zones and activity areas in Table 25.2, Mr Wyeth recommended the 500m³ maximum volume threshold continue to apply across the whole MRZ.
140. We are not persuaded by Mr Edmonds' evidence that there is any direct relationship between the earthworks volume thresholds for the JPZ and the MRZ. That they both contain golf courses, as well as houses and other facilities, and were both established by plan changes to the ODP, is not sufficient to convince us that the approach must be the same in both areas. We did not receive evidence from Mr Edmonds that supported similar approaches to managing the environmental effects in each zone, or in achieving the outcomes sought for each zone and their surroundings. There were no submissions before this Panel regarding the earthworks volume limits in the golf course and open space areas at Jacks Point, so we have not been required to turn our minds to the appropriateness of the thresholds that have been brought over from the notified Stage 1 of the PDP. Accordingly, we do not consider the limits for Jacks Point are relevant to our consideration at Millbrook.
141. The Stream 14 Hearings Panel heard evidence relating to the water quality of Mill Creek and Lake Hayes and associated effects from development in the catchment. Its findings are contained in section 2.8 of Report 18.1 and have relevance to our consideration of appropriate earthworks provisions at Millbrook. It found that water quality monitoring for Lake Hayes and Mill Creek reported consistent exceedances of nutrient related water quality limits in the Water Plan. Significant land disturbance activities in the Lake Hayes Catchment have likely resulted in sediment being transported into Mill Creek during heavy rainfall events. In its view, further degradation of Lake Hayes as a result of subdivision and development is to be avoided. That Panel considered there is evidence that the earthworks provisions of the ODP are not working effectively to control earthworks effects on water quality in the Lake Hayes Catchment, and noted it will be a matter for the Stream 15 Hearings Panel to determine whether it is possible to put a more effective regime in place through Chapter 25.
142. We have received no evidence from Mr Edmonds that having no maximum volume thresholds for these areas at Millbrook would be more effective in avoiding further degradation of Lake Hayes; nor that it would be appropriate to enable management of adverse environmental effects that achieve Objective 25.2.1, and the objectives and policies of the MRZ which recognise its sensitive values and the importance of reducing contaminants entering Mill Creek. We recommend that Mr Wyeth's recommendations for the MRZ as a whole be accepted (and that part of the submission from Millbrook), but that the submission from Millbrook seeking no threshold for the golf course and open space areas be rejected.

6.1.3 *Ben Lomond Sub-Zone*

143. Skyline requested that a specific maximum volume threshold of 1000m³ be included for the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone of the Informal Recreation Zone. In the notified Chapter 25, all Open Space and Recreation Zones were included in Rule 25.5.1 of Table 25.2, with a maximum volume threshold of 100m³. The submission noted that the ODP permits earthworks between 300 – 1000m³ within the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, depending on the zoning of High Density Residential Zone or Rural Zone. Skyline did not consider there was any evidence of inappropriate landscape and visual effects to justify changing the threshold from that in the

ODP. ZJV¹⁵⁹ also lodged a submission in relation to the earthworks provisions for the Open Space and Recreation Zones, supporting the notified provisions.

144. Mr Sean Dent gave evidence on this matter on behalf of Skyline¹⁶⁰. Mr Dent acknowledged that the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone is within an identified ONL, but also stated that there is no specific evidence from the Council to demonstrate that the earthworks limits in the ODP are resulting in inappropriate landscape modification and visual effects. Mr Dent referred us to resource consents that have been granted to Skyline to carry out earthworks in the sub-zone in excess of 1000m³. In his opinion, the granting of these consents for rather substantial earthworks on a non-notified basis indicates that the sub-zone has the ability to absorb earthworks of a more significant volume than 100m³ per annum as a permitted activity in Table 25.2. Mr Dent also referred to the provisions for the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, which contemplate further development within a more enabling planning framework than in other parts of the Informal Recreation Zone. He considered the 100m³ threshold to be too restrictive in that context.
145. Mr Jeffrey Brown gave evidence on earthworks within the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone on behalf of ZJV¹⁶¹. However, his evidence was confined to earthworks associated with forestry harvesting and management which we have addressed earlier in this Report. Mr Brown did not provide us with evidence relating to the maximum volume threshold for earthworks in this sub-zone.
146. Mr Wyeth responded to the submission and to Mr Dent's evidence in his Section 42A Report¹⁶² and Rebuttal evidence¹⁶³. Mr Wyeth noted that a threshold of 1000m³ would provide a significantly more lenient earthworks limit in the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone than in Open Space and Recreation Zones elsewhere in the District. He did not consider this was preferable in the interests of plan clarity and consistency. He did not find anything in the submission that supported an operational need for the increased earthworks threshold, or that demonstrated it would not result in adverse effects beyond the site.
147. Mr Wyeth disagreed with Mr Dent that the granting of resource consents (including the notification basis) was justification for increasing the threshold. He stated that a key function of the earthworks volumes in Table 25.2 is to define an acceptable threshold to trigger the need for resource consents when there is a risk of significant adverse effects. The resource consents then ensure that the potential for adverse effects is subject to proper assessment, control and monitoring where necessary via consent conditions. Mr Wyeth considered that this is quite distinct from the tests for notification in the Act.
148. The Panel noted the somewhat unusual situation with the zoning of this area throughout the course of Stage 1 and 2 of the PDP, and the consequences of this for the earthworks rules. In Stage 1 of the PDP, the area now proposed to be Ben-Lomond Sub-Zone was predominantly included within the Rural Zone. If this zoning had remained, the maximum volume threshold for earthworks from Table 25.2 would have been 1000m³. However, the Rural Zone was not confirmed over this land in the Council's decisions on Stage 1 as, in the meantime, the Stage 2 provisions had been notified. Stage 2 of the PDP introduced a new zoning for this area under Chapter 38, Open Space and Recreation Zones. The Ben Lomond land was included within the Informal Recreation Zone, and the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone. The maximum volume threshold

¹⁵⁹ Submission 2485

¹⁶⁰ S Dent, EiC, paragraphs 104-110

¹⁶¹ J Brown, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraph 4

¹⁶² J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 12.50

¹⁶³ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 5.22-5.24

for earthworks in all parts of the Open Space and Recreation Zones then became 100m³, a combined effect of the change of zoning from the notified Stage 1 and the introduction of the Earthworks Chapter 25 in Stage 2.

149. The Panel accepts that this situation will have arisen for all land now zoned under Chapter 38, where different earthworks provisions may apply under Stage 2 from those applicable under the Stage 1 PDP zoning. All of the land in the Open Space and Recreation Zones is administered by the Council and predominantly designated as “Reserve”. The Council is commonly the main user and developer of the land in those zones. However, in the case of the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, as Mr Dent has pointed out, there are multiple commercial users within this sub-zone, where further development is contemplated within a much more enabling planning framework than in other parts of the Informal Recreation Zone. Those users are reliant on the underlying zoning for this land, rather than the designation, and have been affected by the change of notified zoning from Rural to Informal Recreation. In this instance, the change of zoning has also affected the earthworks provisions that apply through Chapter 25. We consider we need to examine the basis for the change to the earthworks threshold, as a result in the change of zoning from Rural in Stage 1 to Informal Recreation in Stage 2.
150. We have considered the Section 32 Reports prepared by the Council for the notified Chapters 25 and 38, and relevant evidence provided by the Council.
151. The Section 32 Report for Chapter 25¹⁶⁴ did not refer to the volume thresholds for specific zones in its evaluation of costs and benefits / effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed and alternative options. The attached report from 4Sight Consulting¹⁶⁵ provided technical analysis to assist the Council’s decision as to an appropriate area threshold for earthworks (which are in addition to the volume thresholds in Table 25.2). That report did not evaluate the appropriate volume thresholds.
152. While the Section 32 Report for Chapter 38¹⁶⁶ did not refer specifically to the consequential changes arising through Chapter 25, it did recognise that the notified option would be a significant change from the ODP, with the rezoning of open space and recreation areas into specific zones and subzones, future removal of the designations, and establishing a specific rule framework for each zone. The costs and benefits / effectiveness and efficiency evaluation of the proposed option identified costs from the implementation of a new framework; but overall benefits for users; greater efficiency, clarity and certainty as to outcomes for each open space and recreation area; and a zoning hierarchy for open spaces that better reflects their use, significance and sensitivity. For the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, in particular, the Chapter 38 Section 32 Report states that the overall suite of rules achieve an appropriate balance between providing a degree of certainty and foreshadowing what could be undertaken with the sub-zone, while still providing adequate scope to address the actual and potential adverse effects of activities.
153. Mr Sunich, a Senior Environmental Consultant at 4Sight Consulting, provided technical advice to the Council, and evidence on behalf of the Council to the Stream 15 hearing, in relation to the maximum volume thresholds. Mr Sunich has expertise in erosion and sediment

¹⁶⁴ Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan, Section 32 Evaluation, Stage 2 Components October 2017, for Earthworks

¹⁶⁵ 4Sight Consulting. Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan: Assessment of Thresholds for Earthworks. September 2017

¹⁶⁶ Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan, Section 32 Evaluation, Stage 2 Components October 2017, for Open Space and Recreation Zones

management, stormwater quality management and integrated catchment management planning. The evidence from Mr Sunich¹⁶⁷ was that the general approach to setting permitted activity thresholds is to define a level which can be reasonably expected to accommodate and enable most building or land use requirements within each zone, without needing a resource consent. However, he considered this may not always be possible due to the sensitivity of some activities and the receiving environment. Mr Sunich stated that the Council had generally carried over the maximum volume thresholds from the ODP earthworks chapter. This indicated to him that the Council was generally comfortable with how the ODP earthworks chapter is being implemented in relation to volume thresholds. He noted that this is reflected in the limited commentary in the Section 32 Report regarding volume thresholds, as we have noted above.

154. Mr Sunich had reviewed the notified thresholds and concluded they are appropriate. For Rule 25.5.1 that sets the volume threshold of 100m³ for Open Space and Recreation Zones, Mr Sunich commented that the maximum volume recognises the sensitivity of the receiving environments and the need to be cognisant of historic values and special character. For the Rural Zone in Rule 25.5.6, he commented that the maximum volume of 1000m³ has been retained from the ODP and reflects typical rural land uses, while also providing for commercial and viticulture activities. He noted that sensitive landscapes, such as ONLs which cover most of the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, are excluded from Rule 25.5.1 and included in Rule 25.5.2, where the maximum volume threshold is 10m³. Whilst he found no compelling reason to make any significant changes to the notified thresholds, Mr Sunich acknowledged that they are not entirely effects based, but rather a combination of risk of effects and the type and scale of development anticipated within the zones. In his opinion, they were fit for purpose.
155. In relation to the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone, Mr Sunich stated that the reduction in threshold to 100m³, from 1000m³ under a Rural Zone, aligns with the Council's intention to simplify and ensure consistency across zone types throughout the District. In addition, in his view, there was merit in reducing the maximum volume threshold for this sub-zone where effects on landscape and amenity need to be carefully managed and assessed through a resource consent process if the threshold is exceeded.
156. We are satisfied that the Council has appropriately assessed the costs and benefits of the change in the maximum earthworks threshold from the underlying the zones (in this case the Rural Zone) to open space and recreation zones. We consider the individual packages of rules for each open space and recreation zone have been appropriately evaluated in terms of their costs and benefits for risks of adverse environmental effects and for enabling the type and scale of development anticipated in each zone. This included consideration of the consequential changes to rules through other chapters, such as Chapter 25. We accept Mr Sunich's evidence that the earthworks thresholds specified for each group of zones are fit for purpose. We consider the notified 100m³ threshold applied to the Ben Lomond Sub-Zone appropriately takes into account that this is a sensitive and highly valued environment (being highly visible and predominantly within an ONL) and requires more restrictive controls. We note that within an ONL, the maximum threshold is specified as 10m³. We consider that the costs and benefits of applying the 100m³ threshold strike an appropriate balance between allowing anticipated use and development of the area and managing environmental effects. Accordingly, we recommend that Skyline's submission be rejected and the notified 100m³ maximum earthworks volume threshold be retained.

¹⁶⁷ T Sunich, EiC, paragraphs 5.2, 5.4-5.7 & 7.9-7.10

6.2 Table 25.3 Standards

6.2.1 Overview of Issues

157. Following the analysis from Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich on behalf of the Council, and their recommended amendments to Table 25.3 contained in the Reply Version of Chapter 25, the outstanding matters of dispute between the submitters and the Council’s witnesses related to:

- requests from several submitters to exempt earthworks in SASZs from all standards in Table 25.3, which we have already addressed earlier in this Report;
- the appropriate wording for Standards 25.5.12 – 25.5.14, or whether these Standards should be deleted, as requested by Paterson Pitts¹⁶⁸; the Real Journeys Group; the Treble Cone Group; and NZSki¹⁶⁹;
- clarification of the wording of Standard 25.5.19 relating to earthworks setbacks from boundaries, as requested by Paterson Pitts¹⁷⁰;
- the standards for earthworks in setbacks from water bodies in Standard 25.5.20, as requested by Fish and Game¹⁷¹; the Real Journeys Group; and the Treble Cone Group and associated submitters¹⁷²;
- deletion or clarification of Standard 25.5.22 relating to cleanfill, as requested by Darby Planning LP¹⁷³; Lakes Hayes Limited¹⁷⁴; Glendhu Bay Trustee Limited¹⁷⁵; and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Land Holdings Limited¹⁷⁶.

6.2.2 Standard 25.5.12 - Erosion and Sediment Control Measures

158. Submissions from Paterson Pitts and the Real Journeys Group, amongst other submitters, raised concerns about the onerous nature of notified Standard 25.5.12, which required earthworks to be undertaken in a way that “prevents” sediment from entering water bodies, stormwater networks or going across the boundary of the site. They stated that the standard was unduly onerous, and not practical to comply with all of the time, even with implementation of best management approaches. The lack of guidance on appropriate sediment control measures to comply with the standard was also mentioned.

159. In his evidence and in his presentation to the Panel¹⁷⁷, Mr Sunich described his observations of bulk earthworks being undertaken at sites across the District, where erosion and sediment control implementation is limited and does not, in his view, meet best practice. He referred to the role of erosion and sediment control guidelines that many councils are preparing and using, including the guidelines for the Auckland region that have been adopted by other councils across the country. He noted the Council is currently producing a guideline, which he considered is required to contribute to the outcomes sought by Chapter 25. In response to the concerns of the submitters, Mr Sunich agreed that, where erosion and sediment control measures have been designed, implemented and maintained in accordance with best practice, it is generally accepted that sediment leaving a site will be minimised to a practicable level, but it is not possible to remove 100% of sediment. He considered it is inefficient to seek to achieve 100% prevention, as required by notified Standard 25.5.12. Mr Sunich considered the

¹⁶⁸ Submission 2457

¹⁶⁹ Submission 2454

¹⁷⁰ Submission 2457

¹⁷¹ Submission 2455

¹⁷² Treble Cone Group and Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382

¹⁷³ Submission 2376

¹⁷⁴ Submission 2377

¹⁷⁵ Submission 2382

¹⁷⁶ Submission 2381

¹⁷⁷ T Sunich, EiC, paragraphs 12.1-13.9

focus should be on minimising the amount of sediment exiting a site. However, he stated that prescribing erosion and sediment controls as permitted activity standards, that should apply to all sites and circumstances, is not possible due to the variability of earthworks sites and receiving environments. Controls need to be customised to the site and earthworks areas, highlighting the role of guidelines to achieve this.

160. In his section 42A Report¹⁷⁸, Mr Wyeth did not agree with deleting Standard 25.5.12 in its entirety, on the basis of Mr Sunich’s observations of current practices in the District. Mr Wyeth did agree that the notified wording of the standard is uncertain, impractical and needs refinement, although he acknowledged that such refinement is problematic to monitor and enforce as a permitted activity standard. Mr Wyeth suggested alternative wording in his Section 42A Report, which then became the subject of evidence and questions from the Panel through the course of the hearing. The Panel, in its questions of Mr Wyeth, expressed concern regarding his amended wording for this, and other, standards that did not appear to be sufficiently certain or clear enough for permitted activity standards. Mr Wyeth accepted that in trying to draft standards that were more achievable than the notified standards, they had become less certain.
161. Mr Wyeth returned to the certainty of Standards 25.5.12 and 25.5.14 in his Reply evidence¹⁷⁹. In order to improve the certainty and implementation of these standards, he recommended including reference to the erosion and sediment control guideline produced by the Auckland Council (GD05)¹⁸⁰. He and Mr Sunich considered this is recognised as the most comprehensive guideline in New Zealand, with its predecessor (TD90)¹⁸¹ having been widely used by councils throughout the country. He noted that GD05 also includes guidance on dust control. Mr Wyeth recommended this as an interim approach, in the absence of guidance having yet been developed by the Council for this District.
162. Mr Wyeth recommended reference to GD05 be included as a Note, in the same manner and with the same wording as is used in the Auckland Unitary Plan, whereby compliance with the standard is “*generally deemed to be compliance with*” GD05. He acknowledged that reference to this guideline as a Note does not fully address the Panel’s concerns regarding the use of the word “minimise” as part of a permitted activity standard. However, in his opinion, this is the preferable alternative, avoiding the use of an absolute term (such as the notified “prevent”) and providing a degree of flexibility in the selection and implementation of control measures from GD05.
163. We note here that we received evidence on Standard 25.5.12 from Mr Botting from Paterson Pitts¹⁸² and Mr Henderson on behalf of the Treble Cone Group¹⁸³, who both generally supported Mr Wyeth’s amendments to Standard 25.5.12 in his Section 42A Report.
164. Having considered the evidence before us, and the amendments recommended by Mr Wyeth in the Reply Version, we accept the evidence of Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich. We accept that, in

¹⁷⁸ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 14.1-14.15

¹⁷⁹ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 3

¹⁸⁰ Recommended citation: Leersnyder, H., Bunting, K., Parsonson, M., and Stewart, C. (2016). *Erosion and sediment control guide for land disturbing activities in the Auckland region*. Auckland Council Guideline Document GD2016/005. Prepared by Beca Ltd and SouthernSkies Environmental for Auckland Council

¹⁸¹ Technical Publication No. 90, *Erosion and Sediment Control: Guidelines for Land Disturbing Activities*, Auckland Regional Council, 2007

¹⁸² M Botting, Evidence presented at the hearing, paragraph 6

¹⁸³ R Henderson, EiC, paragraphs 136 & 153

the absence of Council-prepared erosion and sediment control guidelines for this District, reference to the Auckland guidelines as a means of compliance with Standard 25.5.12 is the most appropriate means of ensuring that sediment leaving an earthworks site is minimised to a practicable level, and Objective 25.2.1 achieved. We recommend that Standard 25.5.12 as set out in the Reply Version is accepted and the submissions from Paterson Pitts, the Real Journeys Group and the Treble Cone Group are accepted in part.

6.2.3 *Standard 25.5.13 – Deposition of Material on Roads*

165. Submissions from Paterson Pitts, Federated Farmers, the Real Journeys Group and NZSki, amongst other submitters, raised similar concerns to those discussed above, regarding about the onerous nature of notified Standard 25.5.13, which required that no material being transported from one site to another be deposited on roads. They stated that the standard was overly onerous, and not practical to comply with all of the time as earthworks on occasions can result in material being deposited on roads, even if it is immediately cleaned-up.
166. In his Section 42A Report¹⁸⁴, Mr Wyeth agreed with some of the concerns of the submitters regarding the wording of the standard. Although he acknowledged his suggestion was not ideal, he recommended amended wording requiring earthworks to be managed to avoid deposition on public roads or minimise it to the extent it does not cause nuisance effects. As with the previous standard, the Panel, in its questions of Mr Wyeth, expressed concern regarding his amended wording that did not appear to be sufficiently certain or clear enough for a permitted activity standard.
167. Mr Wyeth returned to the certainty of Standard 25.5.13 in his Reply evidence¹⁸⁵. On further reflection, he considered that this standard was unnecessary as it is only likely to be relevant for larger earthworks sites that would require resource consent for non-compliance with other standards, such as the volume or area thresholds. In those circumstances, the management of adverse effects on roads can be addressed through consent conditions. Mr Wyeth recommended the deletion of Standard 25.5.13 and did not include it in his Reply Version.
168. We also received evidence on Standard 25.5.13 from Mr Botting from Paterson Pitts¹⁸⁶ and Mr Henderson on behalf of the Treble Cone Group¹⁸⁷, who both generally supported Mr Wyeth's amendments to Standard 25.5.13 in his Section 42A Report.
169. We accept Mr Wyeth's evidence and his recommendation to delete Standard 25.5.13. We agree that the standard is unnecessary as it is only likely to be relevant for earthworks that require resource consent, when the management of adverse effects on roads can be addressed through consent conditions. We agree that this would overcome the Panel's concerns regarding the uncertainty of the wording and the difficulties this would cause with enforcement. We recommend deletion of Standard 25.5.13 as set out in the Reply Version and that the submissions from Paterson Pitts, the Real Journeys Group and the Treble Cone Group are accepted in part.

6.2.4 *Standard 25.5.14 – Dust Control*

170. We have already partially addressed Standard 25.5.14, when considering Standard 25.5.12 above, as Mr Wyeth has recommended similar amendments in the Reply Version. Similar submissions were received from Paterson Pitts, the Real Journeys Group and NZSki, amongst

¹⁸⁴ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 15.1-15.15

¹⁸⁵ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 10

¹⁸⁶ M Botting, Evidence presented at the hearing, paragraph 6

¹⁸⁷ R Henderson, EiC, paragraphs 136 & 153

other submitters, as for Standards 25.5.12 – 25.5.13. Evidence on Standard 25.5.14 from Mr Botting from Paterson Pitts¹⁸⁸ supported the amendments made by Mr Wyeth in his Section 42A Report.

171. Mr Wyeth initially responded in his Section 42A Report¹⁸⁹, stating that it is appropriate for the PDP to retain a permitted activity standard relating to dust control during earthworks, as earthworks can give rise to dust which has the potential to have nuisance effects beyond the boundary of the site. He considered a standard is appropriate to help achieve Objective 25.2.1 to protect people and communities from the effects of earthworks. Mr Wyeth did not consider that the standard would be overly onerous and impractical to comply with, but did accept that the wording could be slightly refined. In his Reply evidence¹⁹⁰, Mr Wyeth recommended including the same Note as for Standard 25.5.12, referring to the Auckland guidance document and, on further reflection, considered that the wording of Standard 25.5.14 could be simplified to state that dust shall not cause nuisance effects beyond the boundary of the site. He considered this would reduce the level of discretion in the standard and focus it on the performance standard to be achieved, along with the Note referring to GD05 as a means of compliance.
172. We accept the amendments recommended by Mr Wyeth to Standard 25.5.14 in the Reply Version of Chapter 25. We accept his evidence that, in the absence of Council-prepared earthworks guidelines for this District, reference to the Auckland guideline as a means of compliance with Standard 25.5.14 is the most appropriate means of ensuring that dust does not cause nuisance effects beyond the boundary of the site, and Objective 25.2.1 achieved. We recommend that Standard 25.5.14 as set out in the Reply Version is accepted and the submissions from Paterson Pitts, the Real Journeys Group and NZSki are accepted in part.

6.2.5 *Standard 25.5.19 – Earthworks Setbacks from Site Boundaries*

173. Standard 25.5.19 sets out the requirements for earthworks in relation to site boundaries - distances of setbacks depending on the height of fill or height of retaining wall. The submission from Paterson Pitts and evidence from Mr Botting¹⁹¹ raised several issues with the wording of this Standard, as follows:
- He did not agree with the way that setback distances from a boundary are calculated in Standard 25.5.19a.ii., and the resulting steepness of the permitted batter slopes. He recommended a steepness of 1:3 as a maximum batter angle for cut slopes and for fill.
 - He did not support the setback relating to fill in Standard 25.5.19a.i., as he considered that the formation of earthwork fill close to a site boundary should be subject to a similar slope requirement as that of an earthwork cut.
 - He did not support the exemption in Standard 25.5.19b.ii. for retaining walls that have building consent. He considered that there is potential for a retaining wall up to 2m high to be built close to or on a boundary without needing to obtain resource consent or require adjoining neighbours' approval. In his opinion, any retaining walls greater than 500mm on or near a boundary should require resource consent, irrespective of whether a building consent has been obtained.
174. At the Panel's request Mr Wyeth considered Mr Botting's suggestions regarding Standard 25.5.19 and responded in his Reply evidence¹⁹². He stated he had discussed Mr Botting's

¹⁸⁸ M Botting, Evidence presented at the hearing, paragraph 6

¹⁸⁹ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 15.20-15.30

¹⁹⁰ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 3

¹⁹¹ M Botting, Evidence presented at the hearing, paragraphs 8-12

¹⁹² J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 5

amendments to Standards 25.5.19a.i and 25.5.19a.ii with Mr Sunich who agreed that a slope of 1:3 is appropriate for unsupported cut and fill; that this angle is consistent with the Council's Section 32 Report; and aligns with the guidance in the Council's subdivision code of practice. Mr Wyeth recommended that Standards 25.5.19a.i and 25.5.19a.ii and their associated Interpretative Diagrams 25.4 and 25.5 be amended to require a maximum batter slope angle of 1:3 (vertical: horizontal).

175. Mr Wyeth also considered Mr Botting's evidence regarding the exemption from the boundary setback requirements in Standard 25.5.19b. for retaining walls that have been granted building consent. Mr Wyeth agreed it was undesirable that retaining walls could be constructed on a boundary up to 2m in height without requiring a resource consent. He accepted Mr Botting's evidence and recommended that Standard 25.5.19b.ii. be deleted, although unfortunately it was not shown as deleted in the Reply Version.
176. We accept the evidence of Mr Botting and Mr Wyeth. We recommend Standards 25.5.19a.i, 25.5.19a.ii and Interpretative Diagrams 25.4 and 25.5 be amended as set out in Section 5 of the Reply evidence of Mr Wyeth and that Standard 25.5.19b.ii be deleted. We recommend that the submission from Paterson Pitts be accepted.

6.2.6 *Standard 25.5.20 – Waterbodies*

177. In the Reply Version¹⁹³, Standard 25.5.20 requires that earthworks within 10m of the bed of a water body, or any drain or water race that flows to a lake or river, not exceed 5m³ in total volume within any consecutive 12-month period, subject to an exemption for artificial water bodies that do not flow to a lake or river. Several submissions were received on this standard. Fish and Game¹⁹⁴ supported the standard in part but opposed the exemption¹⁹⁵. The Treble Cone Group and associated submitters¹⁹⁶, and the Real Journeys Group, sought a lesser setback distance and/or a greater volume of earthworks to be permitted within the setback. The Real Journeys Group also sought an exemption for the installation of hazard protection works in and adjoining water bodies. The submitters with interests in ski areas (including NZSki) sought an exemption from Standard 25.5.20 for earthworks in SASZs, which we have addressed earlier in this Report.
178. In his evidence and in his presentation to the Panel¹⁹⁷, Mr Sunich referred to his report¹⁹⁸ containing background analysis for Stage 2 of the PDP, in which he recommended that the earthworks setback distance be increased to 10m (from the 7m setback in the ODP) to reflect practical considerations and current practice elsewhere in New Zealand. His report had reviewed other district plans, including the recent Auckland Unitary Plan, and the NES-PF¹⁹⁹, as to setbacks considered appropriate, and the scale of earthworks permitted within the

¹⁹³ The notified Standard 25.5.20 did not include the allowance for 5m³ of permitted earthworks within the 10m setback distance

¹⁹⁴ Submission 2455

¹⁹⁵ Fish and Game's concern regarding the wording of the exemption for artificial water bodies that do not flow to a lake or river has been addressed in the Reply Version of Standard 25.5.20.

¹⁹⁶ Treble Cone Group and Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382

¹⁹⁷ T Sunich, EIC, paragraphs 11.6-11.8

¹⁹⁸ 4Sight Consulting. Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan: Assessment of Thresholds for Earthworks. September 2017

¹⁹⁹ Both the 4Sight Consulting report and Mr Wyeth (EIC, paragraph 16.13) confirmed that the 10m earthworks setback in the NES-PF was determined on an assessment of current best practice around New Zealand and to be largely consistent with water body setbacks for earthworks in district and regional plans.

setbacks. Mr Sunich considered the increased setback distance (from the ODP) is appropriate as it provides:

- additional protection, and buffer, for river and lake environments;
- additional room to provide for erosion and sediment control (such as silt fences) to minimise and mitigate discharges to waterways; and
- protection of the structure and function of the riparian margin.

179. Mr Sunich also considered the decrease, from the ODP provisions, in the permitted volume of earthworks within the setback (from 20m³ to 5m³ in a 12-month period). He agreed with having a volume for permitted earthworks, as otherwise minor activities within the setback distance would be required to obtain resource consents, given the broad definition of “earthworks”. However, in his opinion, 20m³ is not appropriate as it appears to be a large volume relative to the potential for adverse effects on the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins. He supported the 5m³ in the Reply Version. In answer to the Panel’s questions, Mr Sunich explained his opinion that 20m³ is a relatively significant volume of earthworks and may lead to significant adverse effects on riparian margins. He considered no allowance for earthworks in the setbacks is too restrictive, however, 5m³ is not an insignificant allowance. He considered 5m³ would give reasonable scope for earthworks to be undertaken without capturing minor activities, and enable tailored, relevant controls to be established through conditions for larger scale earthworks.
180. Mr Wyeth²⁰⁰ referred us to the evaluation of this standard in the Section 32 Report. This evaluation recognised the additional costs in applying for resource consent but assessed this as a small cost relative to not managing the potential harm from uncontrolled earthworks within the margins of a waterbody. It identified benefits for management of adverse environmental effects, economic benefits in protecting the environmental reputation of the District, and social and cultural benefits from safeguarding the life supporting capacity of water. The Section 32 Report concluded that setback requirements will be effective in ensuring that adverse effects on landscape, amenity and character are appropriately managed in the context of the District’s sensitive environment. In terms of efficiency, the rules were not considered to be overly restrictive, introduced an appropriate scale of control, and were commensurate with the sensitivity of the receiving environment.
181. We received some limited planning evidence, and no technical evidence, on this matter on behalf of the Real Journeys and Treble Cone Groups of submitters.
182. Mr Henderson²⁰¹ agreed that a threshold limit is appropriate to avoid all earthworks within the setback requiring consent. He acknowledged that the figure will to some extent be arbitrary. He questioned the basis for Mr Sunich’s recommendation of 5m³ but did not provide any evidence in support of an alternative threshold.
183. Mr Farrell²⁰² stated his belief that a 10m setback is very large and that, in his experience, most earthworks activities can be carried out within 10m of a waterbody without adverse effects, especially if erosion and sediment control measures are employed. He questioned the Council’s justification for the 10m setback, suggesting that alternative distances could be required depending on the slope of the land. In his experience, the topography of the land is a significant factor in the likelihood of earthworks affecting water quality and natural values. Mr Farrell, whilst providing examples, provided no technical justification for different setback

²⁰⁰ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 16.12 & 16.16

²⁰¹ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 147

²⁰² B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 24

distances based on the slope of the land. In response, Mr Wyeth²⁰³ considered it would be overly complex from a compliance perspective to introduce multiple setback requirements based on land slope across the District, and that there are wider factors to take into account when considering the risk from adverse effects of earthworks (e.g. bank stability, vegetation removal, adequacy of erosion and sediment control measures).

184. We have considered the evidence before us, the Council's background technical report and its section 32 evaluation. We have no expert technical evidence from the submitters which would cause us to disregard the evidence from Mr Sunich on behalf of the Council, and nor do we consider it would be appropriate to do so. We consider the Council has evaluated the appropriateness of alternative options (particularly as between the ODP and notified PDP provisions), considering their benefits and costs, effectiveness and efficiency and the risk of retaining a less restrictive approach, such as in the ODP. We have no evidence before us on alternative methods that would enable us to reconsider the Council's recommended provisions in accordance with s32AA of the Act.
185. We agree with Mr Sunich and Mr Wyeth that the context of the District's environment is an important consideration when evaluating the appropriateness of this standard. A high level of importance is placed on the District's lakes, rivers and wetlands, demonstrated through the extent of identified ONLs and ONFs (including many waterbodies); the high natural character and biodiversity values of the waterbodies and their margins; the importance of the District's water resources and water quality to Kāi Tahu; and the contribution of the District's waterbodies to amenity values for residents and visitors. These factors are encapsulated in Chapter 3 Strategic Directions, through the direction contained in Objectives 3.2.4, 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 and Policies 3.3.17 to 3.3.19 and 3.3.29 to 3.3.35, as well as in Chapter 5 Tangata Whenua. We have set out our understanding of the direction provided by Chapter 3 earlier in this Report, concluding that this gives a strong direction to Chapter 25 in relation to sediment generation and other adverse effects, including on water quality, landscape, natural character and Kāi Tahu values. In this context, and to achieve the Strategic objectives and policies, as well as Objective 25.3.1, we consider it is most appropriate for Chapter 25 to include firm control over the effects of earthworks in close proximity to waterbodies. We consider the provisions contained in the Reply Version of Standard 25.5.20 would be effective and efficient in achieving this.
186. In terms of the more specific submissions on the wording of Standard 25.5.20, Fish and Game's concern regarding the wording of the exemption for artificial water bodies has been clarified in the Reply Version of the standard. The concern of the Real Journeys Group that the standard does not apply to artificial watercourses has also been addressed through Mr Wyeth's recommended amendments to the wording. Mr Wyeth has recommended a further exemption from Standard 25.5.20 to provide for the "*Maintenance and repairing of existing hazard protection structures in and around a water body*", in response to the evidence on behalf of the Real Journeys Group²⁰⁴ regarding the need to maintain such works on Walter Peak (in accordance with ORC's Water Plan requirements). We accept Mr Wyeth's recommendation as appropriately allowing for such maintenance and repair works.
187. Accordingly, we recommend Standard 25.5.20 be amended as set out in the Reply Version. We recommend that the submission from Fish and Game is accepted, and those from the Treble Cone Group and associated submitters²⁰⁵, and the Real Journeys Group, be accepted in

²⁰³ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 4.14-4.17

²⁰⁴ F Black, EiC, paragraphs 29-36; Ben Farrell, EiC, paragraphs 22-23

²⁰⁵ Treble Cone Group and Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382

part (in so far as provision has been included for small scale earthworks within the waterbody setback).

6.2.7 *Standard 25.5.22 - Cleanfill*

188. Standard 25.5.22 requires a restricted discretionary activity consent where more than 300m³ of Cleanfill is transported to or from an area that is the subject of earthworks. Darby Planning LP²⁰⁶; Lakes Hayes Limited²⁰⁷; Glendhu Bay Trustee Limited²⁰⁸; and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Land Holdings Limited²⁰⁹ opposed this standard due to the overlapping definition and potential confusion with the requirements of Rule 25.4.3. The submissions seek the deletion of the standard. Rule 25.4.3 requires a restricted discretionary activity consent for earthworks for the construction or operation of a Cleanfill Facility²¹⁰.
189. Mr Wyeth responded to this submission in his Section 42A Report²¹¹. He agreed that the submissions on this matter demonstrate that the relationship between Standard 25.5.22 and Rule 25.4.3 is not clear. He explained that Rule 25.4.3 relates to earthworks for the construction and operation of a Cleanfill Facility, whereas Standard 25.5.22 relates to the transportation of Cleanfill material by road to or from an earthworks site. He did not agree that Standard 25.5.22 should be deleted. He understood the need for the standard arose from a concern about managing the effects of material from earthworks being taken off-site and deposited elsewhere in the District, and there being no ability to manage those effects in the ODP. Mr Wyeth did not recommend any changes to Standard 25.5.22.
190. Mr Henderson provided evidence on this standard on behalf of the group of submitters. Despite Mr Wyeth's explanation in his Section 42A Report, Mr Henderson still considered that greater clarity is needed between Rule 25.4.3 and Standard 25.5.22 to ensure efficient management of these provisions. In the absence of that clarity he continued to recommend deletion of the Standard.
191. We do not agree that there is a great deal of confusion between these two provisions. We can see how the omission of the word "Facility" in Rule 25.4.3 may have resulted in some confusion. We also consider that some confusion could have arisen because of the structure of Standard 25.5.22. We note that it is written more as an Activity (for which consent is required), rather than as a permitted activity Standard. We consider some minor amendment to the structure of Standard 25.5.22, in accordance with clause 16(2), could make it read as a Standard without changing its meaning or intent, as follows:

No more than 300m³ of Cleanfill shall be transported by road to or from an area subject to Earthworks.

192. With these changes, we consider there would be adequate clarity that Rule 25.4.3 is a specific requirement for consent for earthworks associated with a Cleanfill Facility, being land used solely for the disposal of Cleanfill. Whereas, Standard 25.5.22 is a permitted activity standard

²⁰⁶ Submission 2376

²⁰⁷ Submission 2377

²⁰⁸ Submission 2382

²⁰⁹ Submission 2381

²¹⁰ In the notified Rule 25.4.3 the word "Facility" was omitted. This may have caused some of the confusion. In his Rebuttal Version of Chapter 25, Mr Wyeth recommended adding the word "Facility" to be consistent with the defined term.

²¹¹ J Wyeth. Section 42A Report. Paragraphs 16.63-16.69

which would require consent for transporting more than 300m³ of Cleanfill by road to or from an earthworks site, with Cleanfill being the material itself.

193. We accept Mr Wyeth's evidence that there is a need for Standard 25.5.22 and have not received evidence from Mr Henderson that satisfied us there is no need for this standard in order to manage the effects of transporting cleanfill in the District. Accordingly, we recommend that the submissions be rejected, and Standard 25.5.22 retained and amended as we have set out above.

7. SECTION 25.6 NON-NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATIONS

194. There were few submissions on these provisions of Chapter 25, and we heard only very limited evidence in the presentation from Mr Duncan White²¹² on behalf of Paterson Pitts who stated that he still maintained a preference for more comprehensive and specific non-notified provisions than those contained in the notified Chapter 25.
195. Mr Wyeth addressed these submissions in his Section 42A Report²¹³, giving his opinion that it is generally preferable for councils to have full discretion to notify or limited notify an application on a case-by-case basis in accordance with s95-95G of the Act. which are now relatively prescriptive. He expected the majority of earthworks applications would continue to be processed without notification. However, he noted that applications for exceeding earthworks volume thresholds may result in minor or more than more adverse effects on amenity, landscape and land stability, that may warrant an application being notified in some circumstances. Mr Wyeth recommended the submissions to preclude notification or to adopt the approach of the OPD be rejected.
196. The Panel asked Mr Wyeth to consider whether wider provision should be included for non-notification for earthworks applications, whether there is scope in the submissions, or whether the revised notification provisions of the Act will have the same effect. Mr Wyeth responded to the Panel's request in his Reply evidence²¹⁴. He reiterated his preference for councils to have discretion regarding notification in accordance with the requirements of the Act. However, he acknowledged that there can be benefits in terms of certainty and efficiency, for both applicants and the councils, through the inclusion of rules in a plan that preclude notification, so that all of the steps in s95-95G of the Act do not need to be undertaken.
197. Mr Wyeth considered the submissions provided scope to widen provision for non-notification. He evaluated the new notification provisions in the Act and concluded that earthworks associated with the construction or alteration of residential dwellings would be precluded from notification by s95A95)(b)(ii) of the Act. In his opinion, this would capture the majority of earthworks occurring in residential zones, and a large portion of the earthworks consents in the District.
198. Mr Wyeth referred us to the Council's Section 32 Report for Chapter 25. This supported non-notification of applications for non-compliance with the area thresholds (as set out in 25.6.1) but, otherwise, public or limited notification was not precluded by the notified PDP for non-compliance with other standards. This was on the basis that adverse effects from earthworks can be significant, locations in the District can be sensitive, and there are range of potential effects on other persons and statutory agencies. Mr Wyeth continued to support the approach

²¹² D White, Evidence presented at the hearing, paragraph 4

²¹³ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 17.1-17.7

²¹⁴ J Wyeth, Reply Evidence, section 4

of the notified PDP. In his view, the risks associated with precluding notification for non-compliance with other earthworks standards are greater than the likely benefits to Council and applicants in terms of certainty and efficiency. He considered the process for determining notification or non-notification under the Act appropriately allows decisions to be made based on the degree of adverse environmental effects on the environment and other persons. He noted that the approach of the notified PDP is consistent with other plans such as the Auckland Unitary Plan.

199. We are grateful to Mr Wyeth for his consideration of these matters, and for outlining the implications from the new notification provisions in the Act. We accept his evidence and his recommendation to retain the notification provisions as proposed in the notified PDP. We recommend that the requests to preclude notification of applications that exceed the earthworks volume thresholds, or to adopt the approach in the ODP, are rejected.

8. SECTIONS 25.7 MATTERS OF DISCRETION AND 25.8 ASSESSMENT MATTERS

200. We heard little specific evidence on the amendments sought by submitters to the Matters of Discretion or Assessment Matters. Mr Wyeth recommended amendments to these matters in response to submissions in both this Section 42A Report²¹⁵ and his Rebuttal evidence²¹⁶. These included refined wording for Assessment Matter 25.8.2d. in response to the evidence of Mr Timothy Williams²¹⁷ for RPL and QPL; and changing references to “*indigenous biodiversity*” to the more general “biodiversity” in response to the submission from Fish and Game. We accept the amendments recommended by Mr Wyeth as shown in the Reply Version.
201. The evidence from Mr Farrell for the Real Journeys Group²¹⁸ challenged the inclusion of detailed Assessment Matters in Chapter 25. Whilst he considered they were helpful in providing some guidance when assessing applications, he did not consider they were the most appropriate method for implementing the objectives. He did not consider that the Council had considered alternative options for providing this guidance, such as removing the Assessment Matters from the Plan and including them in a separate non-statutory document, or including a statement in the PDP that the Assessment Matters are not mandatory and should be applied on a case-by-case basis.
202. Mr Wyeth responded to this submission and acknowledged that Assessment Matters have generally been removed from the PDP in the interests of streamlining the plan and so that activities can be assessed through the relevant objectives and policies. He referred to the Section 32 Report for Chapter 25 which gave the reasons for retaining Assessment Matters in this chapter, namely that they articulate a finer level of detail than the policies as to how earthworks activities should be designed and undertaken to be consistent with the policies. Based on the Section 32 Report’s reasons and that most submitters supported the Assessment Matters, Mr Wyeth recommended the request from the Real Journeys Group to delete the Assessment Matters from Chapter 25 be rejected.
203. The Panel acknowledges that it is a matter of preference for a council as to whether or not it includes detailed Assessment Matters in its plan, and that this preference can extend to including Assessment Matters in some chapters and not others, depending on their utility and

²¹⁵ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, section 18

²¹⁶ J Wyeth, Rebuttal Evidence, paragraphs 6.13-6.15

²¹⁷ T Williams, EiC, paragraphs 5.17-5.21

²¹⁸ B Farrell, EiC, paragraph 28

effectiveness. In this case, we accept that the Council has chosen to include Assessment Matters in Chapter 25 despite them being generally removed from the PDP. Mr Wyeth explained that the alternatives of not including Assessment Matters has been considered by the Council in the Section 32 Report and in response to submissions on this Chapter and others. We are satisfied that the Council has had adequate regard to alternatives and accept Mr Wyeth's recommendation to retain 25.8 Assessment Matters. Subject to some minor wording clarification we have included (without changing the meaning or intent), we recommend the submission from the Real Journeys Group be rejected.

204. We also note here that Ms Baker-Galloway²¹⁹ raised the matter of the positive benefits from earthworks being listed in all Matters of Discretion, in order that they can be considered when assessing restricted discretionary activity applications. This was responded to by Ms Scott on behalf of the Council in its Reply Representations / Legal Submissions (in relation to Chapter 38). The Panel has considered this matter in Part A of this Report.

9. SCHEDULE 25.9 INTERPRETATIVE DIAGRAMS

205. Schedule 25.9 contains a number of diagrams to assist with interpretation of the earthworks standards, particularly the setbacks of earthworks from site boundaries. We received evidence on these interpretative diagrams from Mr Botting on behalf of Paterson Pitts which we have already addressed in relation to the relevant standards. Subject to the amendments we recommend in response to Mr Botting's evidence and the responses from Mr Wyeth and Mr Sunich, we recommend these diagrams in accepted.

10. SCHEDULE 25.10 ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY PROTOCOL

206. Schedule 25.10 sets out a protocol in the event of an accidental discovery during earthworks of material listed in Standard 25.5.15, being kōiwi tangata, wāhi taoka, wāhi tapu or other Māori artefact material; any feature or archaeological material that predates 1900; or evidence of contaminated land. Standard 25.5.15 requires earthworks that discover any such material to comply with the standards and procedures in Schedule 25.10 'Accidental Discovery Protocol'.
207. We heard little evidence in relation to Schedule 25.10. Most of the submissions²²⁰ supported it and sought that it be retained. Submissions from Sean McLeod²²¹ and the Real Journeys Group sought that the schedule be deleted. We did not hear evidence from Mr McLeod and Mr Farrell did not address this aspect in his evidence for the Real Journeys Group. Mr Henderson supported the retention of Schedule 25.10 in his evidence²²² for the Treble Cone Group. Mr Wyeth addressed these submissions in his Section 42A Report²²³ and recommended that the submissions from Mr McLeod and the Real Journeys Group be rejected, on the basis that it is effective and efficient to include the protocol in the PDP, to alert plan users, provide certainty as to the procedures to follow, and a clear link to Standard 25.5.15. We accept Mr Wyeth's evidence and agree with his reasoning regarding the appropriateness of including an Accidental Discovery Protocol for earthworks in the PDP.

²¹⁹ Maree Baker-Galloway, legal submission for the Real Journeys Group

²²⁰ The Treble Cone Group and associated Submissions 2377, 2381 & 2382; and Submissions 2311 and 2484

²²¹ Submission 2349

²²² R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 158

²²³ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, section 19

208. The Panel does have a concern regarding the structure and wording of the protocol in Schedule 25.10. As stated in Standard 25.5.15, the protocol is a standard that is applied to permitted activities. The protocol must be written in a clear, directive form, that can be applied in this way. It must state what “shall be” done, rather than what will be “determined” by the Council, for example. A resource consent is only required if the protocol is not adhered to, so reference to consent holders is not relevant in a standard. We have made some amendments to the structure and clarity of the wording in the protocol, in accordance with clause 16(2), without changing its meaning or intent, in order to ensure it can act as a standard for permitted activities. Subject to those amendments, we recommend Schedule 25.10 be included in Chapter 25 and those submissions seeking its deletion be rejected.

11. VARIATION TO STAGE 1 PDP CHAPTER 2 DEFINITIONS

209. The Stage 2 Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 2 Definitions amended the definitions of Earthworks, Landfill and Mining Activity; and introduced new definitions for Cleanfill, Cleanfill Facility, Mineral Exploration, Mineral Prospecting and Regionally Significant Infrastructure. We heard little evidence in relation to these definitions. Ms Kim Reilly²²⁴, on behalf of Federated Farmers, accepted the comments in the Section 42A Report in respect of its submission points on definitions. Mr Henderson²²⁵, on behalf of the Treble Cone Group, stated that the submitters opposed the inclusion of “the deposition and removal of cleanfill” into the definition of “Earthworks”, on the basis that it is defined separately and subject to a discretionary activity rule regardless of volume. However, he provided no planning evidence to support this submission.

210. Mr Wyeth addressed submissions on the definitions in his Section 42A Report²²⁶ and recommended that the submission from the Treble Cone Group relating to the inclusion of “cleanfill” within the “Earthworks” definition be rejected. Mr Wyeth referred to the draft National Planning Standards which are seeking to standardise some definitions across planning documents. He acknowledged that no weight can be put on these Standards, as they are still draft and may be subject to change following public consultation. However, he considered they provide a useful guide as to the national direction and have been prepared following consideration of existing definitions in plans across the country. Mr Wyeth noted that, in combination, the definitions of “earthworks” and “land disturbance” in the draft National Planning Standards, specifically include “cleanfill”.

211. In addition, as we have discussed earlier in this Report, Mr Wyeth explained that there appears to be a misunderstanding about the purpose of Rule 25.4.3, which relates to earthworks for the construction and operation of a Cleanfill Facility, being land used solely for the disposal of Cleanfill; whereas earthworks generally may (and often will) include the deposition or removal of Cleanfill, unrelated to a “Cleanfill Facility”. As we noted previously, Mr Wyeth recommended adding the word “Facility” to Rule 25.4.3 to be consistent with the defined term and, potentially, improve clarity.

212. We accept Mr Wyeth’s explanation of the relationship between Rule 25.4.3 and the inclusion of cleanfill in the general definition of earthworks. We agree this necessary to ensure that effects from the deposition or removal of cleanfill, in a manner unrelated to a “Cleanfill Facility”, is treated in the same way as other earthworks activities, with the same standards and consent requirements. We are satisfied that the wording of the definition of

²²⁴ K Reilly, EiC, paragraph 50

²²⁵ R Henderson EiC, paragraph 151 & 159

²²⁶ J Wyeth, Section 42A Report, paragraphs 20.1-20.20

“Earthworks” is the most appropriate to achieve the objectives of Chapter 25. We recommend that the submissions from the Treble Cone Group regarding the definition of “Earthworks” are rejected, and the definition included in the Reply Version be accepted.

12. VARIATION TO STAGE 1 PDP CHAPTER 27 SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT

213. The Stage 2 Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development amended Rule 27.3.2.1 in order to specify the relationship between Chapters 25 and 27 for earthworks undertaken at the time of subdivision. Submissions were received on this variation from the Jacks Point Group and Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd²²⁷ requesting that Rule 27.3.2.1 be amended to better explain and clarify the relationship between the two chapters. We have addressed this matter earlier in this report, when we considered submissions seeking exemptions from Chapter 25 for earthworks associated with subdivision. We have recommended amendments to both Rule 25.3.4.1 and Rule 27.3.2.1 to clarify the relationship between these chapters. As a result, we recommend that the submissions on the variation to Chapter 27 be accepted in part.

13. VARIATION TO STAGE 1 CHAPTER 41 JACKS POINT ZONE

214. The Stage 2 Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 41 Jacks Point Zone struck out the earthworks-related provisions from Chapter 41, in order that they could be integrated into the notified Chapter 25. The evidence for the Jacks Point Group²²⁸ was that they generally supported the integration of all earthworks provisions into the standalone Chapter 25. No submissions were received on this variation. Accordingly, we have not addressed this variation further in the report.

14. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 16(2)

215. Clause 16(2) of the First Schedule to the Act provides that:

(2) a local authority may make an amendment, without using the process in the schedule, to its proposed policy statement or plan to alter any information, where such alteration is of minor effect or may correct any minor errors.

216. We have set out below our recommendations for amendments pursuant to Clause 16(2). We have not included circumstances where consequential changes are required as a result of changes to policy/rule numbers or deletion of provisions.
217. The amendments made to the text under Clause 16(2) below have already been included in the text changes attached in Appendix 1.
- (a) 25.1 Purpose – consequential amendments as a result of changes to the rules specifying the relationship between earthworks controls under Chapter 25 and subdivisions involving earthworks in Chapter 27.
 - (b) Sections 25.3 and 25.8 – replace “*land disturbance activities*” with “*earthworks*”.
 - (c) Section 25.3 – amended the format and headings, and minor wording changes, to be consistent with the format and wording of the Chapters in the PDP (Decisions Version)
 - (d) Section 25.3 – added reference to the NES-PF.

²²⁷ Submission 2382

²²⁸ R Henderson, EiC, paragraph 17

- (e) Rule 25.4.1 – restructured the wording of the rule to distinguish more clearly between compliance with the standards in Tables 25.2 & 25.3 and the activity statuses listed in Table 25.1
- (f) Table 25.2 – correct references to names of zones and areas to be consistent with the PDP (Decisions Version).
- (g) Table 25.3 – delete references to matters of discretion in each standard and replace with general reference in Clause 25.3.2.3.
- (h) Standard 25.5.20 – minor clarifications to the wording to improve ease of interpretation.
- (i) Standard 25.5.22 – minor amendments to write as a standard for permitted activities, rather than an activity status.
- (j) Schedule 25,10 – minor amendments to write schedule as a standard for permitted activities, rather than as conditions for resource consents.

15. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

218. For the reasons set out above, we are satisfied that:
- the amendments we are recommending to the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act,
 - the amendments we are recommending to the policies and rules are the most efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the PDP; and
 - our recommended amendments to the rules will be efficient and effective in implementing the policies of the Plan.
219. For all the reasons above, we recommend the Council adopt Chapter 25, and its associated variations to Chapters 2, 27 and 41, with the wording as set out in Appendix 1, and accept, accept in part, or reject the submissions on this chapter as set out in Appendix 2.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent, Chair
Dated: 11 January 2019

Appendix 1: Chapter 25 and Variations to Chapters 2, 27 and 41 as Recommended

25 Earthworks

25.1 Purpose

Earthworks are often a necessary component of the use and development of rural and urban land, and are often an integral part of the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure. Within urban areas, some modification of the landscape is inevitable in order to provide for development, including creating functional, safe and stable building sites, as well as roads and access ways with appropriate gradients. Within rural areas, some smaller scale earthworks are required to ensure the ongoing viability of rural land uses.

Within both rural and urban locations earthworks have the potential for adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values and require management to ensure the District’s Outstanding Natural Features, Landscapes, amenity values, cultural values, waterbodies and their margins are protected from inappropriate development.

Earthworks associated with construction, subdivision, land use and development can cause erosion of land and sedimentation of stormwater. Unless appropriately managed this could affect stormwater networks, or result in sediment entering wetlands, rivers and lakes. Earthworks can also create temporary nuisance effects from dust, noise and vibration that require management. The focus of Chapter 25 is therefore on ensuring the adverse effects of earthworks are appropriately managed and minimised. It does not seek to discourage or avoid earthworks in the District.

The volume, cut and fill limits in the Earthworks Chapter do not apply to earthworks associated subdivisions All other rules in the Earthworks Chapter apply to subdivisions to manage potential adverse effects from for instance, earthworks near water bodies or cut and fill adjacent to neighbouring properties. Applications for subdivisions involving earthworks shall also be considered against the matters of discretion and assessment matters in this chapter.

Earthworks in this plan encompass the defined activities of earthworks but exclude cultivation, mineral prospecting, exploration and mining activity.

25.2 Objectives and Policies

25.2.1 Objective – Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the environment, protects people and communities, and maintains landscape and visual amenity values.

Policies

- 25.2.1.1 Ensure earthworks minimise erosion, land instability, and sediment generation and off-site discharge during construction activities associated with subdivision and development.
- 25.2.1.2 Manage the adverse effects of earthworks to avoid inappropriate adverse effects and minimise other adverse effects, in a way that:

- a. Protects the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;
- b. Maintains the amenity values of Rural Character Landscapes
- c. Protects the values of Significant Natural Areas and the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands;
- d. Minimises the exposure of aquifers, in particular the Wakatipu Basin, Hāwea Basin, Wanaka Basin and Cardrona alluvial ribbon aquifers;

Note: These aquifers are identified in the Otago Regional Plan: Water for Otago 2004.

- e. Protects Māori cultural values, including wāhi tapu and wāhi tūpuna and other sites of significance to Māori;
- f. Protects the values of heritage sites, precincts and landscape overlays from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and
- g. Maintains public access to and along lakes and rivers.

- 25.2.1.3 Avoid, where practicable, or remedy or mitigate adverse visual effects of earthworks on visually prominent slopes, natural landforms and ridgelines.
- 25.2.1.4 Manage the scale and extent of earthworks to maintain the amenity values and quality of rural and urban areas.
- 25.2.1.5 Design earthworks to recognise the constraints and opportunities of the site and environment.
- 25.2.1.6 Ensure that earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that does not adversely affect infrastructure, buildings and the stability of adjoining sites.
- 25.2.1.7 Encourage limiting the area and volume of earthworks being undertaken on a site at any one time to minimise adverse effects on water bodies and nuisance effects of adverse construction noise, vibration, odour, dust and traffic effects.
- 25.2.1.8 Undertake processes to avoid adverse effects on cultural heritage, including wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and other taonga, and archaeological sites, or where these cannot be avoided, effects are remedied or mitigated.
- 25.2.1.9 Manage the potential adverse effects arising from exposing or disturbing accidentally discovered material by following the Accidental Discovery Protocol in Schedule 25.10.
- 25.2.1.10 Ensure that earthworks that generate traffic movements maintain the safety of roads and accesses, and do not degrade the amenity and quality of surrounding land.
- 25.2.1.11 Ensure that earthworks minimise natural hazard risk to people, communities and property, in particular earthworks undertaken to facilitate land development or natural hazard mitigation.

25.2.2 Objective – The social, cultural and economic wellbeing of people and communities benefits from earthworks

Policies

- 25.2.2.1 Enable earthworks that are necessary to provide for people and communities wellbeing, having particular regard to the importance of:
- a. Nationally and Regionally Significant Infrastructure;
 - b. tourism infrastructure and activities, including the continued operation, and provision for future sensitive development of recreation and tourism activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones and the vehicle testing facility within the Waiorau Ski Area Sub Zone;
 - c. minimising the risk of natural hazards;
 - d. enhancing the operational efficiency of farming including maintenance and improvement of track access and fencing; and
 - e. the use and enjoyment of land for recreation, including public walkways and trails.

25.3 Other Provisions and Rules

25.3.1 District Wide

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters.

1 Introduction	2 Definitions	3 Strategic Direction
4 Urban Development	5 Tangata Whenua	6 Landscapes
26 Historic Heritage	27 Subdivision	28 Natural Hazards
29 Transport	30 Energy and Utilities	31 Signs
32 Protected Trees	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity	34 Wilding Exotic Trees
35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings	36 Noise	37 Designations
Planning Maps		

25.3.1.1 Refer to Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity for earthworks within Significant Natural Areas. The provisions of this chapter apply in addition to the provisions in Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity.

25.3.1.2 Earthworks are also managed as part of development activities and modifications to Historic Heritage items and settings identified on the Planning Maps and in Chapter 26 Historic Heritage. The provisions of this chapter apply in addition to the provisions in Chapter 26 Historic Heritage.

25.3.1.3 The rules relating to construction noise and vibration are managed in Chapter 36: Noise. Consideration of construction noise and vibration associated with earthworks are included as matters of discretion in Part 25.7 and assessment matters in Part 25.8 as a component of the management of the potential adverse effects of earthworks.

25.3.2 Interpreting and Applying the Rules

25.3.2.1 A permitted activity must comply with all the rules listed in the Activity and Standards tables, and any relevant district wide rules, otherwise a resource consent will be required.

25.3.2.2 Where an activity does not comply with a Standard listed in the Standards table, the activity status identified by the Non-Compliance Status column shall apply. Where an activity breaches more than one Standard, the most restrictive status shall apply to the Activity.

25.3.2.3 For restricted discretionary activities, the Council shall restrict the exercise of its discretion to the matters listed in 25.7 Matters of Discretion.

25.3.2.4 The rules for any zone include any subzone or overlay applicable to that zone, except where otherwise specified.

25.3.2.5 Earthworks associated with subdivisions under Chapter 27 are exempt from the following Rules:

- a. Table 25.2 Maximum Volume;
- b. Rule 25.5.15 Cut Standard; and
- c. Rule 25.5.16 Fill Standard.

All other rules in the Earthworks Chapter apply to earthworks associated with a subdivision. Applications for earthworks that are associated with subdivision shall be considered against the matters of discretion for earthworks in Part 25.7 and assessment matters in Part 25.8.

Applications for subdivision involving any earthworks shall be considered against the matters of discretion for earthworks in Part 25.7 and assessment matters in Part 25.8.

25.3.2.6 Earthworks within the Ski Area Sub Zones and vehicle testing facilities within the Waairau Ski Area Sub Zone are exempt from the earthworks rules, with the exception of the following rules that apply:

- a. Rules 25.5.12 and 25.5.13 that control erosion and sediment and dust;
- b. Rule 25.5.19 setbacks from waterbodies; and
- c. Rule 25.5.20 exposing groundwater.

- 25.3.2.7 Earthworks within the Rural Zone, Gibbston Character Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone to facilitate the construction of a building and landscaping authorised by resource consent within an approved building platform are exempt from the following rules:
- a. Table 25.2 Maximum Volume;
 - b. Rule 25.5.15 Cut Standard; and
 - c. Rule 25.5.16 Fill Standard.
- 25.3.2.8 The provisions in this chapter do not apply to the following activities in Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities:
- a. Earthworks, buildings, structures and National Grid sensitive activities undertaken within the National Grid Yard;
 - b. Earthworks for the placement of underground electricity cables or lines.
 - c. Earthworks for the construction, alteration, or addition to underground lines.
- 25.3.2.9 Earthworks shall be calculated as follows:
- a. The maximum volume and area of earthworks shall be calculated per site, within any consecutive 12 month period
 - b. Volume shall mean the sum of all earth that is moved within a site and includes the total of any combined cut and fill. Refer to Interpretive Diagrams 25.1 to 25.3 located within Schedule 25.9
- 25.3.2.10 Earthworks for the following shall be exempt from the rules in Tables 25.1 to 25.3:
- a. Erosion and sediment control except where subject to Rule 25.5.19 setback from waterbodies.
 - b. The digging of holes for offal pits
 - c. Fence posts.
 - d. Drilling bores.
 - e. Mining Activity, Mineral Exploration or Mineral Prospecting.
 - f. Planting riparian vegetation.
 - g. Internments within legally established burial grounds.
 - h. Maintenance of existing vehicle and recreational accesses and tracks, excluding their expansion.
 - i. Deposition of spoil from drain clearance work within the site the drain crosses.

- j. Test pits or boreholes necessary as part of a geotechnical assessment or contaminated land assessment where the ground is reinstated to existing levels within 48 hours.
- k. Firebreaks not exceeding 10 metres width.
- l. Cultivation and cropping.
- m. Fencing in the Rural Zone, Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (excluding the Precinct), Rural Lifestyle Zone and Gibbston Character Zone where any cut or fill does not exceed 1 metre in height or any earthworks does not exceed 1 metre in width.
- n. Earthworks where the following National Environmental Standards have regulations that prevail over the District Plan:
 - (i) Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009.
 - (ii) Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.
 - (iii) Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016.
 - (iv) Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2016.

25.3.2.11 The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.

P	Permitted	C	Controlled
RD	Restricted Discretionary	D	Discretionary
NC	Non Complying	PR	Prohibited

25.3.3 Advice Notes - Regional Council Provisions

25.3.3.1 Some earthworks activities including those that:

- a. involve the diversion of water; including any earthworks structures used for flood hazard mitigation; or
- b. discharge of stormwater with sediment; or
- c. modification to water bodies including wetlands; or
- d. result in the exposure of groundwater aquifers:
are subject to the Otago Regional Council Regional Plan: Water for Otago 2004.

25.3.3.2 Cleanfill and Landfill activities are also subject to the Otago Regional Council Regional Plan: Waste for Otago 1997.

25.3.4 Advice Notes - General

25.3.4.1 Those who wish to undertake earthworks in the vicinity of Queenstown Airport or Wanaka Airport are referred to Figures 1 to 4 of the Planning Maps which identify the Airport Approach and Protection Measures, and Airport Protection Inner Horizontal and

Conical Surfaces for Queenstown Airport and Wanaka Airport. Land use restrictions within these areas are further described in Chapter 37: Designations, Parts D.3 and E.2. Persons who wish to undertake earthworks are advised to consult with the relevant requiring authority and the Civil Aviation Authority.

25.3.4.2 Part I of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 states that no work may be undertaken on an archaeological site (whether recorded or unrecorded) until an archaeological authority to destroy, damage or modify a site has been granted by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga in accordance with that Act. Note: A recorded site is an archaeological site recorded via the New Zealand Archaeological Association's Site Recording Scheme and information is available at www.archsite.org.nz.

25.3.4.3 Attention is drawn to the following iwi management plans that should be taken into account of and given regard to when assessing resource consent applications:

- a. Te Tangi a Taurira: The Cry of the People, the Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Iwi Management Plan for Natural Resources 2008.
- b. Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plans 1995 and 2005.

25.3.4.4 Resource consent may be required for earthworks under the following National Environmental Standards:

- a. Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011. In particular for earthworks associated with the removal or replacement of fuel storage tanks, earthworks associated with sampling or disturbance of land identified in the Listed Land Use Register held by the Otago Regional Council. In these instances, the NES applies instead of the District Plan provisions.
- b. The Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016. In particular for earthworks associated with antennas and cabinets. Refer to Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities for clarification as to whether the NES applies instead of the District Plan provisions.
- c. The Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009. Refer to Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities for clarification as to whether the NES applies instead of the District Plan provisions.
- d. The Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017.

25.4 Rules – Activities

	Table 25.1 - Earthworks Activities	Activity Status
25.4.1	Earthworks that comply with all of the standards in Tables 25.2 and 25.3, except where listed in Table 25.1 as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.	P

	Table 25.1 - Earthworks Activities	Activity Status
25.4.2	Earthworks that do not comply with the standards for the maximum total volume of earthworks in Table 25.2.	RD
25.4.3	Earthworks for the construction or operation of a Cleanfill Facility.	RD
25.4.4	Earthworks for the construction or operation of a Landfill.	D
25.4.5	<p>Earthworks</p> <p>25.4.5.1 that modify, damage or destroy a wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna or other site of significance to Māori whether identified on the Planning Maps or not; or</p> <p>25.4.5.2 that modify, damage or destroy a listed heritage feature, in Chapter 26.8 Historic Heritage; or</p> <p>25.4.5.3 within the setting or extent of place of a listed heritage feature in Chapter 26.8 – Historic Heritage.</p>	D
25.4.6	Earthworks within a Statutory Acknowledgment Area, Tōpuni or Nohoanga identified on Planning Map 40.	D

25.5 Rules – Standards

	Table 25.2 - Maximum Volume	Maximum Total Volume
25.5.1	Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone Arrowtown Town Centre Zone Open Space and Recreation Zones	100m ³
25.5.2	Heritage Landscape Overlay Area Heritage Precinct Outstanding Natural Feature	10m ³
25.5.3	Low Density Residential Zone Medium Density Residential Zone High Density Residential Zone Waterfall Park Zone	300m ³

	Table 25.2 - Maximum Volume	Maximum Total Volume
25.5.4	Large Lot Residential Zone Rural Residential Zone Rural Lifestyle Zone Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and Precinct	400m ³
25.5.5	Queenstown Town Centre Zone Wanaka Town Centre Zone Local Shopping Centre Zone Business Mixed Use Zone Airport Zone (Queenstown) Millbrook Resort Zone	500m ³
25.5.6	Rural Zone Gibbston Character Zone Airport Zone (Wanaka)	1000m ³
25.5.7	25.5.7.1 Roads 25.5.7.2 Roads located within an Outstanding Natural Feature identified on the Planning Maps	a. No limit b. 10m ³
	Jacks Point Zone	
25.5.8	Residential Activity Areas Open Space Horticulture Open Space Residential Open Space Foreshore Farm Buildings and Craft Activity Area Boating Facilities Area	500m ³
25.5.9	Open Space Landscape Open Space Amenity	1000m ³

	Table 25.2 - Maximum Volume	Maximum Total Volume
	Homesite	
25.5.10	Open Space Golf Education Lodge Village Village Homestead Bay	No maximum

	Table 25.3 - Standards	Non-Compliance
	Nuisance effects, erosion, sediment generation and run-off	
25.5.11	Earthworks over a contiguous area of land shall not exceed the following area: 25.5.11.1 2,500m ² where the slope is 10° or greater. 25.5.11.2 10,000m ² where the slope is less than 10°.	RD
25.5.12	Erosion and sediment control measures must be implemented and maintained during earthworks to minimise the amount of sediment exiting the site, entering water bodies, and stormwater networks. Note: Compliance with this standard is generally deemed to be compliance with Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland region. Auckland Council Guideline Document GD2016/005.	RD
25.5.13	Dust from earthworks shall be managed through appropriate dust control measures so that dust it does not cause nuisance effects beyond the boundary of the site Note: Compliance with this standard is generally deemed to be compliance with section 9 of Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland region. Auckland Council Guideline Document GD2016/005.	RD

	Table 25.3 - Standards	Non-Compliance
25.5.14	<p>Earthworks that discovers any of the following:</p> <p>25.5.14.1 kōiwi tangata (human skeletal remains), wāhi taoka (resources of importance), wāhi tapu (places or features of special significance) or other Māori artefact material, or</p> <p>25.5.14.2 any feature or archaeological material that predates 1900, or</p> <p>25.5.14.3 evidence of contaminated land (such as discolouration, vapours, landfill material, significant odours),</p> <p>that is not provided for by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011, any resource consent or other statutory authority, shall comply with the standards and procedures in Schedule 25.10 'Accidental Discovery Protocol'.</p>	RD
	Height of cut and fill and slope	
25.5.15	<p>The maximum depth of any cut shall not exceed 2.4 metres.</p> <p>25.5.15.1 This rule shall not apply to roads.</p>	RD
25.5.16	<p>The maximum height of any fill shall not exceed 2 metres.</p> <p>25.5.16.1 This rule shall not apply to roads and to the backfilling of excavations.</p>	RD

	Table 25.3 - Standards	Non-Compliance
25.5.17	<p>Earthworks for farm tracks and access ways in the following Zones and Activity Areas shall comply with standards 25.5.18.1 to 25.5.18.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Zone • Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone • Gibbston Character Zone • Jacks Point Zone Activity Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Space Landscape - Open Space Golf - Open Space Amenity - Homesite - Education - Lodge <p>25.5.17.1 No farm track or access way shall have an upslope cut or batter greater than 1 metre in height.</p> <p>25.5.17.2 All cuts and batters shall not be greater than 65 degrees.</p> <p>25.5.17.3 The maximum height of any fill shall not exceed 2 metres.</p> <p>This standard shall not apply to roads.</p>	RD
	Setbacks from boundaries	

	Table 25.3 - Standards	Non-Compliance
25.5.18	<p>Earthworks greater than 0.3 metres in height or depth shall be set back from the site boundary the following minimum distances:</p> <p>25.5.18.1 Earthworks not supported by retaining walls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a distance at least equal to the maximum height of the fill, as measured from the toe of the fill, with a maximum batter slope angle of 1:3 (vertical: horizontal); or b. 300mm plus a batter slope angle of a maximum of 1:3 (vertical: horizontal), as measured from the crest of the cut. <p>Refer to Interpretive Diagrams 25.4 and 25.5 located within Schedule 25.9.</p> <p>25.5.18.2 Earthworks supported by retaining walls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cut or fill supported by a retaining wall must be setback a distance at least equal to the height of the retaining wall; b. Cut and fill equal to or less than 0.5m in height is exempt from this rule. <p>Refer to Interpretive Diagrams 25.6 and 25.7 located within Schedule 25.9.</p>	RD
	Water bodies	
25.5.19	<p>Earthworks within 10m of the bed of any water body, or any drain or water race that flows to a lake or river, shall not exceed 5m³ in total volume, within any consecutive 12-month period.</p> <p>This rule shall not apply to:</p> <p>25.5.19.1 any artificial water body (watercourse, lake, pond or wetland) that does not flow to a lake or river, including Lake Tewa within the Jacks Point Zone; or</p> <p>25.5.19.2 Maintenance and repairing of existing hazard protection structures in and around a water body.</p>	RD
25.5.20	<p>Earthworks shall not be undertaken below the water table of any groundwater aquifer, or cause artificial drainage of any groundwater aquifer.</p>	RD

	Table 25.3 - Standards	Non-Compliance
	Cleanfill	
25.5.21	No more than 300m³ of Cleanfill shall be transported by road to or from an area subject to Earthworks.	RD

25.6 Non-Notification of Applications

All applications for resource consent for the following matters shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified:

25.6.1 Rule 25.5.11 for restricted discretionary activities that exceed the area (m²) standard.

25.7 Matters of Discretion

25.7.1 For all restricted discretionary activities discretion shall be restricted to the following matters. These matters may also be applicable to any discretionary or non-complying activity.

25.7.1.1 Soil erosion, generation and run-off of sediment.

25.7.1.2 Landscape and visual amenity.

25.7.1.3 Effects on infrastructure, adjacent sites and public roads.

25.7.1.4 Land stability.

25.7.1.5 Effects on water bodies, ecosystem services and biodiversity.

25.7.1.6 Cultural, heritage and archaeological sites.

25.7.1.7 Nuisance effects.

25.7.1.8 Natural Hazards.

25.7.1.9 Functional aspects and positive effects.

25.8 Assessment Matters

25.8.1 In considering whether or not to grant consent or impose conditions on a resource consent, regard shall be had, but not be limited by the following assessment matters which are listed in the order of the matters of discretion.

25.8.2 Soil erosion and generation of sediments

25.8.2.1 The extent to which the proposal achieves effective erosion and sediment management.

- 25.8.2.2 Whether earthworks will be completed within a short period, reducing the risk of actual and potential adverse effects.
- 25.8.2.3 Whether the extent or impacts of adverse effects from the earthworks can be mitigated by managing the season or staging of when such works occur.
- 25.8.2.4 Whether the proposal is supported with erosion and sediment management design that corresponds to the scale, area, duration of the works and the sensitivity of receiving environment. In particular where resource consent is required for non-compliance with Rule 25.5.11, this design is prepared by a suitably qualified person.

25.8.3 Landscape and visual amenity

- 25.8.3.1 Whether the design of the earthworks is sympathetic to natural topography.
- 25.8.3.2 Whether any rehabilitation is proposed and to what extent rehabilitation, revegetation or future buildings would mitigate adverse effects, including any re-vegetation or landscaping.
- 25.8.3.3 The duration of earthworks and any timeframes proposed for remedial works and revegetation.
- 25.8.3.4 Within Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and, the Rural Landscape landscapes, whether and to what extent earthworks avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects or improve landscape quality and character, taking into account:
 - a. physical attributes including geological, topographical features, waterbodies and formative processes of the landscape;
 - b. visual attributes including legibility, existing land management patterns, vegetation patterns, ridgelines or visually prominent areas; and
 - c. cultural attributes including Tangata whenua values, historic and heritage associations.
- 25.8.3.5 The sensitivity of the landscape to absorb change, and whether the earthworks will change the character or quality of the landscape.
- 25.8.3.6 The potential for cumulative effects on the natural form of the landscape.
- 25.8.3.7 Whether the design or location of any new tracks or roads can be modified in order to decrease the effects on the stability, visual quality and amenity values of the landscape.
- 25.8.3.8 The extent earthworks will affect visual amenity values including public or private views and whether the earthworks will be remediated, and the final form of the area affected is consistent with natural topography and land use patterns.

25.8.4 Effects on infrastructure, adjacent sites and public roads

- 25.8.4.1 Whether the earthworks will affect stormwater and overland flows, and the extent to which this creates adverse effects off-site and increases stormwater flows onto other properties, including whether this will exceed existing stormwater design or stormwater management of those properties.
- 25.8.4.2 Whether the earthworks or final ground levels will adversely affect existing infrastructure, utility services and assets.
- 25.8.4.3 Where there will need to be off-site disposal of excess material or cleanfill, traffic generation effects limited to access, road network performance and safety, damage to the carriageway and amenity effects.
- 25.8.4.4 Whether the use of legal instruments are necessary, such as a bond to ensure works are completed, the earthworks area is rehabilitated, or for damage to roads.
- 25.8.4.5 Any other measures employed to reduce the impact on other sensitive receivers such as aircraft operating in the Airport Protection Inner and Conical Surfaces for Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.

25.8.5 Land stability

- 25.8.5.1 The extent to which any proposal demonstrates that fill associated with buildings, retaining, accesses and parking areas comply with the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, where these matters have not already been addressed through a subdivision consent or building consent pursuant to Building Act 2004.
- 25.8.5.2 Where earthworks are proposed on a site gradient greater than 18.5 degrees (1 in 3), whether advice from a suitably qualified person has been provided to address the stability of the earthworks.
- 25.8.5.3 Whether cut, fill and retaining are designed and undertaken in accordance with the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice.
- 25.8.5.4 Whether the earthworks and any associated retaining structures are designed and located to avoid adverse effects on the stability and safety of surrounding land, buildings, and structures.

25.8.6 Effects on water bodies, ecosystem services and biodiversity

- 25.8.6.1 The effectiveness of sediment control techniques to ensure sediment run-off does not leave the development site or enter water bodies.
- 25.8.6.2 Whether and to what extent any groundwater is likely to be affected, and mitigation measures are proposed to address likely effects.
- 25.8.6.3 The effects of earthworks on the natural character, ecosystem services and biodiversity values of wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins.

25.8.6.4 The effects on significant natural areas.

25.8.7 Cultural, heritage and archaeological values

25.8.7.1 The extent to which the activity modifies or damages wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga, whether tangata whenua have been notified and the outcomes of any consultation.

25.8.7.2 The extent to which the activity affects Ngāi Tahu's cultural, spiritual, historic and traditional association with a Statutory Acknowledgment Area having regard to the relevant provisions of the iwi management plans identified in Advice Note 25.3.4.3.

25.8.7.3 The extent to which a protocol for the accidental discovery of kōiwi, archaeology and artefacts of Māori origin or other archaeological items has been provided and the effectiveness of the protocol in managing the impact on Mana Whenua cultural heritage if a discovery is made. Using the Accidental Discovery Protocol in Schedule 25.10 as a guide.

25.8.7.4 Whether the proposal protects the relationship of Mana Whenua with their cultural heritage.

25.8.7.5 Whether the area subject to earthworks contains a recorded archaeological site, and if so the extent to which the proposal would affect any such site and whether any necessary archaeological authority has been obtained from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

25.8.7.6 The extent to which earthworks and vibration adversely affect heritage items.

25.8.8 Nuisance effects

25.8.8.1 The extent to which earthworks will generate adverse noise, vibration, odour, dust, lighting and traffic effects on the surrounding environment and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures, including whether a management plan has been submitted as part of the application.

25.8.8.2 Duration and hours of operation, including whether the activity will generate noise and vibration effects, which detract from the amenity values of the surrounding area to an extent greater than anticipated to accommodate development otherwise provided for by the District Plan.

25.8.9 Natural Hazards

25.8.9.1 Whether the earthworks are necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate the risk of any natural hazard.

25.8.9.2 Where the proposal is affected by, or potentially affected by, natural hazards as identified in the Council's natural hazards database, particular regard shall

be had to the Natural Hazards Chapter 28, in particular Policies 28.3.2.1, 28.3.2.2, 28.3.2.3.

- 25.8.9.3 Whether the earthworks and final ground levels will adversely affect an aquifer or an overland flow path or increase the potential risk of flooding within the site or surrounding sites.
- 25.8.9.4 The extent earthworks affect the risk of natural hazards and whether the risk is reduced or not increased.

25.8.10 Functional aspects and positive effects

- 25.8.10.1 Whether the earthworks are necessary for the functional or operational requirements of infrastructure, including network utility installation, repair or maintenance.
- 25.8.10.2 The extent to which the earthworks are necessary to accommodate development otherwise provided for by the District Plan.
- 25.8.10.3 Whether the earthworks are associated with farming activities and will enhance operational efficiency including maintenance and improvement of track access, safety and fencing.
- 25.8.10.4 Whether the earthworks are for the purposes of a fire break and the extent of the fire break is necessary.
- 25.8.10.5 Whether the earthworks are for the purposes of public recreation trails that enhance recreational opportunities and access.
- 25.8.10.6 Whether the earthworks are necessary for the remediation of contaminated land and facilitate the efficient use of the land resource.


25.9 Schedule 25.9 Interpretive Diagrams

25.1 Interpretative Diagram: Volume scenario A Elevation View

The total volume of earthworks means 'the total volume of all material that is moved within a site'

$$\text{A) Total Volume} = 50\text{m}^3 \text{ (Cut)} + 50\text{m}^3 \text{ (Fill)}$$

$$= 100\text{m}^3$$




25.2 Interpretative Diagram: Volume scenario B Elevation View

The total volume of earthworks means 'the total volume of all material that is moved within a site'

$$\text{B) Total Volume} = 50\text{m}^3 \text{ (Cut) removed off-site}$$

$$= 50\text{m}^3$$




25.3

Interpretative Diagram: Volume scenario C
Elevation View


The total volume of earthworks means 'the total volume of all material that is moved within a site'

- C) Total Volume = 50m³ (Cut)** removed from site
- = 50m³ material placed in same location (i.e. compacted fill)
- = 100m³




25.4

Interpretative Diagram: Unsupported Cut
Elevation View




25.5


Interpretative Diagram: Unsupported Fill Elevation View



25.6

Interpretative Diagram: Cut Supported by Retaining Elevation View



25.7**Interpretative Diagram: Fill Supported by Retaining Elevation View****25.10 Schedule 25.10 Accidental Discovery Protocol**

Earthworks shall be undertaken as follows:

Upon discovery of any material listed in Rule 25.5.14, the following steps shall be taken:

25.10.1 Cease works and secure the area

25.10.1.1 All works shall immediately cease within 20m of any part of the discovery, including shutting down all earth disturbing machinery and stopping all earth moving activities, and in the case of evidence of contaminated land applying controls to minimise discharge of contaminants into the environment.

25.10.1.2 The area of the discovery shall be secured, including a sufficient buffer area to ensure that all discovered material remains undisturbed.

25.10.2 Inform relevant authorities and agencies

25.10.2.1 The following parties shall be immediately informed of the discovery:

- a. the New Zealand Police if the discovery is of human remains or kōiwi;
- b. the Council in all cases;
- c. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga if the discovery is an archaeological site, Māori cultural artefact, human remains or kōiwi;

- d. Mana Whenua if the discovery is an archaeological site, Māori cultural artefact, or kōiwi.

25.10.3 Wait for and enable inspection of the site

- 25.10.3.1 All works shall cease and provision shall be made to enable the site to be inspected by the relevant authority or agency:
- a. if the discovery is human remains or kōiwi, the New Zealand Police are required to investigate the human remains to determine whether they are those of a missing person or are a crime scene. The remainder of this process shall not apply until the New Zealand Police confirm that they have no further interest in the discovery; or
 - b. if the discovery is of other than evidence of contaminants, a site inspection for the purpose of initial assessment and response shall be arranged by the Council in consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and appropriate Mana Whenua representatives; or
 - c. if the discovery is evidence of contaminants, a suitably qualified person shall complete an initial assessment and provide information to the Council on the assessment and response.

Following site inspection and consultation with all relevant parties, the directions of the Council, as to the area within which work must cease and any changes to controls on discharges of contaminants, shall be complied with, until the requirements of f. are met.

25.10.4 Recommencement of work

- 25.10.4.1 Work within the area determined by the Council at e. shall only recommence when all of the following requirements, so far as relevant to the discovery, have been met:
- a. Heritage New Zealand has confirmed that an archaeological authority has been approved for the work or that none is required;
 - b. any required notification under the Protected Objects Act 1975 has been made to the Ministry for Culture and Heritage;
 - c. the requirements of the National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011 have been met;
 - d. any material of scientific or educational importance must be recorded and if appropriate recovered and preserved;
 - e. where the site is of Māori origin and an authority from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga is not required the Council will confirm, in consultation with Mana Whenua, that:
 - (i) any kōiwi have either been retained where discovered or removed in accordance with the appropriate tikanga; and

- (ii) any agreed revisions to the planned works to be/have been made in order to address adverse effects on Māori cultural values.
- f. any necessary resource consent has been granted to any alteration or amendment to the earthworks or land disturbance that may be necessary to avoid the sensitive materials and that is not otherwise permitted under the Plan or allowed by any existing resource consent.
- g. there are no requirements in the case of archaeological sites that are not of Māori origin and are not covered by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

Variation to Stage 1 PDP Chapter 2 Definitions:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike-through~~ text for deletions.

<p>Earthworks</p>	<p>Means the disturbance of land surfaces by the removal or <u>deposition on or change to the profile of land.</u></p> <p><u>Earthworks includes excavation, filling, cuts, root raking and blading, firebreaks, batters and the formation of roads, access, driveways, tracks and the deposition and removal of cleanfill. depositing of material, excavation, filling or the formation of roads, banks, and tracks. Excludes the cultivation of land and the digging of holes for offal pits and the erection of posts or poles or the planting of trees.</u></p>
<p>Landfill</p>	<p>Means a site used for the deposit of solid wastes onto or into land.</p> <p><u>Means the use of land for the primary purpose of providing a disposal facility for the controlled deposit of solid wastes, household wastes and green waste onto or into land. Excludes offal pits, silage pits and silage stacks that are part of a farming activity.</u></p>
<p>Mining Activity</p>	<p>Means the use of land and buildings for the primary purpose of the extraction, winning, quarrying, excavation, taking and associated processing of minerals and includes prospecting and exploration.</p> <p><u>Means operations in connection with mining for any mineral; and includes, when carried out at or near the site where the mining is undertaken:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the extraction, transport, treatment, processing, and separation of any mineral or chemical substance from the mineral; and</u> • <u>the construction, maintenance, and operation of any works, structures, and other land improvements, and of any related machinery and equipment connected with the operations; and</u> • <u>the removal of overburden by mechanical or other means, and the stacking, deposit, storage, and treatment of any substance considered to contain any mineral; and</u> • <u>the deposit or discharge of any mineral, material, debris, tailings, refuse, or wastewater produced from or consequent on the operations.</u>

	<u>Mineral extraction, extraction or extractive activities shall have the same meaning.</u>
--	---

New Definitions Stage 2 PDP:

<u>Cleanfill</u>	<p><u>Means material that, when buried, will have no adverse effects on people or the environment. Cleanfill material includes virgin natural materials such as clay, soil and rock, and other inert materials, such as concrete or brick, that are free of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>combustible, putrescible, degradable or leachable components;</u> (b) <u>hazardous substances;</u> (c) <u>products or materials derived from hazardous waste treatment, hazardous waste stabilisation, or hazardous waste disposal practices;</u> (d) <u>materials that may present a risk to human or animal health, such as medical and veterinary waste, asbestos or radioactive substances; or</u> (e) <u>liquid waste.</u>
<u>Cleanfill Facility</u>	<u>Means land used solely for the disposal of cleanfill. A cleanfill facility may include stockpiling, rehabilitation and landscaping.</u>
<u>Mineral Exploration</u>	<u>Means an activity undertaken for the purpose of identifying mineral deposits or occurrences and evaluating the feasibility of mining particular deposits or occurrences of 1 or more minerals; and includes drilling, dredging, or excavations (whether surface or subsurface) that are reasonably necessary to determine the nature and size of a mineral deposit or occurrence.</u>
<u>Mineral Prospecting</u>	<p><u>Means any activity undertaken for the purpose of identifying land likely to contain mineral deposits or occurrences; and includes the following activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>geological, geochemical, and geophysical surveys;</u> • <u>the taking of samples by hand or hand held methods;</u> • <u>aerial surveys.</u>
<u>Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u>	<p><u>Means:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>renewable electricity generation facilities, where they supply the National Grid and local distribution network and are operated by an electricity operator;</u> • <u>electricity transmission infrastructure forming the National Grid;</u> • <u>electricity Distribution Lines identified on the Planning Maps;</u> • <u>telecommunication and radio communication facilities*;</u> • <u>municipal infrastructure**;</u> • <u>roads classified as being of national or regional importance; and</u> • <u>Queenstown and Wanaka airports.</u> <p><u>* As defined by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities) Regulations 2016.</u></p>

Shading indicates provisions withdrawn under Clause 8D of the Resource Management Act 1991 as publicly notified on 4 April 2019

** As defined by the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2015.

Variation to Stage 1 Subdivision and Development Chapter 27:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike-through~~ text for deletions.

27.3.2 Earthworks associated with subdivision

27.3.2.1 Refer to Chapter 25 Earthworks, Rule 25.3.2.5. Earthworks associated with subdivisions are subject to the earthworks standards in Chapter 25 (except the maximum total volume, cut and fill standards). Applications for subdivision involving earthworks shall be assessed against the matters of discretion and assessment matters in Chapter 25. ~~Earthworks undertaken for the development of land associated with any subdivision shall not require a separate resource consent under the rules of the District Wide Earthworks Chapter, but shall be considered against the matters of control or discretion of the District Wide Earthworks Chapter as part of any subdivision activity.~~

Variation to Stage 1 Jacks Point Zone Chapter 41:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike-through~~ text for deletions.

Page 41-3:

~~41.3.2.2 Earthworks undertaken for the development of land associated with any subdivision shall be governed by Chapter 27: Subdivision and Development.~~

Pages 41-13 to 41-15:

Rule 41.5.4 Delete in entirety.

Earthworks (excluding earthworks associated with a subdivision)		RD
<p>41.5.4.1 Volume of Earthworks</p> <p>The maximum total volume of earthworks (m³) shall not exceed that specified in the table below.</p> <p>a. The maximum total volume of earthworks shall be calculated per site, within one consecutive 12 month period.</p> <p>b. Volume shall mean the sum of all earth that is moved within a site and includes any combination of cut and fill, removing fill off site and replacing fill on site — refer Interpretive Diagrams 5 (a), (b) and (c) of the Earthworks Chapter of the Operative District Plan.</p>		
Activity Area	Maximum Total Volume	
Residential Activity Areas Village Village Homestead Bay Open Space Horticulture Open Space Residential	500 m ³	

Open Space Foreshore Farm Buildings and Craft Activity Area Boating Facilities Area			
Open Space Landscape Open Space Amenity Farm Preserve 1 and 2 Homesite	1,000 m ²		
Open Space Golf Education Education Innovation Campus Lodge	No maximum		

41.5.4.2 — Height of cut and fill and slope

OSL, OSG, OSA, FP 1 and 2, HS, E, EIC and L Activity Areas:

- No road, track or access way shall have an upslope cut or batter greater than 1 metre in height, measured vertically.
- All cuts and batters shall be laid back such that their angle from the horizontal is no more than 65 degrees.
- The maximum height of any fill shall not exceed 2 metres.

c. All other Activity Areas:

- The maximum height of any cut shall not exceed 2.4 metres.
- The maximum height of any fill shall not exceed 2 metres.
- The vertical height of any cut or fill shall not be greater than the distance of the top of the cut or the toe of the fill from the site boundary (see Interpretative Diagram 6 of the Earthworks Chapter of the Operative District Plan), except where the cut or fill is retained, in which case it may be located up to the boundary, if less or equal to 0.5 metre in height.

41.5.4.3 Fill

All fill for residential building platforms and associated retaining walls is to be in accordance with the requirements of NZS 4404:2010 and/or NZS 4431:1989 as appropriate.

14.5.4.4 Environmental Protection Measures

Any person carrying out earthworks shall implement sediment and erosion control measures to avoid sediment effects beyond the boundary of the site.

- d. Any person carrying out earthworks shall implement appropriate dust control measures to avoid nuisance effects of dust beyond the boundary of the site.

~~e. Areas of exposed soil are to be vegetated / re-vegetated within 12 months from the completion of works.~~

~~41.5.4.5 Water bodies~~

~~Earthworks within 7m of the bed of any water body shall not exceed 20m³ in total volume, within one consecutive 12-month period.~~

~~f. Any material associated with earthworks activity shall not be positioned within 7m of the bed of any water body or where it may dam, divert or contaminate water.~~

~~g. Earthworks shall not:~~

- ~~• cause artificial drainage of any groundwater aquifer;~~
- ~~• cause temporary ponding of any surface water.~~

~~41.5.4.6 Cultural heritage and archaeological sites~~

~~Earthworks shall not modify, damage or destroy any waahi tapu, waahi taonga or identified feature in Chapter 26, or any archaeological site.~~

~~Discretion is restricted to all of the following:~~

- ~~• The nature and scale of the earthworks~~
- ~~• Environmental protection measures~~
- ~~• Remedial works and revegetation~~
- ~~• The effects on landscape and visual amenity values~~
- ~~• The effects on land stability and flooding~~
- ~~• The effects on water bodies~~
- ~~• The effects on cultural and archaeological sites~~
- Noise

Appendix 2: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions

Appendix 2: Recommendations on Submissions

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
519.3	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Accept	12
567.12	Wild Grass Partnership, Wild Grass Investments No 1 Limited & Horizons Investment Trust	Accept in Part	1.4
632.77	RCL Queenstown Pty Ltd, RCL Henley Downs Ltd, RCL Jacks	Accept in Part	1.4
632.78	RCL Queenstown Pty Ltd, RCL Henley Downs Ltd, RCL Jacks	Accept in Part	1.4
762.12	Jacks Point Residential No.2 Ltd, Jacks Point Village Holdings Ltd, Jacks Point Developments Limited, Jacks Point Land Limited, Jacks Point Land No. 2 Limited, Jacks Point Management Limited, Henley D	Accept	1.4
762.13	Jacks Point Residential No.2 Ltd, Jacks Point Village Holdings Ltd, Jacks Point Developments Limited, Jacks Point Land Limited, Jacks Point Land No. 2 Limited, Jacks Point Management Limited, Henley D	Accept	1.4
768.3	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Accept in Part	12
2019.2	Jonathan Holmes	Accept in part	1.4
2133.1	Tonnie & Erna Spijkerbosch	Reject	1.4
2140.3	Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2140.4	Friends of Lake Hayes Society Inc	Reject	1.4
2194.10	Chorus	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2194.11	Chorus	Accept	1.4
2194.12	Chorus	Accept	1.4
2194.13	Chorus	Accept	8

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2194.8	Chorus	Accept	3.6
2194.9	Chorus	Accept in Part	4.1
2195.10	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2195.11	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	1.4
2195.12	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	1.4
2195.13	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	8
2195.8	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept	3.6
2195.9	Spark New Zealand Trading Ltd	Accept in Part	4.1
2222.4	Broadview Villas Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2222.5	Broadview Villas Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2222.6	Broadview Villas Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2224.1	MOUNT CARDRONA STATION LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2228.4	T. ROVIN	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2228.5	T. ROVIN	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2228.6	T. ROVIN	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2229.19	R & M DONALDSON	Accept in part	1.4
2230.4	THE ESCARPMENT LIMITED	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2230.5	THE ESCARPMENT LIMITED	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2230.6	THE ESCARPMENT LIMITED	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2239.6	QLDC Chief Executive - submitting on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2239.7	QLDC Chief Executive - submitting on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2242.12	Department of Conservation	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
2242.13	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	3.4
2242.14	Department of Conservation	Accept	3.6
2242.15	Department of Conservation	Accept	4.3
2242.16	Department of Conservation	Accept in Part	8

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2242.17	Department of Conservation	Accept	8
2290.4	KAWARAU JET SERVICES HOLDINGS LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2291.8	LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2292.7	M McGuinness	Accept in part	1.4
2295.4	Millbrook Country Club	Reject	3.3 & 3.4
2295.5	Millbrook Country Club	Reject	3.3
2295.6	Millbrook Country Club	Accept	3.6
2295.7	Millbrook Country Club	Reject	3.6
2295.8	Millbrook Country Club	Accept in Part	6.1
2308.10	Jon Waterston	Accept in part	1.4
2311.12	Streat Developments Limited	Accept in Part	4.2
2311.13	Streat Developments Limited	Accept	6.1
2311.14	Streat Developments Limited	Reject	7
2311.15	Streat Developments Limited	Accept	10
2314.11	STONERIDGE ESTATE LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2315.11	R G DAYMAN	Accept in part	1.4
2316.11	TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2317.11	MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK	Accept in part	1.4
2318.11	C BATCHELOR	Accept in part	1.4
2319.11	D D & J C DUNCAN	Accept in part	1.4
2320.10	G WILLS & T BURDON	Accept in part	1.4
2327.1	Ian Dee	Reject	3.5
2329.1	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua and Te Runanga o Oraka-Aparima (Kai Tahu)	Accept in part	1.4
2329.5	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o	Accept in part	1.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
	Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua and Te Runanga o Oraka-Aparima (Kai Tahu)		
2349.1	Sean McLeod	Reject	1.4
2349.10	Sean McLeod	Reject	9
2349.2	Sean McLeod	Reject	10
2349.23	Sean McLeod	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2349.24	Sean McLeod	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2349.25	Sean McLeod	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2349.5	Sean McLeod	Reject	6.1
2349.6	Sean McLeod	Accept in Part	6.2
2349.7	Sean McLeod	Reject	9
2349.8	Sean McLeod	Reject	9
2349.9	Sean McLeod	Reject	9
2373.10	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in Part	4.2
2373.11	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	4.3
2373.12	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2373.13	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
2373.14	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2373.15	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2373.16	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2373.17	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2373.18	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
2373.19	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	4.3
2373.26	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
2373.4	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in Part	3.4
2373.5	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	3.6
2373.6	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2373.7	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	4.1

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2373.8	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	4.1
2373.9	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	4.1
2375.17	Church Street Trustee Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2375.3	Church Street Trustee Limited	Accept	6.1
2375.4	Church Street Trustee Limited	Reject	7
2376.20	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	3.4
2376.21	Darby Planning LP	Accept	3.6
2376.22	Darby Planning LP	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2376.23	Darby Planning LP	Accept	4.1
2376.24	Darby Planning LP	Accept	4.1
2376.25	Darby Planning LP	Accept	4.1
2376.26	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	4.2
2376.27	Darby Planning LP	Reject	4.3
2376.28	Darby Planning LP	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2376.29	Darby Planning LP	Accept	1.4
2376.30	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	1.4
2376.31	Darby Planning LP	Accept	1.4
2376.32	Darby Planning LP	Reject	N/A
2376.33	Darby Planning LP	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2376.34	Darby Planning LP	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2376.35	Darby Planning LP	Reject	4.3
2376.36	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2376.37	Darby Planning LP	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2376.38	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2376.39	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2376.40	Darby Planning LP	Reject	4.3
2376.41	Darby Planning LP	Reject	4.3
2376.42	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	6.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2376.43	Darby Planning LP	Accept	10
2376.44	Darby Planning LP	Reject	11
2376.45	Darby Planning LP	Accept in Part	12
2376.46	Darby Planning LP	N/A	N/A
2377.21	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	3.4
2377.22	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	3.6
2377.23	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2377.24	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.1
2377.25	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.1
2377.26	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.1
2377.27	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	4.2
2377.28	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2377.29	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2377.30	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2377.31	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2377.32	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2377.33	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2377.34	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2377.35	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2377.36	Lake Hayes Ltd	Accept	10
2377.37	Lake Hayes Ltd	Reject	11
2381.10	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	4.2
2381.11	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2381.12	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.4
2381.13	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	1.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2381.14	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.4 & 6.2
2381.15	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
2381.16	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.4
2381.17	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4
2381.18	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
2381.19	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	1.4
2381.20	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	10
2381.21	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	11
2381.28	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	12
2381.37	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4
2381.38	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4
2381.39	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	13
2381.4	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	3.4
2381.5	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	3.6
2381.6	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2381.7	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	4.1
2381.8	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	4.1

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2381.9	Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	4.1
2382.1	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Reject	1.4
2382.10	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	4.1
2382.11	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	4.2
2382.12	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2382.13	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Reject	6.1
2382.14	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Reject	N/A
2382.15	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2382.16	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2382.17	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2382.18	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2382.19	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
2382.20	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2382.21	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	10
2382.22	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Reject	11
2382.23	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	12
2382.5	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept in Part	3.4
2382.6	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	3.6
2382.7	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2382.8	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	4.1
2382.9	Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd	Accept	4.1
2384.10	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	4.2
2384.11	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2384.12	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2384.13	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2384.14	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2384.15	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
2384.16	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.17	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.18	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.19	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.20	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.21	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
2384.28	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in Part	3.1, 3.6 & 3.8
2384.4	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in Part	3.4
2384.5	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	3.6
2384.6	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2384.7	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	4.1
2384.8	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	4.1
2384.9	Soho Ski Area Limited, Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	4.1
2385.15	BOXER HILLS TRUST	Accept in part	1.4
2386.17	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in part	1.4
2386.20	BOXER HILL TRUST	Accept in part	1.4
2387.16	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2387.17	TROJAN HELMET LIMITED	Reject	N/A
2388.2	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2388.3	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept	3.6
2389.11	WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED	Accept in part	1.4
2442.10	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	4.1
2442.11	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	4.1
2442.12	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	11
2442.13	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	11
2442.6	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	4.1
2442.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	3.6
2442.8	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	3.7
2442.9	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	4.1
2446.10	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	5
2446.11	Heritage New Zealand	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2446.12	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2446.13	Heritage New Zealand	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2446.14	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	8
2446.15	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	8
2446.16	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	10
2446.7	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	3.1
2446.8	Heritage New Zealand	Accept	4.1
2446.9	Heritage New Zealand	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 5
2448.2	Millennium & Copthorne Hotels NZ Ltd	Reject	1.4 & 1.6
2454.1	NZSki Ltd	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
2454.2	NZSki Ltd	Accept	4.3 & 6.2
2454.3	NZSki Ltd	Reject	4.3

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2454.4	NZSki Ltd	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
2454.5	NZSki Ltd	Reject	4.3
2454.6	NZSki Ltd	Reject	3.8
2454.7	NZSki Ltd	Accept in Part	4.3
2454.8	NZSki Ltd	Reject	4.3
2455.13	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2455.14	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	6.2
2455.15	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2455.16	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	3.1
2455.17	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept in Part	6.2
2455.18	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	8
2455.19	Otago Fish and Game Council	Accept	8
2457.10	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	4.2
2457.11	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	6.2
2457.12	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	6.2
2457.13	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	6.2
2457.14	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	6.2
2457.15	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	6.2
2457.16	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Reject	7
2457.17	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept in Part	8
2457.2	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	2
2457.3	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	3.1 & 3.2
2457.4	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	3.4
2457.5	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	3.7
2457.6	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	3.7
2457.7	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	1.4
2457.8	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Accept	11
2457.9	Paterson Pitts (Wanaka)	Reject	1.3 & 1.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2460.1	Queenstown Central Limited	Reject	N/A
2460.2	Queenstown Central Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2462.1	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	3.2
2462.2	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2462.21	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	4.2
2462.3	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2462.4	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept	3.6
2462.5	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2462.6	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 4.2
2462.7	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2465.2	RCL Henley Downs Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2466.15	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	3.2
2466.151	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2466.152	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2466.153	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	4.3
2466.154	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	4.3
2466.16	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	4.1
2466.17	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept	4.3
2466.18	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	4.2
2466.19	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2466.20	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2466.21	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2466.22	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2466.23	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept	6.2
2466.24	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2466.25	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2466.26	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	6.2
2466.27	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	6.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2466.28	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	8
2466.29	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	8
2466.30	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	10
2466.54	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept	3.4
2466.55	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2466.56	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept	3.6
2466.8	Real Journeys Ltd	Reject	1.5 & 6.2
2466.9	Real Journeys Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2468.1	Remarkables Park Ltd	Reject	3.2
2468.2	Remarkables Park Ltd	Reject	3.1 & 3.2
2468.3	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2468.4	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2468.5	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept	3.6
2468.6	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2468.7	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2468.8	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
2468.9	Remarkables Park Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2478.10	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2478.11	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2478.12	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2478.13	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	8
2478.8	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept	3.6
2478.9	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Accept in Part	4.1
2484.1	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2484.10	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	11
2484.2	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	3.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2484.21	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2484.22	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	10
2484.23	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2484.3	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	4.1
2484.4	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	4.1
2484.5	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2484.6	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	6.2
2484.7	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2484.8	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	11
2485.11	ZJV (NZ) Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2487.14	BSTGT Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2492.1	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
2492.10	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.1
2492.11	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 4.3
2492.115	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.116	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.117	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.118	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.119	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.120	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.1
2492.12	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.2
2492.13	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2492.14	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2492.15	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
2492.16	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2492.17	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	6.2
2492.18	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2492.19	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2492.2	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
2492.20	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2492.21	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	6.2
2492.22	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	8
2492.23	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	8
2492.24	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	10
2492.48	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.4
2492.49	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2492.50	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.6
2492.9	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	3.2
2493.11	Skyline Enterprises Limited	Reject	4.2
2493.12	Skyline Enterprises Limited	Reject	6.1
2493.13	Skyline Enterprises Limited	Reject	6.1
2494.13	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	3.2
2494.14	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	4.1
2494.149	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2494.15	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	4.3
2494.153	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.154	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.155	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.156	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.157	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.158	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2494.16	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	4.2
2494.17	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2494.18	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2494.19	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2494.20	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2494.21	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	6.2
2494.22	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2494.23	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2494.24	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2494.25	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	6.2
2494.26	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept in Part	8
2494.27	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	8
2494.28	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	10
2494.52	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.4
2494.53	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.54	Te Anau Developments Limited	Accept	3.1
2494.6	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	1.5
2494.7	Te Anau Developments Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2495.10	Young Changemakers - Wakatipu Youth Trust Advisory Group	Reject	1.4
2495.2	Young Changemakers - Wakatipu Youth Trust Advisory Group	Accept	1.4
2497.1	Otago Regional Council	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2497.2	Otago Regional Council	Accept	4.1
2497.3	Otago Regional Council	Accept in Part	1.4
2508.3	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept	1.4
2508.4	Aurora Energy Limited	Accept	8
2538.23	NZ Transport Agency	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2538.24	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.6

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2538.25	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.7
2538.26	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	3.7
2538.27	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2538.28	NZ Transport Agency	Reject	6.2
2538.29	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	8
2538.30	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	8
2538.31	NZ Transport Agency	Accept	8
2539.1	Eco Sustainability Development Limited	Reject	6.2
2539.2	Eco Sustainability Development Limited	Accept	6.2
2539.3	Eco Sustainability Development Limited	Reject	6.2
2540.33	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	2
2540.34	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.1
2540.35	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.1
2540.36	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.4
2540.37	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 3.3
2540.38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2540.39	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.6
2540.40	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.7
2540.41	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.42	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.43	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.44	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.45	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.46	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.4
2540.47	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	5
2540.48	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2540.49	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2540.50	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	6.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2540.51	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2540.52	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
2540.53	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	8
2540.54	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 11
2540.55	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 11
2540.56	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 11
2549.2	Glentui Heights Limited	Reject	1.4 & 1.6
2552.2	Greenwood Group Ltd	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 1.6
2560.3	Jade Lake Queenstown Ltd	Reject	1.6
2575.19	Queenstown Trails Trust	Accept	3.6
2575.6	Queenstown Trails Trust	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2575.7	Queenstown Trails Trust	Reject	4.2
2581.15	Go Orange Limited	Reject	3.5
2581.153	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.154	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.155	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.156	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.157	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.158	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
2581.16	Go Orange Limited	Reject	4.1
2581.17	Go Orange Limited	Accept	4.3
2581.18	Go Orange Limited	Reject	4.2
2581.19	Go Orange Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2581.20	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2581.21	Go Orange Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2581.22	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2581.23	Go Orange Limited	Accept	6.2
2581.24	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	6.2

Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
2581.25	Go Orange Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2581.26	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
2581.27	Go Orange Limited	Reject	6.2
2581.28	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	8
2581.29	Go Orange Limited	Reject	8
2581.30	Go Orange Limited	Reject	10
2581.54	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.4
2581.55	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
2581.56	Go Orange Limited	Accept	3.6
2581.8	Go Orange Limited	Reject	1.5
2581.9	Go Orange Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
2584.8	Slopehill Properties Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 1.6
2618.2	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in Part	3.1 - 3.6
2618.3	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	4.1
2618.4	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	1.4
2618.5	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
2618.6	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept in Part	6.2
2618.7	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	8
2618.8	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	8
2618.9	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	11

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS1015.134	768.3	Straterra	Accept in Part	12
FS1015.39	519.3	Straterra	Accept	12
FS1040.23	519.3	Forest and Bird	Reject	12

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS1219.78	632.77	Bravo Trustee Company	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1219.79	632.78	Bravo Trustee Company	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1252.78	632.77	Tim & Paula Williams	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1252.79	632.78	Tim & Paula Williams	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1275.124	567.12	"Jacks Point" (Submitter number 762 and 856)	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1275.251	632.77	"Jacks Point" (Submitter number 762 and 856)	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1275.252	632.78	"Jacks Point" (Submitter number 762 and 856)	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1277.158	762.12	Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association	Accept	1.4
FS1277.159	762.13	Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association	Accept	1.4
FS1277.81	632.77	Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1277.82	632.78	Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1283.191	632.77	MJ and RB Williams and Brabant	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1283.192	632.78	MJ and RB Williams and Brabant	Accept in Part	1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS1316.139	762.12	Harris-Wingrove Trust	Reject	1.4
FS1316.140	762.13	Harris-Wingrove Trust	Reject	1.4
FS1316.77	632.77	Harris-Wingrove Trust	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1316.78	632.78	Harris-Wingrove Trust	Accept in Part	1.4
FS1356.3	519.3	Cabo Limited	Reject	12
FS2701.16	2387.16	Murray & Clare Doyle	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2701.17	2387.17	Murray & Clare Doyle	Reject	N/A
FS2710.14	2388.2	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	N/A
FS2710.15	2388.3	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	N/A
FS2710.33	2295.4	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	3.3 & 3.4
FS2710.34	2295.5	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	3.3
FS2710.35	2295.6	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2710.36	2295.7	McGuinness Pa Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2710.37	2295.8	McGuinness Pa Limited	Accept in Part	6.1
FS2719.173	2584.8	BSTGT Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 1.6
FS2720.116	2295.4	Boundary Trust	Accept	3.3 & 3.4
FS2720.117	2295.5	Boundary Trust	Accept	3.3
FS2720.118	2295.6	Boundary Trust	Reject	3.6
FS2720.119	2295.7	Boundary Trust	Accept	3.6
FS2720.120	2295.8	Boundary Trust	Accept in Part	6.1
FS2723.116	2295.4	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	3.3 & 3.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2723.117	2295.5	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	3.3
FS2723.118	2295.6	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Reject	3.6
FS2723.119	2295.7	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept	3.6
FS2723.120	2295.8	Spruce Grove Trust - Malaghans Road	Accept in Part	6.1
FS2724.116	2295.4	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	3.3 & 3.4
FS2724.117	2295.5	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	3.3
FS2724.118	2295.6	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Reject	3.6
FS2724.119	2295.7	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept	3.6
FS2724.120	2295.8	Spruce Grove Trust - Butel Road	Accept in Part	6.1
FS2725.15	2319.11	Guenther Raedler	Accept in part	1.4
FS2725.41	2317.11	Guenther Raedler	Accept in part	1.4
FS2728.1	2466.20	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.10	2454.8	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	4.3
FS2728.11	2492.1	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	4.3
FS2728.13	2373.4	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.14	2376.20	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2728.15	2377.21	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2728.16	2381.4	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.17	2382.5	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2728.18	2384.4	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2728.19	2466.154	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.2	2492.14	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2728.20	2575.7	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	4.2
FS2728.21	2492.19	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.22	2494.23	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2728.23	2581.25	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2728.3	2494.18	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.4	2581.20	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2728.5	2349.2	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	10
FS2728.6	2466.30	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2728.7	2492.24	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	10
FS2728.8	2494.28	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	10
FS2728.9	2581.30	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou, Hokonui Runanga, Te Runanga o Waihopai, Te Runanga o Awarua, Te Runanga o Oraka Aparima (collectively Kai Tahu)	Accept	10
FS2733.16	2387.16	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2733.17	2387.17	A Feeley, E Borrie and LP Trustees Limited	Reject	N/A
FS2743.156	2552.2	Morven Ferry Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 1.6
FS2743.99	2386.20	Morven Ferry Limited	Accept in part	1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2745.4	2295.4	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.3 & 3.4
FS2745.5	2295.5	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.3
FS2745.6	2295.6	Juie QT Limited	Reject	3.6
FS2745.7	2295.7	Juie QT Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2745.8	2295.8	Juie QT Limited	Accept in Part	6.1
FS2746.31	2466.8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	1.5 & 6.2
FS2746.32	2242.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2746.33	2457.4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.4
FS2746.34	2466.54	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	3.4
FS2746.35	2497.1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2746.36	2373.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2746.37	2494.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	4.2
FS2746.38	2455.17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2746.39	2455.18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	8
FS2746.40	2455.19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	8
FS2746.41	2242.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Reject	8
FS2748.73	2291.8	Len McFadgen	Accept in part	1.4
FS2749.104	2386.20	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Accept in part	1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2749.161	2552.2	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 1.6
FS2750.59	2291.8	Wakatipu Equities Limited	Accept in part	1.4
FS2751.1	2462.6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 4.2
FS2751.10	2581.19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.11	2373.4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.12	2376.20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.13	2377.21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.14	2381.4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.15	2382.5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.16	2384.4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.17	2540.36	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2751.18	2540.38	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
FS2751.19	2466.20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.2	2466.152	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.20	2492.14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.21	2494.18	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.22	2581.20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2751.23	2466.21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2751.24	2581.21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.25	2466.25	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.26	2492.19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.27	2494.23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.28	2581.25	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.29	2466.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	8
FS2751.3	2494.149	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.30	2466.29	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	8
FS2751.31	2492.23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	8
FS2751.32	2494.27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	8
FS2751.33	2581.29	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	8
FS2751.34	2349.2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	10
FS2751.35	2466.30	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	10
FS2751.36	2492.24	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	10
FS2751.37	2494.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	10
FS2751.38	2581.30	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2751.4	2575.7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	4.2
FS2751.5	2468.9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.6	2492.2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2751.7	2466.19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.8	2492.13	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2751.9	2494.17	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2752.17	2290.4	Go Orange Limited	Accept in part	1.4
FS2752.4	2462.6	Go Orange Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 4.2
FS2753.10	2466.8	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.5 & 6.2
FS2753.11	2466.9	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.151	2466.151	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.152	2466.152	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.153	2466.153	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2753.154	2466.154	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2753.165	2581.8	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.5
FS2753.166	2581.9	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.17	2466.15	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	3.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2753.172	2581.15	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	3.5
FS2753.173	2581.16	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2753.174	2581.17	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2753.175	2581.18	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2753.176	2581.19	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.177	2581.20	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.178	2581.21	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.179	2581.22	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.18	2466.16	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2753.180	2581.23	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	6.2
FS2753.181	2581.24	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.182	2581.25	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.183	2581.26	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.184	2581.27	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2753.185	2581.28	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	8
FS2753.186	2581.29	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	8
FS2753.187	2581.30	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	10

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2753.19	2466.17	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2753.20	2466.18	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2753.209	2581.54	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.4
FS2753.21	2466.19	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.210	2581.55	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
FS2753.211	2581.56	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2753.22	2466.20	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.23	2466.21	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2753.24	2466.22	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.25	2466.23	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	6.2
FS2753.26	2466.24	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.27	2466.25	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2753.28	2466.26	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2753.29	2466.27	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2753.30	2466.28	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	8
FS2753.308	2581.153	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
FS2753.309	2581.154	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2753.31	2466.29	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	8
FS2753.310	2581.155	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
FS2753.311	2581.156	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
FS2753.312	2581.157	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
FS2753.313	2581.158	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.1 & 3.7
FS2753.32	2466.30	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Reject	10
FS2753.54	2466.54	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.4
FS2753.55	2466.55	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
FS2753.56	2466.56	Queenstown Water Taxis Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2754.36	2618.2	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	3.1 - 3.6
FS2754.37	2618.3	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2754.38	2618.4	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	1.4
FS2754.39	2618.5	Remarkables Park Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2754.40	2618.6	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2754.41	2618.7	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2754.42	2618.8	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2754.59	2466.152	Remarkables Park Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2754.60	2575.7	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2754.61	2492.13	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2754.62	2376.26	Remarkables Park Limited	Accept in Part	4.2
FS2754.63	2494.16	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2754.64	2382.19	Remarkables Park Limited	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2754.65	2239.6	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2754.66	2239.7	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2754.67	2242.16	Remarkables Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2755.35	2618.2	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	3.1 - 3.6
FS2755.36	2618.3	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2755.37	2618.4	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.4
FS2755.38	2618.5	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2755.39	2618.6	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2755.40	2618.7	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2755.41	2618.8	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2755.58	2466.152	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2755.59	2575.7	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2755.60	2492.13	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2755.61	2376.26	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in Part	4.2
FS2755.62	2494.16	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2755.63	2382.19	Queenstown Park Limited	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
FS2755.64	2239.6	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2755.65	2239.7	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2755.66	2242.16	Queenstown Park Limited	Reject	8
FS2756.8	2485.11	Kiwi Birdlife Park Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2757.4	2618.2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Reject	3.1 - 3.6
FS2757.5	2540.54	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 11
FS2758.1	2446.9	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 5
FS2758.2	2446.10	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Reject	5

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2758.3	2446.13	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2758.4	2446.14	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Reject	8
FS2758.5	2446.15	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Reject	8
FS2758.6	2242.12	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2758.7	2242.16	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Reject	8
FS2759.5	2242.12	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2759.7	2462.7	Queenstown Airport Corporation	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.135	2384.4	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2760.136	2384.5	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2760.137	2384.6	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.138	2384.7	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.139	2384.8	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.140	2384.9	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.141	2384.10	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.2
FS2760.142	2384.11	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.143	2384.12	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.144	2384.13	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.145	2384.14	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.146	2384.15	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.147	2384.16	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2760.148	2384.17	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.149	2384.18	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.150	2384.19	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.151	2384.20	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.152	2384.21	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.159	2384.28	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.1, 3.6 & 3.8
FS2760.163	2373.4	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2760.164	2373.5	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2760.165	2373.6	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.166	2373.7	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.167	2373.8	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.168	2373.9	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2760.169	2373.10	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.2
FS2760.170	2373.11	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.171	2373.12	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.172	2373.13	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2760.173	2373.14	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.174	2373.15	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2760.175	2373.16	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.176	2373.17	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.177	2373.18	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
FS2760.178	2373.19	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.185	2373.26	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
FS2760.186	2454.1	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
FS2760.187	2454.2	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.3 & 6.2
FS2760.188	2454.3	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.189	2454.4	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
FS2760.190	2454.5	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.191	2454.6	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	3.8
FS2760.192	2454.7	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2760.193	2454.8	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.197	2290.4	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in part	1.4
FS2760.201	2492.1	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.202	2492.2	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2760.209	2492.9	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2760.210	2492.10	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2760.211	2492.11	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 4.3
FS2760.212	2492.12	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2760.213	2492.13	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.214	2492.14	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.215	2492.15	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2760.216	2492.16	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2760.217	2492.17	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	6.2
FS2760.218	2492.18	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2760.219	2492.19	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.220	2492.20	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2760.221	2492.21	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2760.222	2492.22	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	8
FS2760.223	2492.23	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	8
FS2760.224	2492.24	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	10
FS2760.24	2538.23	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
FS2760.248	2492.48	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.4
FS2760.249	2492.49	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.5
FS2760.25	2538.24	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.6

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.250	2492.50	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2760.26	2538.25	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.7
FS2760.27	2538.26	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.7
FS2760.28	2538.27	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.29	2538.28	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2760.30	2538.29	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	8
FS2760.31	2538.30	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	8
FS2760.315	2492.115	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.316	2492.116	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.317	2492.117	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.318	2492.118	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.319	2492.119	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.32	2538.31	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	8
FS2760.320	2492.120	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.326	2494.6	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.5
FS2760.327	2494.7	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.331	2494.13	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	3.2
FS2760.332	2494.14	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.1
FS2760.333	2494.15	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2760.334	2494.16	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	4.2
FS2760.335	2494.17	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.336	2494.18	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.337	2494.19	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.338	2494.20	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2760.339	2494.21	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	6.2
FS2760.340	2494.22	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2760.341	2494.23	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.342	2494.24	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2760.343	2494.25	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2760.344	2494.26	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	8
FS2760.345	2494.27	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	8
FS2760.346	2494.28	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	10
FS2760.370	2494.52	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.4
FS2760.371	2494.53	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.372	2494.54	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.449	2494.149	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.453	2494.153	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.454	2494.154	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.455	2494.155	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.456	2494.156	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.457	2494.157	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.458	2494.158	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	3.1
FS2760.460	2468.9	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.464	2462.6	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 4.2
FS2760.506	2446.10	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	5
FS2760.507	2446.9	Real Journeys Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 5
FS2760.508	2446.13	Real Journeys Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2760.514	2455.17	Real Journeys Limited	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2764.1	2377.35	Queenstown Central Limited	Reject	6.2
FS2767.11	2493.11	Queenstown Commercial Parapenters	Reject	4.2
FS2767.12	2493.13	Queenstown Commercial Parapenters	Reject	6.1
FS2767.13	2493.12	Queenstown Commercial Parapenters	Reject	6.1

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2769.44	2386.17	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	1.4
FS2769.47	2386.20	Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture	Accept in part	1.4
FS2771.4	2382.5	John May	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2771.5	2382.13	John May	Accept	6.1
FS2772.12	2388.2	R Hadley	Reject	N/A
FS2772.13	2388.3	R Hadley	Reject	N/A
FS2777.11	2485.11	Skyline Enterprises Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 6.1
FS2782.45	2487.14	Glencoe Station Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2783.149	2318.11	Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	Accept in part	1.4
FS2787.113	2319.11	P Chittock	Accept in part	1.4
FS2787.35	2315.11	P Chittock	Accept in part	1.4
FS2787.61	2316.11	P Chittock	Accept in part	1.4
FS2787.8	2291.8	P Chittock	Accept in part	1.4
FS2787.87	2317.11	P Chittock	Accept in part	1.4
FS2788.1	2327.1	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	3.5
FS2788.10	2455.18	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	8
FS2788.11	2455.19	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	8
FS2788.12	2494.18	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2788.13	2329.1	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept in part	1.4
FS2788.2	2242.12	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2788.3	2242.16	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	8
FS2788.7	2446.9	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 5
FS2788.8	2446.10	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Reject	5
FS2788.9	2446.13	Henley Downs Land Holdings Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2789.1	2327.1	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	3.5
FS2789.10	2455.18	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	8
FS2789.11	2455.19	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	8
FS2789.12	2494.18	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2789.13	2329.1	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept in part	1.4
FS2789.2	2242.12	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2789.26	2454.8	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	4.3
FS2789.27	2454.6	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	3.8
FS2789.3	2242.16	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	8
FS2789.7	2446.9	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 5
FS2789.8	2446.10	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Reject	5
FS2789.9	2446.13	Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2790.1	2327.1	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	3.5
FS2790.10	2455.18	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	8
FS2790.11	2455.19	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	8
FS2790.12	2494.18	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2790.13	2329.1	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept in part	1.4
FS2790.2	2242.12	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 3.2
FS2790.26	2454.8	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2790.27	2454.6	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	3.8
FS2790.3	2242.16	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	8
FS2790.7	2446.9	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 5
FS2790.8	2446.10	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Reject	5
FS2790.9	2446.13	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2799.1	2468.2	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	3.1 & 3.3
FS2799.10	2349.2	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	10
FS2799.11	2442.12	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	11
FS2799.12	2376.44	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	11
FS2799.2	2462.1	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	3.2
FS2799.3	2457.9	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	1.3 & 1.4
FS2799.4	2377.31	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2799.5	2539.1	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Reject	6.2
FS2799.6	2457.11	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2799.7	2466.22	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	6.2

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2799.8	2454.5	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Reject	4.3
FS2799.9	2457.15	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (the Oil Companies)	Accept in Part	6.2
FS2800.1	2454.1	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
FS2800.10	2384.4	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2800.11	2384.5	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2800.12	2384.6	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.13	2384.7	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.14	2384.8	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.15	2384.9	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.16	2384.10	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.2
FS2800.17	2384.11	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.18	2384.12	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2800.19	2384.13	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2800.2	2454.2	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.3 & 6.2
FS2800.20	2384.14	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.21	2384.15	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	1.4 & 6.2
FS2800.22	2384.16	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.3
FS2800.23	2384.17	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.24	2384.18	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.25	2384.19	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.26	2384.20	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.27	2384.21	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.3	2454.3	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Submitter	Commissioners' Recommendation	Reference in Report
FS2800.34	2384.28	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	3.1, 3.6 & 3.8
FS2800.38	2373.4	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	3.4
FS2800.39	2373.5	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	3.6
FS2800.4	2454.4	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.5 & 4.3
FS2800.40	2373.6	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.41	2373.7	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.42	2373.8	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.43	2373.9	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	4.1
FS2800.44	2373.10	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	4.2
FS2800.45	2373.11	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.46	2373.12	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.47	2373.13	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2800.48	2373.14	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2800.49	2373.15	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	1.3, 1.4 & 6.2
FS2800.5	2454.6	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	3.8
FS2800.50	2373.16	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.51	2373.17	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3 & 1.4
FS2800.52	2373.18	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
FS2800.53	2373.19	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3
FS2800.6	2454.7	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Accept in Part	4.3
FS2800.60	2373.26	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	4.3 & 6.2
FS2800.61	2462.6	Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited	Reject	1.3, 1.4 & 4.2

24. Wakatipu Basin

24.1 Zone Purpose

This chapter applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Rural Amenity Zone) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (Precinct). The purpose of the Zone is to maintain and enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin. Schedule 24.8 divides the Wakatipu Basin into 23 Landscape Character Units. The Landscape Character Units are a tool to assist identification of the particular landscape character and amenity values sought to be maintained and enhanced. Controls on the location, nature and visual effects of buildings are used to provide a flexible and design led response to those values.

The purpose of defining the Precinct is to identify areas within the broader Rural Amenity Zone that have the potential to absorb rural living and other development, while still achieving the overall purpose of the Rural Amenity Zone. The balance of the Rural Amenity Zone is less enabling of development, while still providing for a range of activities suitable for a rural environment.

While the Rural Amenity Zone does not contain Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes, it is a distinctive and high amenity value landscape located adjacent to, or nearby to, Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. There are no specific setback rules for development adjacent to Outstanding Natural Features or Landscapes. However, all buildings except small farm buildings and subdivision require resource consent to ensure that inappropriate buildings and/or subdivision does not occur adjacent to those features and landscapes. Buildings and development in the Zone and the Precinct are required to be set back from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps, to maintain the distinctive and high amenity landscapes of the Wakatipu Basin.

24.2 Objectives and Policies

Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4 and related policies apply to the Precinct and to the balance of the Rural Amenity Zone. Objective 24.2.5 and related policies apply to the Precinct only.

24.2.1 Objective - Landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone are maintained or enhanced.

Policies

- 24.2.1.1 Require an 80 hectare minimum net site area be maintained within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone outside of the Precinct.
- 24.2.1.2 Ensure subdivision and development is designed (including accessways, services, utilities and building platforms) to minimise inappropriate modification to the natural landform.
- 24.2.1.3 Ensure that subdivision and development maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units.
- 24.2.1.4 Maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values associated with the Rural Amenity Zone including the Precinct and surrounding landscape context by:

- a. controlling the colour, scale, form, coverage, location (including setbacks from boundaries) and height of buildings and associated infrastructure, vegetation and landscape elements;
 - b. setting development back from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps.
- 24.2.1.5 Require all buildings to be located and designed so that they do not compromise the landscape and amenity values and the natural character of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes that are either adjacent to the building or where the building is in the foreground of views from a public road or reserve of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.
- 24.2.1.6 Provide for farming, commercial, community, recreation and tourism related activities that rely on the rural land resource, subject to maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.
- 24.2.1.7 Locate, design operate and maintain regionally significant infrastructure so as to seek to avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, while acknowledging that location constraints and/or the nature of the infrastructure may mean that this is not possible in all cases.
- 24.2.1.8 In cases where it is demonstrated that regionally significant infrastructure cannot avoid significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape, such adverse effects shall be minimised.
- 24.2.1.9 Control earthworks and vegetation clearance to minimise adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values.
- 24.2.1.10 Enable residential activity within building platforms created prior to 21 March 2019 subject to achieving appropriate standards.
- 24.2.1.11 Provide for activities, whose built form is subservient to natural landscape elements and that, in areas Schedule 24.8 identifies as having a sense of openness and spaciousness, maintain those qualities.
- 24.2.1.12 Manage lighting so that it does not cause adverse glare to other properties, roads, public places or degrade views of the night sky.
- 24.2.1.13 Have regard to the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of Tangata Whenua in the manner directed in Chapter 5: Tangata Whenua.

24.2.2 Objective – Non-residential activities maintain and enhance amenity values.

Policies

- 24.2.2.1 Ensure traffic, noise and the scale and intensity of non-residential activities do not have an adverse impact on landscape character and amenity values that is more than minor, or affect the safe and efficient operation of the roading and trail network or access to public places.
- 24.2.2.2 Restrict the type and intensity of non-residential activities to those which are compatible in relation to generated effects (e.g. traffic, noise, and hours of operation) with surrounding uses and the natural environment.
- 24.2.2.3 Ensure non-residential activities other than farming, with the potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects, are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.

24.2.2.4 Ensure informal airports are located, operated and managed to maintain the surrounding rural amenity.

24.2.3 Objective – Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated where rural living opportunities, visitor and tourism activities, community and recreation activities occur.

Policies

24.2.3.1 Ensure informal airports are not compromised by the establishment of incompatible activities.

24.2.3.2 Ensure reverse sensitivity effects on rural living and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated.

24.2.3.3 Support productive farming activities such as agriculture, horticulture and viticulture in the Zone by ensuring that reverse sensitivity issues do not constrain productive activities.

24.2.3.4 Ensure non-farming activities with potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects are located a sufficient distance from formed roads, neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.

24.2.4 Objective – Subdivision and development, and use of land, maintains or enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure.

Policies

24.2.4.1 Avoid adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.

24.2.4.2 Restrict the scale, intensity and location of subdivision, development and use of land in the Lake Hayes catchment, unless it can occur consistently with improvement to water quality in the catchment.

24.2.4.3 Provide for improved public access to, and the maintenance and enhancement of, the margins of waterbodies including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes.

24.2.4.4 Provide adequate firefighting water and emergency vehicle access to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response.

24.2.4.5 Ensure development has regard to servicing and infrastructure costs that are not met by the developer.

24.2.4.6 Facilitate the provision of walkway and cycleway networks and encourage opportunities for the provision of bridle path networks.

24.2.4.7 Ensure traffic generated by non-residential development does not individually or cumulatively compromise road safety or efficiency.

24.2.4.8 Encourage the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.

24.2.4.9 Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that contributes to native habitat restoration, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability.

24.2.5 Objective – Rural living opportunities in the Precinct are enabled, provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.

Objective 24.2.5 and policies 24.2.5.1 to 24.2.5.6 apply to the Precinct only. In the event of a conflict between Objective 24.2.5 and Objectives 24.2.1 to 24.2.4, Objective 24.2.5 prevails.

Policies

- 24.2.5.1 Provide for rural living, subdivision, development and use of land where it maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units.
- 24.2.5.2 Promote design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development that maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin overall.
- 24.2.5.3 Provide for non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation, and commercial recreation activities while ensuring these are appropriately located and of a scale and intensity that ensures that the amenity, quality and character of the Precinct is retained.
- 24.2.5.4 Implement minimum and average lot size standards in conjunction with standards controlling building size, location and external appearance, so that the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, as identified in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units, are not compromised by cumulative adverse effects of development.
- 24.2.5.5 Maintain a defensible edge between areas of rural living in the Precinct and the balance of the Zone.
- 24.2.5.6 Retain vegetation that contributes to landscape character and visual amenity values of the Precinct, provided it does not present a high risk of wilding spread.

24.3 Other Provisions and Rules

24.3.1 District Wide

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters.

1 Introduction	2 Definitions	3 Strategic Direction
4 Urban Development	5 Tangata Whenua	6 Landscapes
25 Earthworks	26 Historic Heritage	27 Subdivision
28 Natural Hazards	29 Transport	30 Energy and Utilities
31 Signs	32 Protected Trees	33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity
34 Wilding Exotic Trees	35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings	36 Noise

37 Designations	Planning Maps	
-----------------	---------------	--

24.3.2 Interpreting and Applying the Rules

24.3.2.1 A permitted activity must comply with all of the rules (in this case of Chapter 24) and any relevant district wide rules.

24.3.2.2 The surface of lakes and rivers are zoned Rural.

24.3.2.3 Guiding Principle: Previous Approvals

- a. Requirements relating to building platforms and conditions of consents, including landscaping or other visual mitigation, that are registered on a site's computer freehold register as part of a resource consent approval by the Council are considered by the Council to remain relevant and will remain binding unless altered or cancelled.
- b. Applicants may apply to alter or cancel any conditions of an existing resource consent as a component of an application for resource consent for development. Whether it may be appropriate for the Council to maintain, or to alter or cancel these conditions shall be assessed against the extent to which a resource consent application accords with the objectives and provisions of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (as applicable).

24.3.2.4 These abbreviations for the class of activity status are used in the following tables. Any activity which is not permitted (P) or prohibited (PR) requires resource consent.

P	Permitted	RD	Restricted Discretionary
D	Discretionary	NC	Non-Complying
PR	Prohibited		

24.3.2.5 The Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct is a sub-zone of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and all rules in Table 24.1 apply to the Precinct. Where specific rules and standards are identified for the Precinct in Tables 24.2 and 24.3, these prevail over the Rural Amenity Zone rules in Table 24.1.

24.3.2.6 All activities, including any listed permitted activities are subject to the rules and standards contained in Tables 24.1 to 24.3.

24.3.3 Advice Notes

24.3.3.1 Clarifications of the meaning of root protection zone, minor trimming of a hedgerow, minor trimming and significant trimming are provided in Chapter 2 – Definitions.

24.3.3.2 On-site wastewater treatment is subject to the Otago Regional Plan: Water. In particular, Rule 12.A.1.4 of the Otago Regional Plan: Water requires that within the Lakes Hayes Catchment all on-site wastewater treatment systems are operated in accordance with a resource consent obtained from the Otago Regional Council.

24.4 Rules – Activities

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.1	Any activity not listed in Tables 24.1 and 24.2.	NC
24.4.2	Farming activity.	P
	Residential activities and buildings	
24.4.3	The use of land or buildings for residential activity except as otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 and Table 24.2 and subject to the standards in Table 24.3.	P
24.4.4	The alteration of any lawfully established building used for residential activity.	P
24.4.5	The construction of buildings for a residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area and attached to the residential unit.	P
24.4.6	The construction of buildings for residential activity that are located within a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register before 21 March 2019. Control is reserved over: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity values; c. Access; d. Infrastructure; e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).	C
24.4.7	The construction of buildings for residential activity that are not provided for in Rule 24.4.5 or 24.4.6 and are not contrary to Rule 24.4.8. Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity values; c. Access; d. Infrastructure; e. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed); f. Natural hazards.	RD
24.4.8	The construction of buildings for residential activity outside a building platform approved by a resource consent and registered on the applicable Computer Freehold Register on a site where there is such a building platform.	NC
	Non-residential activities and buildings	

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.9	Farm buildings.	P
24.4.10	Roadside stall buildings.	P
24.4.11	Home occupation.	P
24.4.12	Informal airports.	P
24.4.13	Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site.	P
24.4.14	Commercial recreational activities that are undertaken on land, outdoors and involve not more than 12 persons in any one group.	P
24.4.15	Residential visitor accommodation and homestays.	P
24.4.16	Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site where the access is onto a State Highway. Discretion is restricted to: a. Access to, and safety of, the transport network; b. On-site parking.	RD
24.4.17	Industrial activities directly associated with wineries and underground cellars within a vineyard. Discretion is restricted to: a. Noise; b. Access and parking; c. Traffic generation; d. Odour; e. Hours of operation; f. Waste treatment and disposal.	RD
24.4.18	The construction and alteration of buildings for non-residential activities, not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1. Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity; c. Access; d. Natural hazards; e. Infrastructure; f. Landform modification, landscaping and planting (existing and proposed).	RD
24.4.19	Commercial recreational activities that are undertaken on land, outdoors and involve more than 12 persons in any one group.	D

	Table 24.1 – Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	Activity Status
24.4.20	Cafes and restaurants.	D
24.4.21	Visitor accommodation.	D
24.4.22	Community activities.	D
24.4.23	Any commercial or Industrial activity not otherwise provided for in Table 24.1 including those associated with farming.	NC
24.4.24	Panelbeating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibre glassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motorbody building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956 except where such activities are undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or as a permitted home occupation.	NC

	Table 24.2: Activities in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	Activity Status
	Residential activities	
24.4.25	Residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by no more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6, and is not contrary to Rule 24.4.8. Note: Residential flats attached to the principal residential unit are covered by Rule 24.4.5.	D
24.4.26	Residential flat not exceeding 150m ² gross floor area that is separated from the principal residential unit by more than 6 metres, that is not provided for in Rule 24.4.6, and is not contrary to Rule 24.4.8..	NC
	Non-residential activities	
24.4.27	Informal airports.	D
24.4.28	Panelbeating, spray painting, motor vehicle repair or dismantling, fibreglassing, sheet metal work, bottle or scrap storage, motorbody building, or any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956 except where such activities are undertaken as part of a farming activity, residential activity or as a permitted home occupation.	PR
	Clearance of exotic vegetation	
24.4.29	Clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation that is of a height greater than 4 metres. Discretion is restricted to: a. The extent of clearance; b. Trimming and works within the root protection zone; c. Replacement planting.	RD

--	--	--

24.5 Rules - Standards

The following standards apply to all activities.

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
24.5.1	Residential Density	
24.5.1.1	For sites with a net site area of 1 hectare or less and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per site.	NC
24.5.1.2.	For sites with a net site area greater than 1 hectare and zoned in part or whole Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, no more than one residential unit per hectare on average of the net site area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.	NC
24.5.1.3	Where Rule 24.5.1.1 or Rule 24.5.1.2 applies, all residential units (including residential flats) must be located within the area zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.	NC
24.5.1.4	Any site in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone located wholly outside the Precinct in respect of which the Computer Freehold Register for the site was issued before 21 March 2019 and with an area less than 80 hectares, a maximum of one residential unit per site.	NC
24.5.1.5	For that part of all other sites in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone wholly located outside of the Precinct, a maximum of one residential unit per 80 hectares net site area.	NC
24.5.2	Alterations to buildings for residential activities not located within a building platform Alterations to a building not located within a building platform must not increase the	RD Discretion is restricted to: a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity;

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	ground floor area by more than 30% in any ten year period.	c. External appearance; d. Infrastructure.
24.5.3	<p>Building Material and Colours</p> <p>Any building and its alteration, including shipping containers that remain on site for more than six months, are subject to the following:</p> <p>All exterior surfaces* must be coloured in the range of browns, greens or greys including;</p> <p>24.5.3.1 Pre-painted steel and all roofs must have a light reflectance value not greater than 20%; and</p> <p>24.5.3.2 All other exterior surface** finishes, except for schist, must have a light reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p>* Excludes soffits, windows and skylights (but not glass balustrades).</p> <p>** Includes cladding and built landscaping that cannot be measured by way of light reflectance value but is deemed by the Council to be suitably recessive and have the same effect as achieving a light reflectance value of 30%.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity; c. External appearance; d. Visual prominence from both public places and private locations.</p>
24.5.4	<p>Building Size</p> <p>Where a residential building is constructed within a building platform under Rule 24.4.6, the ground floor area of all buildings must not exceed 500m².</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity;</p>
24.5.5	<p>Building coverage</p> <p>The ground floor area of all buildings not subject to Rule 24.5.4 must not exceed 15% of net site area, or 500m² ground floor area, whichever is the lesser.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Landscape character; b. Visual amenity.</p>
24.5.6	<p>Setback from internal boundaries</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from internal boundaries shall be 10m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Building location, character, scale and form.</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. External appearance including materials and colours. c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.7	Height of buildings	
24.5.7.1	The maximum height of buildings shall be 6m.	<p>RD</p> <p>For buildings with a height greater than 6m and no more than 8m, discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form including the pitch of roofs; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed). <p>Note: 24.5.7.2 applies to buildings with a height greater than 8m.</p>
24.5.7.2	The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.	NC
24.5.8	<p>Setback from roads</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be 75m in the Precinct and 20m elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
24.5.9	<p>Setback from the Queenstown Trail</p> <p>Any building shall be located a minimum of 75m from the boundary of any identified Queenstown Trail Setback as shown on the planning maps.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including material and colours; c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.10	<p>Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features</p> <p>Any building or accessway shall be located a minimum of 50m from the boundary of any Escarpment, Ridgeline or River Cliff Feature shown on the planning maps.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).
24.5.11	<p>Setback from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals</p> <p>The minimum setback from boundaries for any building whose primary purpose is to house animals shall be 30m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open space, rural living character and amenity; b. Privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties and public places;

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
		<p>c. Reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties including odour and noise;</p> <p>d. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).</p>
24.5.12	<p>Setback of buildings from waterbodies</p> <p>The minimum setback of any building from the bed of a wetland, river or lake shall be 30m.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <p>a. Biodiversity values;</p> <p>b. Natural Hazards;</p> <p>c. Visual and recreational amenity values;</p> <p>d. Landscape and natural character;</p> <p>e. Open space.</p>
24.5.13	<p>Farm buildings</p> <p>a. The maximum gross floor area of any farm building shall be 50m².</p> <p>b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys (except soffits).</p> <p>c. Pre-painted steel and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%.</p> <p>d. All other surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Building location, character, scale and form;</p> <p>b. External appearance including materials and colours; and</p> <p>c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).</p>
24.5.14	<p>Home occupations</p> <p>a. The maximum net floor area of home occupation activities shall be 150m².</p> <p>b. No goods materials or equipment shall be stored outside a building.</p> <p>c. All manufacturing, altering, repairing, dismantling or processing of any goods or articles shall be carried out within a building.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. The nature, scale and intensity of the activity;</p> <p>b. Visual amenity from neighbouring properties and public places;</p> <p>c. Noise, odour and dust;</p> <p>d. Access, safety and transportation.</p>
24.5.15	<p>Roadside stalls</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maximum ground floor area shall be 5m². b. Stalls shall not be higher than 2.0m from ground level. c. The minimum sight distance along the road from the stall or stall access shall be 250m. d. The minimum distance of the stall or stall access from an intersection shall be 100m; and, the stall shall not be located on the legal road reserve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Access and safety; d. Parking.
24.5.16	<p>Retail Sales</p> <p>The maximum gross floor area of buildings shall be 25m² for retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine grown, reared or produced on-site or handicrafts produced on the site.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building location, character, scale and form; b. External appearance including materials and colours; c. Access safety and transportation effects; d. Parking, access and safety.
24.5.17	<p>Glare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All fixed exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjacent roads and sites. b. Activities on any site shall not result in more than a 3 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light to any other site, measured at any point within the boundary of the other site. c. There shall be no upward light spill. 	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lighting location and number of lights; b. Proximity to roads, public places and neighbours; c. Height and direction of lights; d. Lux levels.
24.5.18	<p>Informal airports</p> <p>Other than in the case of informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Informal airports shall not exceed a frequency of use of 2 flights per day; 	<p>D</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<p>b. Informal airports shall be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential dwelling not located on the same site;</p> <p>Advice note: For the purpose of this rule a flight includes two aircraft movements i.e. an arrival and a departure.</p>	
24.5.19	<p>Firefighting water and access</p> <p>Buildings for residential activity that do not have reticulated water supply or where there is insufficient fire-fighting water supply must provide the following provision for firefighting:</p> <p>a. A water supply of 20,000 litres and any necessary couplings;</p> <p>b. A hardstand area adjacent to the firefighting water supply capable of supporting fire service vehicles;</p> <p>c. Firefighting water connection point within 6m of the hardstand, and 90m of the building;</p> <p>d. Access from the property boundary to the firefighting water connection capable of accommodating and supporting fire service vehicles.</p> <p>Advice note: excludes non-habitable accessory buildings.</p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. the extent to which SNZ PAS 4509: 2008 can be met including the adequacy of the water supply;</p> <p>b. the accessibility of the firefighting water connection point for fire service vehicles;</p> <p>c. whether and the extent to which the building is assessed as a low fire risk.</p>
24.5.20	<p>Residential visitor accommodation</p> <p>Residential visitor accommodation – Excluding the Lifestyle Precinct</p> <p>24.5.20.1 Must not exceed a cumulative total of 90 nights occupation by paying guests on a site per 12 month period.</p> <p>24.5.20.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Residential Visitor Accommodation activity.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <p>a. The scale of the activity, including the number of guests per night and the number guest nights the activity operates in a 12 month period;</p> <p>b. The management of noise, rubbish and outdoor activities;</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<p>24.5.20.3 Up to date records of the Residential Visitor Accommodation activity must be kept, including a record of the date and duration of guest stays and the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>24.5.20.4 Smoke alarms must be provided in accordance with clause 5 of the Residential Tenancies (Smoke Alarms and Insulation) Regulations 2016.</p> <p>Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.20.1 to 24.5.20.4.</p>	<p>c. The compliance of the residential unit with the Building Code as at the date of the consent;</p> <p>d. Health and safety provisions in relation to guests;</p> <p>e. Guest management and complaints procedures;</p> <p>f. The keeping of records of RVA use, and availability of records for Council inspection; and</p> <p>g. Monitoring requirements, including imposition of an annual monitoring charge.</p>
24.5.21	<p>Residential visitor accommodation – Lifestyle Precinct only</p> <p>24.5.21.1 Must not exceed a cumulative total of 90 nights occupation by paying guests on a site per 12 month period.</p> <p>24.5.21.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Residential Visitor Accommodation activity.</p> <p>24.5.21.3 Up to date records of the Residential Visitor Accommodation activity must be kept, including a record of the date and duration of guest stays and the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>24.5.21.4 Smoke alarms must be provided in accordance with clause 5 of the Residential Tenancies (Smoke Alarms and Insulation) Regulations 2016.</p>	D

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	<p>Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.21.1 to 24.5.21.4</p>	
24.5.22	<p>Homestay</p> <p>Homestay– Excluding the Lifestyle Precinct</p> <p>24.5.22.1 Must not exceed 5 paying guests on a site per night.</p> <p>24.5.22.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Homestay activity.</p> <p>24.5.22.3 Up to date records of the Homestay activity must be kept, including a record of the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p> <p>Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.22.1 to 24.5.22.3.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>Control is reserved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The scale of the activity, including the number of guests per night and the number guest nights the activity operates in a 12 month period; b. The management of noise, rubbish and outdoor activities; c. The keeping of records of Homestay use, and availability of records for Council inspection; and d. Monitoring requirements, including imposition of an annual monitoring charge.
24.5.23	<p>Homestay – Lifestyle Precinct only</p> <p>24.5.23.1 Must not exceed 5 paying guests on a site per night.</p> <p>24.5.23.2 The Council must be notified in writing prior to the commencement of a Homestay activity.</p> <p>24.5.23.3 Up to date records of the Homestay activity must be kept, including a record of the number of guests staying per night, and in a form that can be made available for inspection by the Council at 24 hours' notice.</p>	<p>D</p>

	Table 24.3 - Standards	Non-compliance status
	Note: The Council may request that records are made available to the Council for inspection at 24 hours' notice, in order to monitor compliance with rules 24.5.23.1 to 24.5.23.3.	

24.6 Non-notification of applications

Any application for resource consent for controlled or restricted discretionary activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified, with the exception of the following:

- a. Rule 24.5.4 Building Size.
- b. Rule 24.5.5 Building coverage.
- c. Rule 24.5.6 Setback from internal boundaries.
- d. Rule 24.5.7 Height of buildings.
- e. Rule 24.5.8 Setback from roads.
- f. Rule 24.5.10 Setback from Escarpment, Ridgeline or River Cliff Feature.
- g. Rule 24.4.16 Retail sales of farm and garden produce and wine, where the access is onto a State Highway.

24.7 Assessment Matters

24.7.1 In considering whether or not to grant consent and/or impose conditions on a resource consent, regard shall be had to the assessment matters set out at 24.7.3 to 24.7.15.

24.7.2 All proposals for controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities will also be assessed as to whether they are consistent with the objectives and policies relevant to the identified matters of control or discretion (as applicable) in this Chapter 24 as well as those in Chapters 3 - Strategic Direction; Chapter 4 - Urban Development, Chapter 6 - Landscapes and Chapter 28 - Natural Hazards..

I

	Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities
24.7.3	<p>The construction of buildings for residential activity:</p> <p>Landscape character and visual amenity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the location, form, scale, design and finished materials including colours of the building(s) adequately responds to the identified landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the landscape character units set out in Schedule 24.9 – Landscape Character Units and the criteria set out below.

	Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities
	<p>b. The extent to which the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complement the existing landscape character and visual amenity values, including consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. building height; ii. building colours and materials; iii. building coverage; iv. design, size and location of accessory buildings; v. the design and location of landform modification, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed planting; vi. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns; vii. earth mounding and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways; viii. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.9 - Landscape Character Units; ix. riparian restoration planting; x. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement; and xi. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths. <p>c. The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the proposed development in a manner that maintains or enhances landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape, particularly from public places.</p> <p>e. Whether clustering of buildings or varied densities of the development areas would better maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness, or better integrate development with existing landform and vegetation or settlement patterns.</p> <p>f. Where a residential flat is not located adjacent to the residential unit, the extent to which this could give rise to sprawl of buildings and cumulative effects.</p> <p>g. The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of the appropriate setback from such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.</p> <p>h. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds or covenants.</p> <p>i. The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.</p> <p>j. Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.</p>
24.7.4	Infrastructure and access

Assessment Matters-Controlled Activities	
	<p>a. The extent to which the proposal provides for adequate on-site wastewater disposal and water supply. The provision of shared infrastructure servicing to more than one property is preferred in order to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the proposed access utilises an existing access or provides for a common access in order to reduce visual and environmental effects, including traffic safety, minimising earthworks and vegetation removal.</p>


Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
24.7.5	<p>New buildings (and alterations to existing buildings) including farm buildings and residential flats; and infringements of the standards for building coverage, building size, building material and colours, and building height:</p> <p>Landscape character and visual amenity</p> <p>a. Whether the location, form, scale, design and finished materials including colours of the building(s) adequately responds to the identified landscape character and visual amenity qualities of the landscape character units set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units and the criteria set out below.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the location and design of buildings and ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complement the existing landscape character and visual amenity values, including consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. building height; ii. building colours and materials; iii. building coverage; iv. design, size and location of accessory buildings; v. the design and location of landform modification, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed planting; vi. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns; vii. earth mounding and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways; viii. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units; ix. riparian restoration planting; x. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement; and xi. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths. <p>c. The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the conditions governing the proposed development so as to ensure that landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced in a manner that maintains or enhances landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity in the landscape, particularly from public places.</p>

	Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities
	<p>e. Whether clustering of buildings or varied densities of the development areas would better maintain a sense of openness and spaciousness, or better integrate development with existing landform and vegetation or settlement patterns.</p> <p>f. Where a residential flat is not located adjacent to the residential unit, the extent to which this could give rise to sprawl of buildings and cumulative effects.</p> <p>g. The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of the appropriate setback from such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.</p> <p>h. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds or covenants.</p> <p>i. The merit of the removal of wilding exotic trees at the time of development.</p> <p>j. Whether the proposed development provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.</p>
24.7.6	<p>Servicing, firefighting water, natural hazards, infrastructure and access</p> <p>a. The extent to which the proposal provides for adequate on-site wastewater disposal and water supply. The provision of shared infrastructure servicing to more than one property is preferred in order to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>b. The extent to which the proposed access utilises an existing access or provides for a common access in order to reduce visual and environmental effects, including traffic safety, minimising earthworks and vegetation removal.</p> <p>c. Whether adequate provision is made for firefighting activities and provision for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the objectives and policies set out in Chapter 28, Natural Hazards, are achieved.</p>
24.7.7	<p>Non-residential activities</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <p>a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the amenity and character of the surrounding area including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape character unit.</p> <p>b. Adequate visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places.</p> <p>c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust.</p> <p>d. Access that maintains the safety and efficiency of the roading and trail network.</p>
24.7.8	<p>Setback from boundaries, Queenstown Trail, roads and Escarpments, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p>

Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance of landscape character and visual amenity including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape unit. b. The maintenance of views to the surrounding mountain context. c. Adequate privacy, outlook and amenity for adjoining properties.
24.7.9	<p>Setback from boundaries of non-residential buildings housing animals</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance of landscape character and visual amenity including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the relevant landscape character unit. b. Minimisation of adverse odour, dust and/or noise effects on any neighbouring properties.
24.7.10	<p>Setback of buildings from waterbodies</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The maintenance or enhancement of biodiversity values. b. The maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values including reference to the identified elements set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units for the landscape character unit that the proposal falls into. c. The maintenance or enhancement of open space. d. Mitigation to manage any adverse effects of the location of the building including consideration of whether the waterbody is subject to flooding or natural hazards.
24.7.11	<p>Roadside stalls</p> <p>Whether the proposal achieves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the surrounding landscape character and visual amenity values. b. Preservation of visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places. c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust. d. Adequate parking, access safety and avoids adverse transportation effects.
24.7.12	<p>Retail sales</p> <p>Whether the proposal ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An appropriate scale and intensity of the activity in the context of the surrounding landscape character and visual amenity values. b. Preservation of visual amenity for neighbouring properties and from public places. c. Minimisation of any noise, odour and dust. d. Adequate parking, access safety and avoids adverse transportation effects.

Assessment Matters- Restricted Discretionary Activities	
24.7.13	<p>Glare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The effects on adjacent roads and neighbouring sites. b. The extent of likely visual dominance from light fixtures, poles and lux levels. c. The nature and extent of any effects on character and amenity, including the night sky. d. The nature and extent of any effects on privacy, views and outlook from neighbouring properties. e. Whether there will be any reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties.
24.7.14	<p>Clearance, works within the root protection zone or significant trimming of exotic vegetation over 4m in height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The degree to which the vegetation contributes to the landscape character and visual amenity values, and the extent to which the clearance or significant trimming would reduce those values. b. The potential for buildings and development to become more visually prominent. c. The merits of any proposed mitigation or replacement plantings. d. The effects on the health and structural stability of the vegetation. e. The merit of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees.

24.8 Schedule 24.8 Landscape Character Units



Acronyms used in Schedule 24.8

ONF	Outstanding Natural Feature	ONL WB	Outstanding Natural Landscape Wakatipu Basin
ONL	Outstanding Natural Landscape	SHA	Special Housing Area
LCU	Landscape Character Unit	Ha	Hectare (10,000m ²)
PDP	Proposed District Plan	DoC	Department of Conservation
SH	State Highway	QLDC	Queenstown Lakes District Council

1: Malaghans Valley

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Landform patterns	Relatively open and gently-rolling valley framed by mountain range (Coronet Peak) to the north (outside the LCU), and steeply sloping hillslopes and escarpment faces that define the northern edges of the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield and the Wharehuanui Hills, to the south (within the LCU).
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and shade trees in places. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings and farm buildings. Patches of scrub and remnant riparian vegetation in gullies. Exotic pasture grasses dominant.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams and overland flow paths draining from the mountain range to the north and the hillslopes to the south. Farm ponds in places.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Coronet Peak ONL (WB) to the north and the roche moutonnée ONF (part of Millbrook: LCU 11).
Character Unit boundaries	North: ONL which corresponds to the toe of the mountain range / study area boundary. East: Millbrook Special Zone, Meadow Park West Special Zone. South: Ridgeline crest of hillslopes and escarpments to the south. West: Study area boundary/ONL boundary.
Land use	Predominantly in pastoral land use with pockets of rural residential evident.

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Settlement patterns	<p>Rural residential development tends to be scattered along the elevated hillslopes that enjoy a northern aspect and frame the south side of the unit, and around the Malaghans Road – Dalefield Road intersection.</p> <p>Relatively limited number of consented platforms (given size of LCU) throughout the southern hillslopes and also throughout the valley flats on the north side of the road at the eastern end of the unit (20).</p> <p>Typical lots size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly 100-500ha. • Some smaller lots at either end of the unit, generally between 10-50ha in size. • Pockets of smaller lots (<4ha and 4-10ha) around the Dalefield Road, Coronet View and the Lower Shotover Road intersections.
Proximity to key route	Malaghans Road comprises an important scenic route between Queenstown and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	<p>No walkways, cycleways etc. through the area.</p> <p>Walkways and scenic roads throughout mountainsides immediately to the north (Coronet Peak Road, etc.).</p>
Infrastructure features	<p>No reticulated sewer or water.</p> <p>Limited stormwater reticulation.</p>
Visibility/prominence	The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible in views from Malaghans Road, Coronet Peak Road and the walkways to the north.
Views	<p>Key views relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the dramatic open vistas from Malaghans Road (scenic route) of the mountain range to the north; • views out over the unit from the scenic roads and walkways to the north; and, • the attractive, more rural and open vistas across the pastoral valley to the escarpments and hillslopes to the south.
Enclosure/openness	<p>Generally, the landscape unit exhibits a relatively high degree of openness with the landform features on either side providing a strong sense of containment to the valley.</p> <p>In places, plantings provide a localised sense of containment.</p>
Complexity	<p>The hillslopes and escarpment faces to the south of Malaghans Road display a reasonably high degree of complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.</p> <p>The valley floor lacks complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.</p>
Coherence	<p>The relatively simple and legible valley landform pattern, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence.</p> <p>Gully vegetation patterning throughout the hillslopes to the south serves to reinforce the landscape’s legibility.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	1: Malaghans Valley
Naturalness	The unit exhibits a relatively high perception of naturalness as a consequence of its predominantly open and pastoral character combined with its proximity to the vastly scaled and relatively undeveloped ONL to the north. In the main, dwellings tend to be well integrated by plantings and or relatively modest, serving to reduce their prominence.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a predominantly working rural landscape character with pockets of (mostly) sympathetic rural residential development evident in places. The valley also serves as an important 'breathing space' between Queenstown and Arrowtown and reads as a sensitive landscape 'transition' to the neighbouring ONL.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open, exposed and 'undeveloped' nature of the unit, in addition to its importance as a scenic route, providing a buffer between Queenstown and Arrowtown, and as a transition to the ONL, makes it highly sensitive to additional development.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Potential integration of walkway/cycleway etc. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of openness and spaciousness associated with predominantly pastoral landscape. Subservience of buildings within the overall unit. Dramatic views from Malaghans Road to the mountain range. Highly attractive rural views from Malaghans Road to the Wharehuanui hillslopes and escarpment faces. Impression of the area as a buffer between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Impression of the area as a sympathetic transition between the wider basin and the surrounding mountain ONL.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very low.

2: Fitzpatrick Basin

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Landform patterns	Generally south east / east facing basin landform framed by moderately to steeply sloping hills to the north and west, and a more gently undulating hill system throughout the south (adjoining the steep cliff and terraces framing the Shotover River - LCU 3).
Vegetation patterns	Fragmented and small pockets of woodlot plantings, exotic shelterbelts (in places) and exotic amenity plantings throughout rural residential lots. Mature evergreen vegetation along the Shotover River margins to the south and eastern edges. Pasture grasses and weed species dominate larger lots. Scrub / weeds in gullies throughout northern portion of the unit in particular.
Hydrology	Limited network of streams and overland flow paths draining to the Shotover River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins ONL Wakatipu Basin on its western and southern edges.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest. East: Vegetated stream boundary/cadastral pattern. South: Crest of Shotover River cliff/terrace margins. West: ONL/study area boundary.
Land use	Rural lifestyle/hobby farming type uses with rural residential evident. Larger lots appear to be relatively unproductive (e.g. extensive gorse etc. evident).
Settlement patterns	Numerous existing dwellings are evident throughout the Fitzpatrick Basin. Buildings variably contained by vegetation. Buildings and platforms typically located throughout the basin floor, the undulating hill system in the southern portion, or along the southern edges to enjoy views of the Shotover River and ONL backdrop. Several consented but unbuilt platforms (25) with many clustered. Typical lot size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally 20-50ha lots on the north side of Littles Road; • smaller lots on the south side (<4ha and 4-10ha) with some larger lots (10-20ha). The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road).
Heritage features	One heritage building / feature identified in PDP.

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Recreation features	No walkways, cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water main through part of central area.
Visibility/prominence	The relatively contained landform pattern, in conjunction with the mature evergreen plantings along the Shotover River margins, means that the unit is not particularly prominent in views from the wider basin study area. It is however visible from Tucker Beach (LCU 4). The extensive plantings throughout Dalefield mean that whilst the unit is visible in places, it is not prominent. The area is also visible from the mountain tracks to the north, however the diminishing influences of distance / relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the view from the mountain tracks to the north, in which the unit reads as part of a broad swathe of relatively low lying undulating land that extends in a west- east direction across the basin; the view from Tucker Beach (LCU 4), in which the unit reads as a more open area backdropped by the visually complex and relatively intensively inhabited Dalefield slopes. From within the unit, there are attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting. The southern margins enjoy views of the Shotover River (ONL).
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness throughout the basin. The northern portion is generally more open, with the southern area reading as more enclosed as a consequence of vegetation and localised landform patterns.
Complexity	The undulating hill system, together with its associated vegetation patterns throughout the southern portion of the landscape unit, contributes complexity in this part of the basin.
Coherence	Vegetation patterns do not generally reinforce the landform patterns (excepting scrub and weeds in gully areas). The relatively fragmented vegetation, settlement and land use patterns results in a landscape of limited coherence.
Naturalness	Generally a relatively low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development (both built and consented but unbuilt).
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a predominantly rural residential landscape that, together with the adjacent Dalefield landscape character unit, forms a discrete enclave, apart from the balance of the Wakatipu Basin study area.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open and exposed nature of the northern and central portion of the unit, albeit with the exposure effectively confined to the Fitzpatrick Basin and Dalefield catchment (i.e. not the wider Wakatipu Basin landscape). Elevated and southern aspect of the north portion. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for adverse cumulative effects.

Landscape Character Unit	2: Fitzpatrick Basin
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	<p>Visually contained nature of the location (in terms of the wider Wakatipu Basin landscape). Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Riparian restoration potential. Weed management potential. Potential integration of walkways/cycleways etc. Close proximity to Queenstown.</p>
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting. Avoiding built development on the elevated northern slopes that frame the unit. Avoiding built development on the Shotover River cliff/terrace (and ONL) edges. Maintaining the low 'public profile' of the unit with respect to the wider landscape of the Wakatipu Basin. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Littles Road and the north western and eastern ends of Fitzpatrick Road (that are currently relatively open in character) to the surrounding ONL mountain context.</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	High.

3: Shotover River Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	3: Shotover River Terrace
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terraces edged by steep hill slopes to the north and river cliffs to the south.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and scrub throughout the steep river cliffs (outside of the LCU). Scattered shade trees and scrub in places, with mown grass and grazed areas evident.
Hydrology	One stream crosses the terrace draining to the Shotover River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjacent ONL (WB) of the Shotover River and mountain landform (Sugar Loaf) to the south.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest defining Fitzpatrick Basin LCU. East: Ridgeline crest defining Fitzpatrick Basin LCU. South: Shotover River vegetation-clad cliffs. West: ONL / study area boundary.
Land use	Rural residential and rural lifestyle use (hobby farming etc.). DoC land along southern edge of unit.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings and platforms positioned to enjoy highly attractive views of Shotover River and the ONL mountain backdrop. A limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms (3). Limited access via a private road from Littles Road. Typical lot sizes: mix of lots < 4ha and 4-10ha.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road).
Heritage features	No features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area. DoC land.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer. Limited reticulated water / stormwater in places.
Visibility/prominence	The containment of the hill slopes to the north means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the elevated landform to the south, and parts of the Tucker Beach LCU. Overall, the unit is not prominent within the wider basin landscape.
Views	The unit affords attractive mid-range views along the river, and to the Sugar Loaf and Ferry Hill ONL backdrop.

Landscape Character Unit	3: Shotover River Terrace
Enclosure/openness	A moderate sense of openness within the unit as a consequence of the limited vegetation patterns. Overall, the large-scale landforms framing the local area (particularly to the south) contribute a sense of containment.
Complexity	Steep slopes between the terrace and Fitzpatrick Basin provide localised complexity in places.
Coherence	Generally, a relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of varying landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A moderate sense of naturalness as a consequence of the landform separation of this area from the neighbouring Fitzpatrick Basin, its proximity to the Shotover and its aspect adjacent an undeveloped ONL area on the opposite side of the river.
Sense of Place	Generally the unit reads as a discrete rural residential area that is strongly connected to the Shotover River and the undeveloped ONL area to the south.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open and exposed nature of the unit, within an extremely high value landscape context dominated by ONLs, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change. Southern aspect. A very private landscape with virtually no public access. Generally relatively small-scaled lots.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Contained nature of location. Riparian restoration potential. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways etc. associated with riverscape.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of (relative) remoteness and connection with the riverscape and surrounding mountains.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

4: Tucker Beach

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terraces edged and interspersed by steep hill slopes with steep river cliffs along northern edge.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and scrub throughout the steep river cliffs (outside of the LCU) and hill slopes. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Scattered shade trees and scrub in places, with mown grass and grazed areas evident.
Hydrology	The streams drain from Ferry Hill/Lake Johnson environs into the unit.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjacent ONL (WB) of the Shotover River and mountain landform (Ferry Hill environs) to the south.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Shotover River vegetation clad cliffs/ONL. East: Quail Rise urban area. South: ONL/study area boundary. West: ONL/study area boundary.
Land use	Rural residential with some working rural uses evident throughout the land at the western end of the unit. A substantial portion of the undeveloped land at the western end of the unit is in DoC ownership.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings and platforms positioned to enjoy highly attractive views of Shotover River and the ONL mountain backdrop. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (20). Typical lot size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • central and eastern end of the unit < 4ha (with the odd larger lot: 20-50ha); • western end of the unit: over 500ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement pattern in the central and eastern end of the Unit.
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a dead - end road.
Heritage features	No buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area. Substantial DoC reserve land within the central / western portion of the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water and (some) stormwater / sewer throughout central and western end of the unit. Western end- no reticulated services.

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Visibility/prominence	The containment of the hill slopes to the south means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the river terraces to the south, and the upper reaches of Fitzpatrick Basin / Dalefield. The lower lying central and northern portions of the unit and the interior of the flat terraces in the western portion of the unit are not prominent within the wider basin landscape. The elevated hill slopes along the south edge of the unit are locally prominent.
Views	The unit affords attractive mid-range views along the river, and to the wider ONL mountain and hill context.
Enclosure/openness	A varying sense of openness within the unit as a consequence of vegetation patterns. Overall, the large-scale landforms framing the local area (particularly to the south) contribute a sense of containment.
Complexity	Steep slopes and plantings provide localised complexity in places.
Coherence	A relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of varying landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A moderate sense of naturalness throughout the western end of the unit as a consequence of the limited level of built development, its proximity to the Shotover and its position adjacent an undeveloped ONL area. The central and eastern end of the unit is considerably more developed and therefore has a lower perception of naturalness. Reinforced by the close proximity of Quail Rise.
Sense of Place	Generally the unit reads as a part of the Shotover River margins with a continuous sleeve of rural living as one moves westwards away from Quail Rise towards the DoC Reserve.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Relatively open, exposed and undeveloped nature of the western portion of the unit, within an extremely high value landscape context dominated by ONLs and including a substantial DoC Reserve, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change. Absence of defensible boundaries to existing rural residential and urban zones in the vicinity, make the central and eastern portions of the unit in particular, vulnerable to development creep. Visibility of the development throughout the elevated slopes along the southern edge of the unit.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Relatively contained nature of location. Riparian restoration potential. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways etc. associated with riverscape. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Integrating effect of existing development context throughout eastern end of the unit in particular. Easy topography along central and northern portion of the unit. Close proximity of urban infrastructure.

Landscape Character Unit	4: Tucker Beach
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Sense of (relative) remoteness and connection with the riverscape and surrounding mountains at the western end of the unit. Integration of buildings, accessways and earthworks via planting.</p> <p>Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Tucker Beach Road to the Shotover River corridor and surrounding ONL mountain context. Maintaining a sense of openness throughout the elevated land between the Lifestyle Precinct and adjacent ONL (to the south).</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	<p>Low (at western end) Moderate-High (throughout central and eastern end of the unit)</p>

5: Dalefield

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Landform patterns	South-west facing hillside that effectively frames the eastern side of the Fitzpatrick Basin.
Vegetation patterns	<p>Extensive patterning of exotic shelterbelts, hedgerows and exotic amenity plantings around dwellings.</p> <p>Some exotic woodlots.</p> <p>Mix of grazed and mown grass.</p>
Hydrology	Two streams drain across the unit to the Shotover. Third stream drains eastwards to the Wharehuanui Hills LCU.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has longer-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	<p>North: Ridgeline crest defining Malaghans Valley LCU.</p> <p>East: Dalefield Road, vegetation and cadastral patterns.</p> <p>South: study area boundary/ONL.</p> <p>West: Vegetation and cadastral patterns.</p>
Land use	Rural lifestyle/hobby farming and rural residential land uses dominate.
Settlement patterns	<p>Dwellings scattered throughout the entire unit.</p> <p>Very few consented yet unbuilt platforms (6).</p> <p>Typical lot sizes: predominantly <4ha with some 4-10ha.</p> <p>The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Proximity to key route	Accessed via a lesser-used route between Dalefield Road and Arthurs Point Road (Littles Road) and Dalefield Road itself.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	Despite the elevated hillslope location, the extensive vegetation throughout Dalefield means that development within the area is generally well screened/integrated. That said, the area is visible from the mountain tracks to the north however the diminishing influences of distance/relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting (above or framed by vegetation). The unit is visible from the neighbouring Fitzpatrick Basin (Landscape Character Unit 2) and from the river terraces and ONL mountain slopes (Sugar Loaf and Ferry Hill) on the south side of the Shotover River (i.e. Tucker Beach: LCU 4 environs).
Enclosure/openness	A high level of enclosure and containment as a consequence of the vegetation patterning.
Complexity	The extensive vegetation patterns contribute a high degree of complexity.
Coherence	The coherence of the extensive vegetation patterns is compromised by the varied planting characters evident throughout individual lots.
Naturalness	Generally a relatively low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development. Whilst many buildings are well integrated by plantings (and therefore visually discreet), the varied and complex patterning of the plantings reinforces the lot arrangement.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a well-established and reasonably intensively-inhabited leafy rural residential landscape.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Very few larger-scaled lots. Existing platform and lot arrangement together with the vegetation patterning is likely to make it very difficult to locate new building platforms.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Close proximity to Queenstown. Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (primarily due to vegetation patterning). Riparian planting potential. Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.

Landscape Character Unit	5: Dalefield
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Unobtrusiveness of buildings and their integration via planting. Retention of existing vegetation patterns. Maintaining a sense of openness from Littles Road and/or Dalefield Road where there are existing views available out over ONLs including the Shotover River and/or to the surrounding mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, vegetation and lot patterns.)

6: Wharehuanui Hills

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills, and remnant kettle lakes. Many of the latter have been converted into amenity pond features.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and shade trees throughout pastoral areas. Exotic shelterbelts and park-like amenity plantings throughout rural residential lots with native vegetation to pond and watercourse margins. Patches of scrub in gullies. Mix of grazed and mown grass.
Hydrology	Numerous pond and wetland areas together with short watercourses and overland flow paths.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has open, longer-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest defining Malaghans Valley LCU. East: Millbrook Structure Plan area. South: Ridgeline crest defining Speargrass Flat LCU. West: Dalefield Road.

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Land use	A mix of rural and rural residential land uses evident.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings are located clear of wet areas, positioned to enjoy long-range mountain views and sited to optimise the screening/privacy benefits of the localised hummock landform patterning and vegetation patterns. Relatively few consented but unbuilt platforms (9). Typical lot sizes: predominantly 20-50ha lots with pockets of 4-10ha and < 4ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located away from key vehicular route, i.e. accessed via a dead-end road (Mooney Road) or via long driveways off Speargrass Flat Road, Dalefield Road or Lower Shotover Road.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways / cycleways etc. through the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and hummocky character of the central portion of the unit is not particularly prominent in terms of the wider basin landscape. The hills and escarpments along the north and south edges of the unit are however highly visible from the surrounding lower lying areas (noting that these areas have been included in the adjacent Landscape Character Units i.e. LCU1 and LCU 8). The area is visible from the (ONL) mountain tracks to the north however the diminishing influences of distance/relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting. The containment of localised hummocks means that few dwellings within the unit are visible from the surrounding area (excepting the more distant areas at a higher elevation). In views from the mountain tracks to the north, the unit reads as part of a broad swathe of relatively low lying undulating land that extends in a west - east direction across the basin.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and containment. Smaller lots tend to exhibit a more enclosed and contained character as a consequence of vegetation patterns. The hummocky landform pattern also serves to create a sense of containment.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex landscape as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. The configuration of smaller lots and their associated boundary plantings adds to the complexity.

Landscape Character Unit	6: Wharehuanui Hills
Coherence	Vegetation patterns generally do not reinforce landform features (excepting pond and stream plantings), which results in the perception of a landscape lacking coherence. This is reinforced by the varying character of plantings evident on individual properties and the wide range of architectural styles evident.
Naturalness	Generally, a limited perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development evident, and the relatively contrived (albeit in the main, attractive) character of plantings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a rural residential landscape in which buildings are reasonably well integrated by landform and vegetation. Whilst larger more 'rural' lots are evident, overall the amenity plantings throughout tend to contribute a parkland rather than a working rural landscape impression.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Poor drainage/wet areas. Potential visibility of development along the north and south ridgeline edges of the unit. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Relatively visually discreet nature of the majority of the unit (due to landform and, to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Integration potential of landform pattern. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Riparian restoration potential. Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from the ridgeline crests to the north and south edges of the unit. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Mooney Road to the surrounding ONL mountain context. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from new internal roads to the surrounding ONL mountain context. Avoidance of built development on the elevated slopes that frame the north western portion of the Mooney Road 'basin' (and which serves to separate the LCU 6 from LCU 23 Millbrook).
Capability to absorb additional development	High except for the eastern end of the LCU where it adjoins LCU 23 Millbrook Low at the eastern end of the LCU where it adjoins LCU 23 Millbrook

7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terrace edged by steep vegetation-clad river cliffs to the west.
Vegetation patterns	Predominantly exotic vegetation and weeds throughout steep river cliffs (outside of LCU). Scattered exotic shade trees, shelterbelts and amenity plantings around buildings. Mix of grazed and mown grass.
Hydrology	No streams, ponds or wetlands evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Western boundary adjoins Shotover River ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: the toe of the Wharehuanui / Dalefield hill slopes, vegetation / cadastral patterning. East: Domain Road, the Hawthorn Triangle hedging and Lower Shotover Road. South: SH6 cutting. West: Shotover River ONL.
Land use	Rural residential and rural lifestyle/hobby farming uses dominate. Some tourist accommodation.
Settlement patterns	Generally, dwellings are located to enjoy close-range views of the Shotover River corridor and wider mountain views. Several consented but unbuilt platforms along the south and north end of Domain Road (8 in total). Dwellings accessed from Spence Road (towards the south end of the unit) generally well integrated by plantings. Typical lot sizes: predominantly < 4ha or 4-10ha. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	The southern end of the unit is close to SH6, a key route between Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cardrona, the Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP, including the Old Shotover River Bridge at the southern end of the unit.
Recreation features	A council walkway/cycleway runs along the western edge of the south portion of the unit (i.e. along the Shotover). This forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride' route.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in north and central parts of the unit.

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Visibility/prominence	The dense plantings associated with the Hawthorn Triangle to the east means that visibility is limited to the Shotover corridor, the elevated hills to the east (Slope Hill ONF environs), Quail Rise/LCU4 to the west and Lower Shotover Road to the east. The area is generally not visible from SH6 (highway in substantial cutting), although is visible in part from the Shotover Bridge.
Views	The unit affords highly attractive views of the Shotover corridor and ONL mountain backdrop beyond. The unit is of importance in views from the river corridor, the walkway/cycleway route, Quail Rise, the highway Shotover Bridge (in part) and the Old Shotover River Bridge.
Enclosure/openness	There is a variable sense of enclosure throughout the unit as a consequence of vegetation patterns. The central portion of the unit is generally more open in character.
Complexity	The terrace landform patterning, together with the limited vegetation patterning throughout the central portion of the unit, results in a relatively low level of complexity. The more varied topography and vegetation in the north and south makes these areas more complex.
Coherence	A relatively low level of coherence as a consequence of the variance between landform and vegetation patterns.
Naturalness	A limited sense of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development, the proximity of the southern part of the unit to SH6, and the proximity to development within LCU 4 (Tucker Beach) and the Quail Rise Structure Plan Area. This is countered to a degree by the scale and undeveloped character of the Shotover River corridor in very close proximity.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a part of the river 'fringe', distinct from the densely-planted and inhabited units of Dalefield and the Hawthorn Triangle (to the north and east respectively), and the more open and elevated landscape associated with Slope Hill to the east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open and exposed nature of the central portion of the unit, within a high value landscape context, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. The relatively close proximity of visible urban development (Quail Rise) to the southern portion of the unit and proximity of the intensively developed Hawthorn Triangle to the east suggests a reduced sensitivity. The complex patterning of vegetation throughout this portion of the unit also serves to reduce its sensitivity. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for adverse cumulative effects.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Close proximity to Queenstown. 'Developed' context. Easy topography.

Landscape Character Unit	7: Domain Road Shotover Terrace
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Connection with riverscape. Set back of buildings from river cliff/ONL edges. Integration of buildings with plantings. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Domain Road to the Shotover River corridor and surrounding ONL mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-High

8: Speargrass Flat

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Landform patterns	Relatively open pastoral flat framed by the south-facing slopes of the Wharehuanui Hills to the north, and the steep margins of the Slope Hill 'Foothills' to the south.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and patches of mixed scrubland in gullies. Isolated bush fragment to eastern end. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	A series of watercourses and overland flow paths drain southwards across Speargrass Flat from the Wharehuanui Hills to Lake Hayes.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has open longer-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: ridgeline crest, Millbrook Structure Plan area. East: crest of hill slopes, Lake Hayes Rural Residential landuse pattern/cadastral boundaries, Speargrass Flat Road. South: ridgeline crest, Hawthorn Triangle hedging. West: vegetation patterns/stream.
Land use	Predominantly pastoral land use with sparsely scattered rural residential lots.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings tend to be well separated and framed by plantings, or set into localised landform patterns. Generally dwellings are located on the flat land adjacent the road although a very limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms located on elevated hill slopes to the south (that enjoy northern aspect). Overall very few consented but unbuilt platforms (3). Typical lot sizes: the majority of lots are over 50ha.

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Proximity to key route	Located away from a key vehicular route. Part of the area is adjacent to Speargrass Flat Road, Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Speargrass Flat Road is identified as a Council walkway/cycleway. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in places.
Visibility/prominence	The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible from the public road network and the elevated hills to the north and south, although the escarpment confining the character unit to the north blocks some views from the north.
Views	Key views relate to the open and spacious pastoral outlook from Speargrass Flat Road (including the walkway/cycleway route) across to the escarpment faces and hillslopes flanking the valley, backdropped by mountains.
Enclosure/openness	The landform features to the north and south providing a strong sense of containment to the relatively open valley landscape.
Complexity	The hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south display a reasonably high degree of complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. The valley floor itself displays a relatively low level of complexity as a consequence of its open and flat nature.
Coherence	The relatively simple and legible bold valley landform pattern, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence. Gully vegetation patterning serves to reinforce the landscape legibility in places.
Naturalness	The area displays a reasonable degree of naturalness as a consequence of the relatively limited level of built development evident.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a predominantly working rural landscape character with scattered and for the most part, relatively subservient rural residential development evident in places. Whilst Hawthorn Triangle and Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCUs form part of the valley landscape, their quite different character as a consequence of relatively intensive rural residential development sets them apart from the Speargrass Flat LCU, with the latter effectively reading as 'breathing space' between the two. To the eastern end of the unit, there is the perception of the Lakes Hayes Rural Residential area sprawling west into Speargrass Flat.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of a robust edge to the Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCU makes Speargrass Flat vulnerable to 'development creep'. Open character, in combination with walkway / cycleway, makes it sensitive to landscape change.

Landscape Character Unit	8: Speargrass Flat
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p><i>Central and western portion of LCU 8</i></p> <p>Sense of openness and spaciousness as a 'foil' for the more intensively developed rural residential areas nearby. Maintenance of unobstructed rural views from Speargrass Flat Road to the largely undeveloped hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south.</p> <p><i>Eastern portion of LCU 8</i></p> <p>Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting. Maintenance of a spacious and open outlook in views from the Queenstown Trail and Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road, including the southbound view as one descends Christine's Hill. Maintenance of openness in views from Hogans Gully Road to the backdropping hill /escarpment landforms and broader ONL mountain context.</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	Low.

9: Hawthorn Triangle

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Landform patterns	Flat alluvial river terrace landform. Localised (man-made) mounding within the triangle to assist the integration of dwellings and provide privacy.
Vegetation patterns	Tall hawthorn hedging around almost all three sides of the triangle. Elsewhere exotic shelterbelt plantings. Extensive parkland and amenity plantings within the triangle. Mown grass.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Hydrology	Sporadic amenity ponds and truncated streams.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has mid and longer-range views above the hedging and tree plantings to the ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Speargrass Flat Road and shelterbelt/hawthorn hedging. East/South: Domain Road and hawthorn hedging. West/South: Lower Shotover Road and hawthorn hedging.
Land use	Rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Densely configured arrangement of consistently high value rural residential dwellings. Dwellings set into mounding and a planted parkland character. A high number of consented but unbuilt platforms (43). Evidence of a high degree of consistency in terms of building development controls (height, colours, fencing, etc.) Overall a distinctly large-lot suburban character. Typical lot sizes: predominantly under 4ha. Largest lots in the 4-10ha range. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located away from a key vehicular route.
Heritage features	One heritage building / feature identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A council walkway / cycleway runs along the south portion of Domain Road edging the triangle, then dog-legs through the unit, emerging to run along the north end of the Lower Shotover Road bordering the triangle. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in several locations.
Visibility/prominence	The dense evergreen hedging around the unit's edges serve to screen views into the area from the surrounding road network and properties. The quite distinctive patterning of the triangle as a consequence of its shape, reinforced by the vegetation patterns and contrasting density of development in comparison to the surrounds, makes it a distinctive element in views from the elevated surrounds.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Views	Key views relate to the strongly framed corridor views along the roads bordering the triangle. In many places, the roadside plantings serve to block views from the road to the surrounding mountain context. Other key views relate to the elevated views from Slope Hill environs to the east and the views from the walkway/cycleway route that passes through the unit.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a strong sense of enclosure as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	The extensive plantings throughout the unit contribute a relatively high degree of complexity. The frequency of buildings and to a lesser degree, mounding adds to this complexity.
Coherence	The relatively limited palette of species and application of (what would appear to be) relatively consistent building development controls (building height, building colours, fencing, etc.) suggests a reasonable degree of coherence. However, the very flat topography and perimeter screen limits an appreciation of this coherence from the roads and landscape around the unit (excepting elevated vantage points).
Naturalness	The unit exhibits a low degree of naturalness as a consequence of the density of existing rural residential development and the relatively contrived character of much of the plantings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the Triangle displays a large-lot suburban parkland character. The tall, linear and dense perimeter plantings serve to screen road (and potentially, private property) views of the wider mountain setting of the Basin and contrast with the more varied planting patterns evident elsewhere in the Basin. This planting does, however, significantly diminish an awareness of the density of development within the triangle from the immediate surrounds (excepting elevated areas).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Very few larger-scaled lots. Existing platform and lot arrangement, together with mounding and vegetation patterns (which may be covenanted), may physically constrain additional development. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. Integration with consented but unbuilt development - potential for 'internal' adverse cumulative effects (i.e. effects within the triangle).
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	The enclosed and screened nature of the area suggests the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider Basin landscape. Close proximity to Queenstown. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Integration of buildings via appropriately-scaled mounding, planting, and the application of a consistent series of building development controls addressing such matters as building height, coverage, colours/materials, fencing, paving, etc.

Landscape Character Unit	9: Hawthorn Triangle
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, mounding, and vegetation patterns.)

10: Ladies Mile

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Landform patterns	Largely flat alluvial river terrace landform spanning between the Shotover River and Lake Hayes. Adjacent the waterbodies at either end, the terrace is stepped.
Vegetation patterns	A fragmented patterning of exotic shelterbelts and scattered exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Exotic river terrace, lake and river margin vegetation. Horticultural plantings in places.
Hydrology	No ponds and wetlands evident. A very short length of stream on the north side of Ladies Mile Highway.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	North boundary adjoins the Slope Hill ONF (WB). East boundary adjoins Lake Hayes ONF and west boundary adjoins the Shotover River ONL(WB). Longer range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Slope Hill ONF, cadastral boundary. East: Lake Hayes ONF. South: Shotover Country, Queenstown Country Club SHA, Lake Hayes Estate. West: Shotover River, Lower Shotover Road.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential with rural uses evident. A large scale retirement village (Queenstown Country Club SHA) has been recently consented on the south side of Ladies Mile Highway (unbuilt). Urban development to the south of the LCU set on lower lying terraces (Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country).
Settlement patterns	Dwellings tend to be set well back from the busy highway. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms evident (36). A quite dense large-lot suburban pattern associated with the rural residential development in places, although the set back from the highway means that there is a limited awareness from the road (McDowell Drive environs). The SHA extends from Lakes Hayes Estate into the river terrace landform associated with Ladies Mile and serves to sever the south side of the LCU into two. The SHA buildings are set back 75m from the highway edge and fronted by orchard, parkland tree plantings and grazing land. Building heights within the SHA that coincide with Ladies Mile LCU range from one storey to three storey. Typical lot sizes: predominance of lots are less than 10ha with 3 lots in the 20-50ha range and 3 over 10ha (albeit straddling the adjacent ONL).

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Proximity to key route	SH6 passes through the centre of the LCU and comprises a key vehicular route between Queenstown, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Cardrona, Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Approximately seven heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A Council walkway / cycleway route along the eastern end of the unit linking Lake Hayes Estate with the Lake Hayes circuit. Forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Commuter Ride'. (NB cycleway runs from the Shotover Bridge along the river edge south of Lake Hayes Estate etc. to link with the Commuter Ride).
Infrastructure features	No reticulated services within the area however adjacent fully serviced urban development (Shotover Country, Lakes Hayes Estate) and reasonable to expect that the Queenstown Country Club SHA within the unit will be fully serviced.
Visibility/prominence	The unit is, for the most part, highly visible from SH6 and the Field Access Road up the Remarkables to the south. The lower-lying character and large-scale cut slopes adjacent the highway at the western end of the LCU means that this western portion (south of SH6) is relatively visually discreet.
Views	Key views relate to the open and relatively uncluttered views from SH6 southwards across the open and predominantly pastoral LCU to the dramatic mountain sequence framing the south side of the basin and Lake Wakatipu, and northwards to Slope Hill. The dramatic character of the views together with their marked contrast with the outlook afforded from SH6 further to the west (i.e. Frankton Flats) make them highly memorable. It is acknowledged that the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA will significantly alter this impression. The LCU also affords highly attractive vistas out across Lake Hayes. In more elevated views, the area also forms a distinctive green swathe, contrasting with the urban development of Shotover Country, Lake Hayes Estate immediately to the south and the approved SHA (unbuilt) on the terrace.
Enclosure/openness	The unit itself displays a relatively open character framed by Slope Hill to the north and the Remarkables Range to the south. To the south, plantings throughout the terrace faces edging the lower-lying urban areas of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country provide low-level and reasonably distant containment. This will be disrupted by the plantings and buildings associated with the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA which will effectively sever the south side of the LCU into two separate areas.
Complexity	The limited extent of planting and relatively uniform topography contributes a low level of complexity throughout the LCU (excepting the SHA area).
Coherence	The flat topography and fragmented vegetation patterns suggests a low level of coherence. This is countered to a degree by the relatively consistently open and pastoral character of the majority of the unit (excepting the SHA).
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of its proximity to the busy state highway (SH6), the distinctly urban character of the SHA consented in the area, and an awareness (albeit limited) at the eastern end of the LCU of the Lake Hayes Estate urban development.

Landscape Character Unit	10: Ladies Mile
Sense of Place	<p>Generally, Ladies Mile reads as a critical part of the 'green' entrance to Queenstown. The care that has been taken to ensure that both rural residential and urban development in the vicinity is not visible from the road reinforces the role of this unit as a spacious green entrance.</p> <p>This has however been significantly compromised by the Queenstown Country Club SHA retirement village development which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent, central and sizeable part of the LCU.</p> <p>The LCU also functions as an important 'breathing space' between the urban development of Frankton Flats to the west (and Queenstown proper beyond) and the ribbon development and rural residential 'node' associated with Lake Hayes to the east. Again it is acknowledged that the character of development associated with the Queenstown Country Club SHA significantly compromises this impression.</p>
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	<p>Role of the unit as a 'green' entrance to Queenstown.</p> <p>The function of the LCU as an important scenic route and its proximity to ONFs.</p> <p>Role of the area as a 'breathing space' between the urban area to the west and the relatively consistent and intensive patterning of rural residential development associated with Lake Hayes to the east.</p>
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	<p>The discreet nature of the western end of the unit makes it more suited to absorbing change.</p> <p>Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision whilst retaining generous setback from SH6.</p> <p>Close proximity to Queenstown.</p> <p>Close proximity to urban infrastructure.</p> <p>Urbanising effects of the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA suggest a tolerance for (sensitive) urban development.</p> <p>Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways.</p> <p>Riparian restoration potential (limited).</p>
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Sense of a spacious, green entrance to Queenstown.</p> <p>Views from SH6 to the surrounding mountain / hill / lake context.</p>
Capability to absorb additional development	High

11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Landform patterns	Elevated and complex patterning of hills ranging from moderate to steeply sloping in places. Elevated hummock pattern throughout central portion with remnant kettle lakes.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts, woodlots, remnant gully vegetation, and exotic amenity plantings around older rural residential dwellings. Predominantly grazed grass although smaller lots tends to be mown.
Hydrology	Numerous streams, ponds and localised wet areas.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Slope Hill/Lake Hayes ONF.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest. East: Ridgeline crest/ONF. South: Toe of Slope Hill ONF. West: Lower Shotover Road.
Land use	Mix of rural and rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings generally located to enjoy long-range basin and mountain views. Older rural residential development tends to be well integrated by planting and/or localised landform patterns. Newer rural residential is considerably more exposed, with buildings sited to exploit landform screening (where possible). Clustered development evident in places. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (43). Typical lot sizes: evenly distributed mix. One property 100-500ha range, another 50-100ha. Balance typically shared lots or 4-10ha range.
Proximity to key route	Located away from key vehicular route.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A Council walkway/cycleway runs along Slope Hill Road (forms part of the Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride').
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water, sewer and stormwater in places.
Existing zoning	PDP: Western slopes overlooking Hawthorn Triangle: Rural Lifestyle (no defensible edges). Balance of the unit: Rural.
Visibility/prominence	Visibility varies across the landscape unit. The elevated nature of the unit and its location adjacent a flat plain on its western side means that this part of the area is visually prominent. The steep hillslopes and escarpment faces edging Speargrass Flat to the north and Lake Hayes to the east, together with Slope Hill itself, serve to limit visibility of the balance of the unit from the wider basin landscape.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Views	Key views relate to the open vistas available from parts of Hawthorn Triangle environs to the western portion of the unit. The unit affords attractive long-range views out over the basin to the surrounding ONL mountain setting as well as open views of the nearby Slope Hill ONF from some public locations.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and enclosure. The older and more established rural residential development throughout the elevated slopes on the western side of the unit are reasonably enclosed, despite their elevation. Throughout the central and eastern areas, landform provides containment at a macro scale.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit due to the landform patterning. Vegetation patterns add to the complexity in places.
Coherence	The coordination of landform and vegetation patterns in places (associated with gully plantings), contributes a degree of landscape coherence. Elsewhere the discordant vegetation and landform patterning means that there is a limited perception of landscape coherence.
Naturalness	A variable sense of naturalness, largely dependent on how well buildings are integrated into the landscape. The large number of consented but unbuilt platforms suggest that a perception of naturalness could reduce appreciably in time.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural residential landscape. The elevated portions of the area read as a rural residential landscape 'at, or very near, its limit'. The lower-lying stream valley area to the east remains largely undeveloped, and functions as somewhat of a 'foil' for the more intensive rural residential landscape associated with the surrounding elevated slopes.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	DoC ownership of part of low lying stream valley to the east. Drainage in places (e.g. low-lying stream valley to east). Potential visibility of development throughout western hillslopes in particular. Importance of the western slopes as a contrasting and highly attractive backdrop to the intensive patterning throughout the Hawthorne Triangle, particularly in views from within the triangle. Importance of existing open views to Slope Hill. Proximity of popular walkway/cycleway route. Environment Court history suggest that the capacity has been fully exploited in most parts of the LCU.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Improved landscape legibility via gully and steep slope planting.

Landscape Character Unit	11: Slope Hill 'Foothills'
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform pattern. Careful integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from ridgeline crests to north and east of unit. Retention of existing open views to Slope Hill.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Landform patterns	Flat lake terrace / valley floor landform.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity plantings around established rural residential dwellings and along watercourses.
Hydrology	Several streams drain across the land unit to Lake Hayes.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Lake Hayes ONF along south edge.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Speargrass Flat Road, cadastral boundary, Hogans Gully. East: ridgeline crest. South: Toe of Speargrass Flat hillslopes, Lake Hayes ONF, descending ridgeline crest, Bendemeer Special Zone. West: cadastral boundary.
Land use	Almost entirely rural residential land use. Slivers of QLDC land including a lake front reserve. Agistment uses evident on the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road/Hogans Gully intersection.

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Settlement patterns	<p>Dwellings intensively clustered around the northern end of Lake Hayes and reasonably evenly distributed to the west, along the narrow flat margin on the south side of Speargrass Flat Road.</p> <p>Evenly dispersed arrangement of consented but unbuilt platforms throughout the flat land on the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road/Hogans Gully intersection.</p> <p>Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms, particularly in the south-east corner of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road / Hogans Gully intersection (27).</p> <p>More recent development would appear to have had consistent design controls applied and required mounding/planting which assist integration.</p> <p>Typical lot sizes: < 4ha.</p> <p>The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.</p>
Proximity to key route	Located on a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown (Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road).
Heritage features	Approximately two heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	<p>Council walkway / cycleway route passes through the area linking the Queenstown Trail 'Lake Hayes Circuit' to the 'Countryside Ride'.</p> <p>Art gallery, lakefront reserve.</p>
Infrastructure features	The majority of the unit has reticulated sewer and water. Limited reticulated stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	<p>The relatively low-lying and well-vegetated character of much of the unit makes it relatively visually discreet.</p> <p>The exceptions to this are the open and unbuilt (as yet) pocket at the eastern end and parts of the linear area adjacent Speargrass Flat Road at the western end of the unit.</p>
Views	<p>Key views relate to the outlook from the surrounding road network and walkway/cycleway route.</p> <p>Views from within the unit to Lake Hayes and the surrounding ONL mountain context.</p>
Enclosure/openness	<p>Generally, a high degree of enclosure as a consequence of the vegetation patterns.</p> <p>A considerably greater sense of openness at the western and eastern edges of the unit resulting in a direct relationship with the neighbouring Speargrass Flats LCU.</p>
Complexity	The extensive plantings throughout the unit contribute a relatively high degree of complexity, excepting the western and eastern ends, which are more open in character.
Coherence	<p>At a more detailed level, the varied patterning and character of plantings on individual lots results in a relatively low level of landscape coherence.</p> <p>However, at the macro level, the contrasting character of the relatively densely-planted (and inhabited) character of the unit in comparison to the surrounds lends a strong sense of coherence.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	12: Lake Hayes Rural Residential
Naturalness	Generally, a low perception of naturalness as a consequence of the level of rural residential development.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as a distinct 'node' of rural residential development at the northern end of Lake Hayes (despite not having a discernible 'heart') that is buffered from the lake by plantings/open space. The ribbon-type patterning at the western end, extent of (as yet, unbuilt) development at the eastern end, and absence of legible defensible edges, including for the development to the north of Speargrass Flat Road, confer the impression of an 'actively' spreading node.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of legible edges to the west and north edges of the unit. Very few larger-scaled lots to accommodate additional development. Existing platform and lot arrangement together with vegetation patterns may constrain additional development. Proximity of popular walkway / cycleway route.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. The enclosed and screened nature of the area, together with its established rural residential node character, suggests the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider basin landscape. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Integration of buildings via planting and the application of building design controls. Retention of existing vegetation patterns. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Speargrass Flat Road to the surrounding escarpment and ONL mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	High (Potentially limited by existing building, vegetation and lot patterns)

13: Lake Hayes Slopes

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Landform patterns	Variably steep to moderately sloping hillslopes.
Vegetation patterns	Fragmented patterning of exotic shelterbelts and amenity plantings. Viticulture in places.
Hydrology	No streams, ponds, wetlands evident.

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Southern edge adjoins Morven Hill ONL(WB). Overlooks Lake Hayes / Slope Hill ONF.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Descending ridgeline crest. East: Bendemeer Special Zone. South: Morven Hill ONL (WB). West: Lake Hayes or Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road / Low Density Residential zone straddling Lake Hayes.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential. QLDC land. Viticulture, hobby farming and public uses evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings scattered throughout slopes to enjoy panoramic lake and mountain views. Roading snakes up steep hillsides. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms (24). Older dwellings reasonably well integrated by vegetation and generally of a relatively modest scale. Newer dwellings larger-scaled and generally very exposed with landscaping not providing material mitigation as at 2018. Typical lot sizes: almost all of the lots under 10ha.
Proximity to key route	The majority of the unit is located on a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown (Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road). The southern portion of the unit is located on SH6, a key vehicular route between Queenstown, Wanaka, Cardrona, Gibbston Valley and Cromwell.
Heritage features	Approximately four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No specific walkway or cycleway through the area, although Lake Hayes circuit (part of Queenstown Trail), nearby. Winery, cafes, scenic reserve, rowing club
Infrastructure features	Majority of the area has reticulated water, sewer and stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and exposed nature of much of the unit makes it prominent in views from Lake Hayes, parts of SH6, the walkway/cycleway around Lake Hayes and the Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Views	Key views relate to the views from the road network and Lake Hayes (including walkway/cycleway) to the area, and from the unit to the lake and mountain (ONF and ONL) setting.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, a relatively low degree of enclosure as a consequence of the elevated hillslope location and absence of vegetation.
Complexity	The hillslope landform patterns contribute complexity in places; however, this is somewhat outweighed by the paucity of vegetation.

Landscape Character Unit	13: Lake Hayes Slopes
Coherence	Generally, a low degree of landscape coherence as a consequence of the open and exposed character, together with the frequency of highly visible large-scale buildings and winding roads up steep hill slopes.
Naturalness	Generally, a low degree of naturalness as a consequence of the frequency and exposure of buildings.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area displays a relatively unsympathetic rural residential character that reads as development sprawl up the hillsides. The exception to this is the older and lower lying, generally more modest development adjacent Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Elevated and in many places exposed location that is highly visible from the surrounding area, including from key scenic routes. Steep topography. Absence of vegetation in some areas. Highly modified rural living area with a risk of exacerbating perception of development sprawl.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Improve landscape legibility via gully/steep slope planting.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Careful integration of buildings with landform and planting.
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

14: Lake Hayes Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Landform patterns	Elevated alluvial terrace landform.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic and remnant riparian vegetation along Hayes Creek margins. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Fragmented shelterbelt plantings and hedgerows.

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Hydrology	Bordered by the Hayes Creek to the west. No streams or wetlands evident. Amenity pond.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Morven Hill ONL (WB) along east and south boundary and Lake Hayes ONF along north boundary.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Lake Hayes ONF. East: Morven Hill ONL (WB). South: Morven Hill ONL (WB). West: Hayes Creek.
Land use	Rural residential uses with some lifestyle / hobby farming evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings typically located to the eastern edges of the terrace. Few consented but unbuilt platforms within the unit (2). Typical lot sizes: Predominantly 10-20ha. Smaller lots along eastern edge straddling ONL (under 10ha). The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located adjacent SH6, although its elevated terrace setting means that the unit is reasonably discreet from the highway.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings / features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways through the area.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated water supply. Reticulated sewer nearby along SH6. No reticulated stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	Despite its elevation, the area is relatively visually discreet as a consequence of its position tucked into the side of Morven Hill, and the low-lying position of SH6 relative to the terrace. The area is visible from Lake Hayes Estate and in more distant views from Ladies Mile Highway further to the west.
Views	Key 'external' views relate to the distant view from Ladies Mile Highway across to the terrace backdropped by Morven Hill and views from Lake Hayes (including the walkway/cycleway route) to the area. From within the unit, key views relate to the highly attractive northern views towards Lake Hayes and Slope Hill and the quite different outlook westwards to Lake Hayes Estate urban area.
Enclosure/openness	The unit has a reasonably high degree of openness as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. That said, the Morven Hill landform and Remarkables Range to the east and south respectively, provide a strong sense of containment.
Complexity	Generally, the unit displays a low level of complexity as a consequence of landform and vegetative patterns.

Landscape Character Unit	14: Lake Hayes Terrace
Coherence	Similarly, the absence of distinctive and coordinated landform, vegetation or building patterning confers a relatively low level of landscape coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a relatively low sense of naturalness as a consequence of the close proximity and exposure of the area to the lower lying Lake Hayes Estate urban area on the west side of Hayes Creek (despite close proximity of ONL/ONF).
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a relatively undeveloped small-scale plateau sandwiched between the urban area of Lake Hayes Estate and the Morven Hill ONL (WB).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Importance of the unit as a buffer between the urban area to the west and the ONL to the east and south.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision. Easy topography. 'Developed' context to the west. Proximity of urban infrastructure.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Impression of the area as a relatively visually discreet buffer between the urban area of Lake Hayes Estate and the undeveloped Morven Hill ONL to the east. Integration of buildings with plantings. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from Alec Robins Road to the surrounding mountain context.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-High

15: Hogans Gully

Landscape Character Unit	15: Hogans Gully
Landform patterns	Gully framed by moraine-type landform, with the latter characterised by hummocky hills interspersed with plateaus.
Vegetation patterns	Isolated stands of bush, and patches of scrub in gullies and throughout some steeper areas. Exotic amenity plantings around buildings.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams and overland flow paths draining eastwards across the unit to the Arrow River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, open longer-range views to surrounding ONL context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Ridgeline crest, SHA, golf course. East: toe of hummocky landform, Arrow River, cadastral boundary. South: Stream and Bendemeer Special Zone (LCU 16). West: Bendemeer Special Zone (LCU 16).
Land use	Mix of rural residential and rural. Relatively unkempt character of some of the larger rural lots suggests marginally productive.
Settlement patterns	Sparse scattering of dwellings, generally set back from the road and/or well contained by landform / vegetative patterns. No consented but unbuilt platforms evident. Typical lot sizes: predominantly larger lots >20ha. Some smaller lots (<4ha and 4-10ha) at north western end of unit.
Proximity to key route	McDonnell Road passes through the eastern end of the unit which is a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No Council walkways/cycleways within the unit.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water on north side of Hogans Gully Road.
Visibility/prominence	Visibility of the unit from Hogans Gully Road is limited to the plateaus and slopes immediately adjacent. The elevated hummocky nature of the balance of the unit means that visibility is limited to the higher ground to the north (The Hills LCU 22), the elevated land to the west (Bendemeer LCU 16), the Crown Terrace (LCU 20) and ONL(WB) mountain range to the east. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	15: Hogans Gully
Views	Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Morven Hill. The outlook from Hogans Gully Road comprises a relatively attractive, 'low key' rural view in which buildings are subservient. From within the unit, key views relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.
Enclosure/openness	The gully itself displays a relatively open character; however, throughout the elevated areas on either side, the hummocky landform pattern serves to create a sense of enclosure.
Complexity	Generally, there is a variable degree of complexity that derives from the gully and moraine landform pattern.
Coherence	Vegetation patterns reinforce landform patterns in places, conferring a limited sense of coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate to high perception of naturalness as a consequence of the limited visibility and sparse arrangement of buildings and the relatively 'unkempt' character of the area.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural residential area that is somewhat tucked away and forgotten. As a consequence, the unit functions as 'breathing space' between the more intensive rural residential 'nodes' at the north end of Lake Hayes (to the west) and the Arrow River crossing (to the east).
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Potential visibility from nearby rural residential development on elevated land (Bendemeer), ONLs (including tracks) and zig zag lookout. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern. Potential visibility of development along ridgeline edges and from Hogans Gully Road. Lack of defensible edges in places. Potential for development to read as sprawl between the Lake Hayes Rural Residential and Arrow Junction 'nodes'. Also the potential for development here to read as sprawl between Arrow Junction and Arrowtown South.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Integration potential of landform pattern. Riparian restoration potential. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Relatively visually discreet nature of the majority of the unit (due to landform and to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Potential to integrate walkways/cycleways.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Buildings integrated by landform and vegetation. Retention of hummock landform pattern. Reinforcement of landform patterning via gully / stream plantings.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate

17: Morven Ferry

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Landform patterns	Generally flat alluvial terrace landform.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts, scattered shade trees, the odd exotic woodlot planting, exotic amenity plantings around dwellings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	No streams, wetlands or ponds evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins the Arrow River ONF along part of eastern edge and the Morven Hill ONL (WB) along western edge.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundaries. East: McDonnell Road, Arrow Junction rural residential land use edge (cadastral boundaries), Arrow River ONF. South: Toe of moraine landform east of Morven Hill. West: Morven Hill ONL boundary, Bendemeer Special Zone, toe of Hogans Gully hillslopes.
Land use	Predominantly rural residential and hobby farming type uses. Some areas of more open pastoral land particularly adjacent McDonnell Road.
Settlement patterns	Dispersed patterning with some consented but unbuilt platforms (7). Typical lot sizes: large lots on west side of McDonnell Road (>20ha). Elsewhere mix of under 4ha and 4-10ha with the odd lot between 20-50ha in size.
Proximity to key route	SH6 passes through the unit. McDonnell Road also traverses the unit – a popular route between SH6 and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway passes through the unit. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Arrow Bridges Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Very limited water reticulation.
Visibility/prominence	The northern portion of the unit enjoys a reasonably high public profile as a consequence of its location adjacent SH6 and McDonnell Road in conjunction with the relatively open nature of this part of the unit. In contrast, the southern portion of the unit is considerably more visually discreet as a result of its quiet rural road context and vegetation patterns. The popular walkway/cycleway route that passes through this area increases its 'profile'. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Views	Key views relate to the memorable vista from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south, and the highly attractive open views across the area from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway to Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the north. With respect to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout, the unit reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, flat rural/rural residential land flanking Morven Hill.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a variable sense of openness and enclosure largely as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	Similarly, the unit exhibits a variable degree of complexity, largely as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Coherence	The fragmented patterning of vegetation features detracts from the underlying coherence associated with the relatively uniform flat topography. The range of building styles evident does not reinforce the landscape coherence.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate to low level of naturalness as a consequence of the patterning and visibility of rural residential development.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads a mixed rural and rural residential landscape on the edge of the established Arrow Junction rural residential 'node'.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The location of the northern portion of the area adjacent to scenic routes, in combination with its relatively open pastoral character, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Absence of legible edges to the rural residential enclave to the east associated with Arrow Junction makes the unit vulnerable to development creep. Potential for development in northern portion to read as sprawling into Hogans Gully and northwards to Arrowtown. Walkway/cycleway proximity.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Potential for development to form a legible node, as a consequence of 'junction' function, landform pattern (contrasting 'flats') and noting that this patterning is already emerging immediately to the east. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Open views from SH 6 and McDonnell Road to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south. Open views from SH 6 and McDonnell Road to Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the north. Integration of buildings with planting.

Landscape Character Unit	17: Morven Ferry
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate-Low

18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills, swamps and remnant kettle lakes.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic shelterbelts and hedgerows in places. The odd scattered woodlot and patches of scrub in gullies. Pond edge plantings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	Stream, amenity and farm ponds, and wetland features evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins ONL (WB) on west and south sides and Arrow River ONF on eastern side.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Toe of the moraine landform. East: Arrow River ONF. South: ONL(WB)/study area boundary. West: ONL(WB)/study area boundary.
Land use	Predominantly rural lifestyle / hobby farming and more generously proportioned working rural lots with a limited amount of rural residential development evident.
Settlement patterns	Dwellings reasonably evenly dispersed along road or stream edges, and well integrated by plantings. A few consented but unbuilt platforms evident (5). Typical lot sizes: majority of unit > 10ha with approximately half of the unit 50ha or greater.
Proximity to key route	Not located near a key route. Morven Ferry Road is a dead-end road.
Heritage features	Four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway passes through the area (forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Twin Rivers Ride' and 'Arrow River Bridges Ride').
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer, stormwater or water.

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Visibility/prominence	The somewhat sleepy backwater location (on a dead-end road), together with its (relatively) lower-lying topography means that the unit is not particularly prominent in terms of the wider basin landscape. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to the dramatic mountain, Morven Hill and Crown Terrace escarpment views available from the walkway / cycleway network, local roads, and dwellings.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of openness and enclosure as a consequence of the landform patterning (west of Morven Ferry Road) and vegetation patterning (east of Morven Ferry Road).
Complexity	A correspondingly variable degree of complexity as a result of the landform and vegetation patterns.
Coherence	A low level of landscape coherence. Vegetation patterns generally do not reinforce landform features.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate perception of naturalness as a consequence of the limited visibility of buildings, the open hummocky pastoral character (particularly to the western side of Morven Ferry Road), and the close proximity and open views to the mountain setting and Crown Terrace escarpment.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a mixed rural and rural lifestyle / hobby farming area that functions as a transition between the mountain ONL and the lower-lying and more 'developed' river terrace to the north and east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The visibility of the unit from public roads and vantage points and from parts of the Queenstown Trail located on Crown land, very close proximity to ONLs and ONFs, together with the role of the area as a transition between the mountain ONL and the lower-lying and more 'developed' river terrace to the north and east, makes it sensitive to additional development.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Hummocky landform on western side of Morven Ferry Road, and vegetation patterns on eastern side of Morven Ferry Road, provide some potential to absorb additional development. Larger-scaled lots suggest the potential for subdivision. Riparian, pond, and wetland restoration potential. Dead-end road – limited 'profile'.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Landform patterning. Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting.

Landscape Character Unit	18: Morven Eastern 'Foothills'
Capability to absorb additional development	Low

19: Gibbston Highway Flats

Landscape Character Unit	19: Gibbston Highway Flats
Landform patterns	Flat river terrace unit sandwiched between the vegetation-clad steep slopes of the Arrow River and the steep scrub and weed-dominated Crown Terrace escarpment.
Vegetation patterns	Numerous exotic shelterbelts and hedgerows, exotic amenity plantings around buildings. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	A series of streams drain from the Crown Terrace across the flats to the Arrow River. A pond evident.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Adjoins Crown Range ONL (WB) to the east and Arrow River ONF to the west.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundary. East: Toe of Crown Terrace Escarpment (ONL WB)/study area boundary. South: Top of Arrow River streambanks (ONF). West: Top of Arrow River streambanks (ONF).
Land use	Predominantly working rural landscape with some rural residential development, particularly along the Arrow River edge.
Settlement patterns	Reasonably spacious pattern with very few consented but unbuilt platforms (2). Typical lot sizes: majority of unit > 10ha with approximately half falling in the 20-50ha range.
Proximity to key route	Located on key scenic route between Queenstown and Gibbston Valley, Cromwell (SH6).
Heritage features	No heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways in the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Limited reticulated water.
Visibility/prominence	The area is highly visible from SH6.

Landscape Character Unit	19: Gibbston Highway Flats
Views	Key views relate to the highly attractive vistas from SH6 westwards across the flats to the Arrow River margins, backdropped by Morven Hill (ONL WB) and the ONL mountain range to the south (Remarkables), and eastwards to the large-scale and scrub-clad Crown Terrace escarpment.
Enclosure/openness	The unit displays a variable sense of enclosure and openness as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Complexity	Correspondingly variable degree of complexity as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Coherence	Generally a limited landscape coherence as a consequence of the fragmented vegetation patterns and flat topography.
Naturalness	Generally, a moderate perception of naturalness as a consequence of the working rural landscape impression. The very close proximity of the 'wild' scrub-dominated Crown Terrace escarpment serves to counter the diminishing influence of visible dwellings etc. in terms of naturalness values.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as a working rural landscape on the very edge or at the entrance (depending on orientation) of the Wakatipu Basin.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The location of the unit adjacent to a scenic route, in combination with its relatively open pastoral character, makes it sensitive to landscape change. Absence of legible edges to the rural residential enclave to the north associated with Arrow Junction makes the unit vulnerable to development creep. Role of the unit as a 'gateway' to the Wakatipu Basin. Potential for development to read as linear sprawl from the established and legible rural residential 'node' associated with Arrow Junction.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. Riparian restoration potential.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Maintenance of a relatively spacious and, in places, open, working rural landscape character. Open views from SH6 to the Crown Terrace escarpment, the Arrow River margins, Morven Hill and the Remarkables to the south. Impression of the area as a 'green' gateway to the Basin.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very Low.

20: Crown Terrace

Landscape Character Unit	20: Crown Terrace
Landform patterns	Elevated glacial terrace characterised by plateaus interspersed with rolling hummocky hills and includes the lower slopes of the Crown Range.
Vegetation patterns	Scattered exotic shelterbelts/hedgerows, shade trees, pockets of bush and patches of scrub in gullies. Exotic amenity plantings around dwellings in places. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
Hydrology	Complex network of streams draining westwards across the terrace from the Crown Range to the Arrow River.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Surrounded by ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: ONL (WB) toe of mountain range/study area boundary. East: ONL (WB) toe of mountain range/study area boundary. South: ONL (WB) top of escarpment/study area boundary. West: ONL (WB) top of escarpment/study area boundary.
Land use	Predominantly in rural production with loose groupings of rural residential development throughout the unit.
Settlement patterns	Relatively spacious rural residential development loosely grouped throughout the terrace and oriented to take advantage of the panoramic views out over the Wakatipu Basin. Relatively few existing dwellings. Numerous consented but unbuilt platforms evident (33). Rural buildings evident. Typical lots sizes > 20ha.
Proximity to key route	The Crown Range Road passes through the terrace and comprises an important scenic route linking Queenstown to Cardrona and Wanaka. Formalised scenic lookouts at various points.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways in the area.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Limited reticulated water.
Visibility/prominence	The elevated and relatively flat topography of the unit means that only its western edges are visible from the basin. The reasonably open character and flat to gently rolling landform pattern makes much of the unit highly visible from the Crown Range Road.

Landscape Character Unit	20: Crown Terrace
Views	Key views relate to the views across the terrace from the Crown Range Road to the Crown Range and wider Wakatipu Basin landscape, and views from the scenic lookouts out over the Wakatipu Basin.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, the unit exhibits a relatively high degree of openness. The Crown Range provides a strong sense of enclosure to the east. The lower-lying large scale basin landscape to the west amplifies the perception of openness.
Complexity	Localised landform (hummocky hills) and vegetation patterns confer a reasonable degree of complexity in places.
Coherence	The legible and largely uncluttered landform patterning, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence. However, minimal interplay between landform and vegetation patterning.
Naturalness	A reasonably high degree of naturalness as a consequence of its predominantly open and pastoral character combined with its proximity to the vastly scaled and relatively undeveloped Crown Range landscape to the east. In the main, (existing) buildings tend to be well integrated by plantings serving to reduce their prominence.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit displays a working rural landscape character with a reasonably spacious patterning of rural residential development in places. The terrace serves as an important transition between the 'inhabited' Wakatipu Basin landscape and the relatively unmodified 'wilderness' landscape of the Crown Range to the east.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	The relatively open and exposed nature of the unit, in addition to its importance as a scenic route and as a transition between the Wakatipu Basin and the Crown Range, makes it highly sensitive to landscape change.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian restoration potential. Potential integration of walkways/cycleways etc. Larger-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Sense of openness and spaciousness associated with a predominantly pastoral landscape. Dramatic views from the Crown Range Road to the Wakatipu Basin and surrounding mountain setting. Impression of the area as a transition between the inhabited basin landscape and the more 'wild' Crown Range mountain-scape to the east.
Capability to absorb additional development	Very low.

21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Landform patterns	Alluvial river terrace landform flanking the west and east sides of the Arrow River.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic amenity planting around dwellings.
Hydrology	A tributary of the Arrow River passes through the northern portion of the unit on the west side of the river, and a stream drains from the Crown Terrace to a pond in the portion of the unit located on the east side of the river.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	The Arrow River ONF passes through the unit. The eastern portion adjoins the Crown Terrace escarpment ONL (WB).
Character Unit boundaries	North: Cadastral boundary. East: Arrow River and toe of Crown Terrace escarpment. South: landuse / cadastral boundaries. West: cadastral boundaries, SH6, McDonnell Road.
Land use	Rural residential with some rural lifestyle / hobby farming uses evident. Council reserve and DoC land on the eastern side of the river.
Settlement patterns	Generally, a node of relatively intensive rural residential development around the SH6 Arrow River crossing. A limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms on the south west side of the unit (5). Some larger-scaled lots to the north end. Typical lot sizes: predominantly <4ha The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of Residential Activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
Proximity to key route	Located on a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 i.e. McDonnell Road. SH6 passes through the southern portion of the unit.
Heritage features	Three heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	A council walkway/cycleway passes through the unit. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Arrow River Bridges Ride'.
Infrastructure features	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Very limited water reticulation.

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Visibility/prominence	The unit's location on a key vehicular route and a popular pedestrian, and cycle route suggests a prominent location. However, the extensive vegetation throughout much of the area, in combination with its low-lying and flat topography, limits visibility. The area is visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influence of relative elevation, in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Within the unit, roadside views tend to be framed and filtered by vegetation. The walkway / cycleway and SH6 river crossing affords highly attractive views of the Arrow River. Towards the edges of the unit, the open character affords longer range views to the surrounding mountain context. With respect to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout, the unit reads as a distinct 'node' of rural residential development.
Enclosure/openness	Generally, a relatively high degree of enclosure as a consequence of vegetation patterns.
Complexity	A correspondingly high degree of complexity as a consequence of vegetation patterning.
Coherence	Despite the extensive plantings, the varied character of the vegetation in combination with the predominant patterning of smaller lots results in a landscape of limited coherence.
Naturalness	A relatively low degree of naturalness within the unit itself as a consequence of the level of rural residential development. This is partially offset by the very close proximity of the unit to the 'wild' Crown Terrace escarpment and the vegetated margins of the Arrow River.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as an established node of rural residential development focused on the Arrow River crossing.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Absence of legible edges to the unit to the southwest, southeast and north west. Existing platform and lot arrangement throughout the 'node' around the river crossing, together with vegetation patterns, may constrain additional development. Walkway/cycleway proximity. Scenic route proximity.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Riparian, pond edge restoration potential. Some larger lots to the northern end of the unit suggest the potential for subdivision. Integration of defensible edges with additional subdivision. The relatively visually discreet nature of the area, together with its established rural residential node character, suggest the potential to integrate additional development with minimal impact on the wider basin landscape. Vegetation provides containment in places. Proximity to good roading infrastructure.

Landscape Character Unit	21: Arrow Junction Rural Residential
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Maintaining a sense of openness in views from SH6 and McDonnell Road to the Crown Terrace escarpment and ONL ranges to the south; and Morven Hill and the flanking moraine 'foothill' landscape to the west and south. Maintaining a sense of openness where there are existing views from SH6 and the walkway/cycleway route to the Arrow River. Integration of buildings via planting. Retention of existing vegetation patterns.
Capability to absorb additional development	High

22: The Hills

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Landform patterns	Elevated moraine landform with hummocky hills, plateaus, and remnant kettle lakes, with the latter converted to amenity ponds.
Vegetation patterns	Exotic amenity plantings throughout the golf course and around rural residential dwellings. Native plantings around pond, stream, and wetland features. Isolated pockets of bush and woodlot plantings. Extensive roadside plantings to Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Hydrology	Several streams, ponds, and wetland areas.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: cadastral boundary. East: McDonnell Road, toe of hummocky hill landform pattern. South: toe of hummocky hill landform pattern, stream pattern. West: Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
Land use	Golf course and rural residential.
Settlement patterns	Scattered dwellings throughout, primarily located around water features. Gated entrances requiring security codes. Typical lot sizes: one large lot of approximately 100ha, several smaller lots.

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Proximity to key route	Located on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road which is a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Also located on McDonnell Road which is a popular route between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No walkways/cycleways through the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer. No reticulated water or stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	<p>The area is visible from the elevated streets along the western edge of Arrowtown. The relatively close proximity and (reasonably) similar elevation means that part of the unit is prominent in the outlook while the hummocky terrain limits visibility to other parts.</p> <p>Roadside plantings limit views from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.</p> <p>Eastern edges of the unit are visible from McDonnell Road.</p> <p>The unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.</p>
Views	<p>Key views relate to the view out over the unit from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the unit reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown.</p> <p>The outlook from McDonnell Road and the western margins of Arrowtown comprises a relatively attractive, golf course / parkland landscape on the edge of Arrowtown. The recently approved Arrowtown South SHA comprising a distinctly urban three storey high density retirement village development will also be visible in each of these outlooks (albeit to a varying degree depending on location). The Arrowtown South Special Zone appears in the foreground of views west from the southern end of Cotter Avenue.</p> <p>From within the unit, key views are expected to relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.</p>
Enclosure/openness	Landform and vegetation create a variable sense of openness and enclosure.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex landscape as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns.
Coherence	The underlying golf course landscape lends a coherence to the unit.
Naturalness	Generally, a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the distinctly modified character of the golf course setting.
Sense of Place	Generally, the area reads as a distinctly private, highly modified golf course parkland landscape in which rural residential development is an established component. The unit forms part of the swathe of golf courses that 'contain' the western and southern edges of Arrowtown, effectively functioning as a green belt to the village.

Landscape Character Unit	22: The Hills
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Private golf course and previous resource consent processes suggest limited scope for residential development. Accessways and large-scale buildings have the potential to compromise the distinctive hummocky landform pattern.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (due to landform and, to a lesser degree, vegetation patterns). Golf course landscape potentially suited to resort development. Landform pattern creates potential to integrate well sited buildings into the landscape. Riparian restoration potential. Integration of walkways / cycleways. Close proximity to Arrowtown. Large-scaled lots suggest some potential for subdivision.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Locating buildings so that they are visually discreet. Integration of buildings with landform and planting. Set back of buildings from the ridgeline crests to the eastern edges of the unit.
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate

23: Millbrook

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Landform patterns	The unit predominantly comprises an elevated moraine landform with plateaus, hummocky hills and remnant kettle lakes. The exceptions to this are a band of flat land (effectively part of Malaghans Valley) running along the northern margins., a roche moutonnée (ONF) in the north-eastern quadrant adjacent Malaghans Road and a small flat triangular parcel at the eastern end of the unit.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity planting around buildings and throughout golf course, native riparian and pond edge plantings. Dense evergreen shelterbelt plantings along much of the Malaghans Road frontage. Appreciable stand of native bush in steep-sided gully around Waterfall Park. Generally, manicured lawn and parkland plantings dominate.
Hydrology	Numerous watercourses and amenity ponds.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit includes an ONF (roche moutonnée). Mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Character Unit boundaries	North: Malaghans Road. East: McDonnell Road, cadastral boundary, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. South: Millbrook Special zone boundary. West: Millbrook Special zone boundary.
Land use	Golf course, commercial and rural residential uses dominate. A small area of grazing land around the roche moutonnée.
Settlement patterns	Generally, the area is relatively intensively developed with substantial clusters of two-storey semi-detached and terraced housing units throughout the golf course area, accessed via a complex patterning of semi-rural lanes. Generally, development is set into either a comprehensive parkland setting (Millbrook) or a comprehensive bush setting (Waterfall Park Special Zone – undeveloped). Pockets of more spacious rural residential development in places along Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. Additional and similarly-scaled development is anticipated throughout the western portion of the Millbrook Special Zone. This area will be flanked by a golf course and landscape protection areas on its ‘exposed’ western margins. Large lot single ownership.
Proximity to key route	Located on Malaghans Road which comprises an important scenic route between Queenstown and Arrowtown. Also located on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road – a popular route between Queenstown and Arrowtown.
Heritage features	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	Council walkway/cycleway through Millbrook (forms part of the Queenstown Trail ‘Countryside Ride’). Golf course, restaurant, etc.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer, water and stormwater.
Visibility/prominence	The dense evergreen shelterbelt plantings along Malaghans Road mean that the majority of development within Millbrook is screened from the much of Malaghans Road. The more open character at the eastern end of the unit is such that the eastern portion of Millbrook is visible from the eastern end of Malaghans Road, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the elevated north western margins of Arrowtown. Buildings are however relatively unobtrusive in these views as a consequence of the well-established parkland plantings. The far eastern triangular area is visually connected to Arrowtown. Waterfall Park (unbuilt) obscured from view by landform and vegetation patterns. The unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit’s prominence.

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Views	<p>Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown.</p> <p>The outlooks from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the north-western margins of Arrowtown which comprise a relatively attractive, golf course / parkland landscape on the edge of Arrowtown.</p> <p>The unit affords attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.</p> <p>The containment of vegetation and localised hummocks means that a relatively limited number of dwellings are visible from the surrounding area (excepting areas at high elevation).</p>
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of enclosure and openness deriving primarily from vegetation patterns.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns, together with the dense arrangement of buildings.
Coherence	The relatively consistent planting treatment and architectural forms lend a reasonably strong degree of coherence to the Millbrook development. The varying planting and architectural styles associated with the handful of rural residential lots on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road means that these parts of the unit display a reduced perception of coherence.
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the level of existing and anticipated development.
Sense of Place	<p>Generally, the unit reads as an intensively-developed attractive urban settlement set within a parkland landscape.</p> <p>The area also forms part of the swathe of golf courses that frame the western and southern edges of Arrowtown and effectively function as a greenbelt to the village.</p> <p>The far eastern triangle comprises a discrete flat area that contrasts with the more rolling golf course/parkland landscape to the west and south (LCU 22) and associates more closely with the adjacent urban area of Arrowtown.</p>
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	<p>Existing density of development and the issue of absorbing additional development without compromising existing (urban) parkland feel.</p> <p>Ensuring existing development character does not sprawl westwards and southwards into the existing, 'more rural' areas.</p> <p>Private golf course and previous (recent) resource consent processes suggests limited further capability for development.</p>
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	<p>Relatively visually discreet nature of the location (due to landform and vegetation patterns).</p> <p>Close proximity to Arrowtown.</p> <p>Urban infrastructure.</p> <p>Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision.</p>
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	<p>Attractive urban parkland character.</p> <p>Landscape coherence.</p>

Landscape Character Unit	23: Millbrook
Capability to absorb additional development	Moderate: majority of unit High: triangular area at far eastern end of the unit

24: Arrowtown South

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Landform patterns	The unit encompasses the flat to gently rolling land on the south side of Arrowtown and includes the steep escarpment that currently defines the south western edge of the village.
Vegetation patterns	Extensive exotic amenity planting around buildings and throughout the public golf course. A mix of native and weeds species along watercourses. Native and amenity pond edge plantings (in golf course) Scrub and weeds throughout escarpment. Extensive amenity plantings anticipated throughout the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA (unbuilt).
Hydrology	A watercourse (running roughly parallel with McDonnell Road) and amenity ponds.
Proximity to ONL/ONF	Unit adjoins ONL (WB) along east boundary. Mid to long-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
Character Unit boundaries	North: Arrowtown Urban Growth Limit. East: ONL/study area boundary. South: cadastral boundaries. West: McDonnell Road, toe of hummocky hill landform pattern.
Land use	Golf course, rural residential (Arrowtown South Structure Plan) and retirement village (Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA) uses dominate. Open grazing land is required along the McDonnell Road frontage of the Arrowtown South Structure Plan area.
Settlement patterns	The Arrowtown South Special Zone anticipates a reasonably spacious patterning of rural residential development together with extensive riparian and escarpment restoration, pastoral areas and a landscape framework throughout the south western edges of Arrowtown to create an attractive edge to the settlement in conjunction with the adjacent golf courses and roads. The Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA anticipates an urban patterning of buildings ranging from one storey units along the McDonnell Road edge to three storey buildings in the central western margins of the area. Typical lot sizes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly 4-10ha. • Some larger lots 10-20ha. The Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village will have implications for future settlement patterns for the land around it south and west of McDonnell Road.

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Proximity to key route	Located on Centennial Avenue and Mc Donnell Road, both of which comprise a popular routes between Arrowtown and SH6 / Arrow Junction.
Heritage features	Four heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
Recreation features	No Council walkways/cycleways through the unit.
Infrastructure features	Reticulated sewer in part. No reticulated water and stormwater although it is expected that the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA will be fully serviced.
Visibility/prominence	The area is visible from the elevated streets along the western edge of Arrowtown. The relatively close proximity means that the unit is prominent in the outlook. The unit is also visible from McDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue. Like The Hills, the unit is also visible from the western edges of the Crown Terrace, the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zigzag lookout. The diminishing influences of distance and relative elevation in conjunction with the relative unimportance (visually) of the unit within the wider panorama reduces the unit's prominence.
Views	Key views relate to the view out over the area from the tracks throughout the ONL to the east (Mt Beetham environs) and the zig zag lookout. In these views the area reads as a part of the swathe of relatively low lying, undulating rural/rural residential land flanking Arrowtown. The outlooks from McDonnell Road, Centennial Avenue and the western margins of Arrowtown comprise a golf course and rural residential landscape on the edge of Arrowtown. The relatively wild and unkempt escarpment forms a prominent element in views from McDonnell Road. The recently approved Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA comprising a distinctly urban one - three storey high density retirement village development will also be visible in each of these outlooks (albeit to a varying degree depending on location). From within the unit, key views are expected to relate to the attractive long-range views to the surrounding ONL mountain setting.
Enclosure/openness	A variable sense of enclosure and openness deriving primarily from localised landform and vegetation patterns. The escarpment to the north east of the unit and the hummocky landform of The Hills to the south west provide containment to the McDonnell Road portion of the unit.
Complexity	Generally, a relatively complex unit as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns (golf course area), together with the dense arrangement of buildings (SHA area).
Coherence	A limited perception of coherence as a consequence of the varying landform and vegetation patterns and the somewhat anomalous urban character of development associated with the approved SHA located at some distance from the legible village edge (i.e. the escarpment).

Landscape Character Unit	24: Arrowtown South
Naturalness	The unit displays a low level of naturalness as a consequence of the level of existing and anticipated built development together with the golf course patterning. The relatively wild and unkempt character of the escarpment counters this to a limited degree.
Sense of Place	Generally, the unit reads as part of the swathe of golf courses and rural residential development that frame the western and southern edges of Arrowtown and effectively function as a 'greenbelt' to the village. However, this 'greenbelt' effect, together with the legibility of the escarpment as a robust defensible edge to Arrowtown has been significantly compromised by the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent and sizeable part of the unit.
Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development	Extent to which the unit can continue to operate as a 'greenbelt' to Arrowtown. Role of the escarpment as an edge to the village. Ensuring urban residential development is constrained within defensible boundaries and does not sprawl westwards and southwards in an uncontrolled manner into the existing, 'more rural' areas. Public golf course facility.
Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development	Golf course landscape potentially suited to accommodating a reasonably high level of development (e.g. Millbrook). Close proximity to Arrowtown. Close proximity to urban infrastructure. Large-scaled lots suggest potential for subdivision. Urbanising effects of the approved Queenstown Country Club SHA suggest a tolerance for (sensitive) urban development. Potential for integration of walkways/cycleways. Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography.
Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained and enhanced	Views from McDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue to the surrounding mountain/river context. Reinforcing/ re-establishing a robust and defensible edge to Arrowtown.
Capability to absorb additional development	High

Variation to Stage 1 Definition of Site Chapter 2:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

Site	<p><u>Means:</u></p> <p><u>Any area of land which meets one of the descriptions set out below:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>An area of land which is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <u>Comprised of one allotment in one certificate of title, or two or more contiguous allotments held together in one certificate of title, in such a way that the allotments cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the council; or</u> (ii) <u>Contained in a single lot on an approved survey plan of subdivision for which a separate certificate of title could be issued without any further consent of the council;</u> <p><u>Being in any case the smaller area of clauses (i) or (ii) above; or</u></p> <p>(b) <u>An area of land which is composed of two or more contiguous lots held in two or more certificates of title where such titles are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <u>Subject to a condition imposed under section 75 of the Building Act 2004; or</u> (ii) <u>Held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the council; or</u> <p>(c) <u>An area of land which is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <u>Partly made up of land which complies with clauses (a) or (b) above; and</u> (ii) <u>Partly made up of an interest in any airspace above or subsoil below a road where (a) and (b) are adjoining and are held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior approval of the council;</u> <p><u>Except in relation to each description that in the case of land subdivided under the Unit Titles Act 1972 and 2010, the cross lease system or stratum subdivision, 'site' must be deemed to be the whole of the land subject to the unit development, cross lease or stratum subdivision.</u></p>
-------------	---

1. An area of land which is:

- (i) — comprised in a single lot or other legally defined parcel of land and held in a single Certificate of Title; or
- (ii) — comprised in a single lot or legally defined parcel of land for which a separate certificate of title could be issued without further consent of the Council.

Being in any case the smaller land area of i or ii, or

2. an area of land which is comprised in two or more adjoining lots or other legally defined parcels of land, held together in one certificate of title in such a way that the lots/parcels cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the Council; or

3. an area of land which is comprised in two or more adjoining certificates of title where such titles are:

- (i) — subject to a condition imposed under section 37 of the Building Act 2004 or section 643 of the Local Government Act 1974; or
- (ii) — held together in such a way that they cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the Council; or

4. In the case of land not subject to the Land Transfer Act 1952, the whole parcel of land last acquired under one instrument of conveyance;

Except:

- (i) — in the case of land subdivided under the cross lease of company lease systems, other than strata titles, site shall mean an area of land containing: —

- a) — a building or buildings for residential or business — purposes with any accessory buildings(s), plus any — land exclusively restricted to the users of that/those — building(s), plus an equal share of common property; or

- b) — a remaining share or shares in the fee simple creating a vacant part(s) of the whole for future cross lease or company lease purposes; and

- ii — in the case of land subdivided under Unit Titles Act 1972 and 2010 (other than strata titles), site shall mean an area of land containing a principal unit or proposed unit on a unit plan together with its accessory units and an equal share of common property; and

~~iii — in the case of strata titles, site shall mean the underlying certificate of title of the entire land containing the strata titles, immediately prior to subdivision.~~

~~In addition to the above.~~

~~a) — A site includes the airspace above the land.~~

~~b) — If any site is crossed by a zone boundary under this Plan, the site is deemed to be divided into two or more sites by that zone boundary.~~

~~c) — Where a site is situated partly within the District and partly in an adjoining District, then the part situated in the District shall be deemed to be one site.~~

Amendments to Chapter 6 Landscapes and Rural Character

Add new Policy 6.3.3A after Policy 6.3.3

6.3.3A Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this chapter related to those categories do not apply. (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.1.8, 3.2.5.2, 3.3.20-24, 3.3.32).

Variation to Stage 1 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Chapter 22:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.

Part 22.1 Zone Purpose.

Paragraphs 5 and 6:

~~The Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone east of Dalefield Road places limits on the expansion of rural lifestyle development at that location.~~

~~The ‘Hawthorn Triangle’ Rural Lifestyle Zone bordered by Speargrass Flat, Lower Shotover and Domain Roads defines an existing settlement of properties. The adjoining Rural Lifestyle zoned areas within the Wakatipu Basin identify the potential for further limited residential development, within the density limits set out in the provisions.~~

Provision 22.3.2.9

In addition to Tables 1 and 2, the following standards apply to the areas specified:

~~Table 3: Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer Zones~~

~~Table 43: Rural Residential Zone at Forest Hill.~~

~~Table 54: Rural Residential Bob’s Cove and Sub Zone.~~

~~Table 6: Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone.~~

~~Table 5: Rural Residential Zone at Camp Hill.~~

~~Table 76: Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.~~

Rule 22.5.4.3.

~~22.5.4.3 — Rural Residential zone at the north of Lake Hayes — 15m~~

Table 3: Rules 22.5.14 to 22.5.18


	Table 3: Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer zones	Non-compliance:
22.5.14	The erection of more than one non-residential building.	NC
22.5.15	In each area of the Deferred Rural Lifestyle zones east of Dalefield Road up to two residential allotments may be created with a single residential building platform on each allotment.	D
22.5.16	The land in the Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone shall be held in a single allotment containing no more than one residential building platform.	D
22.5.17	In the Deferred Rural Lifestyle (Buffer) zone, apart from the curtilage area, the land shall be maintained substantially in pasture. Tree planting and natural revegetation shall be confined to gullies and watercourses, as specified in covenants and on landscape plans.	D
22.5.18	In the Buffer zone, the maximum building height in the building platform shall be 6.5m.	NC

Table 6. Rules 22.5.33 to 22.5.37

	Table 6: Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone Refer to Part 22.7.2 for the concept development plan	Non-compliance:
22.5.33	Density There shall be no more than one residential unit per lot.	NC
22.5.34	Building Height The maximum building height shall be 6.5m for lots 9-15 on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone. Chimney and ventilation structures may be 7.2m high in this sub-zone.	D
22.5.35	Building Location The location of buildings shall be in accordance with the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone, in rule 22.7.2.	D
22.5.36	Design Standards Within Lots 9-15 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone: 22.5.36.1 The roof pitch shall be between 20° and 30° and roof dormers and roof lights are to be incorporated in the roof pitch; 22.5.36.2 Roof finishes of buildings shall be within the following range: Slate shingle, cedar shingle, steel roofing (long run corrugated or tray) in the following colours, or similar, only: Coloursteel colours New Denim Blue, Grey Friars, Ironsand or Lignite; 22.5.36.3 Wall claddings of buildings shall be within the following range: cedar shingles, natural timber (clear stain), painted plaster in the following colours or equivalent: Resene 5YO18, 5B025, 5B030, 4GR18, 1B55, 5G013, 3YO65, 3YO20; stone cladding provided the stone shall be limited to Otago schist only and all pointing/mortar shall be recessed.	D
22.5.37	Landscaping 22.5.37.1 Any application for building consent shall be accompanied by a landscape plan that shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme. 22.5.37.2 The landscape plan shall ensure: a. That the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone is planted with a predominance of indigenous species in a manner which enhances naturalness; and	D

	<p>b. That residential development on sites adjoining Tucker Beach Road is subject to screening.</p> <p>22.5.37.3 Plantings at the foot of, on, and above the escarpment within lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall include indigenous trees, shrubs, and tussock grasses.</p> <p>22.5.37.4 Plantings on Lots 1 – 17 may include, willow (except Crack Willow), larch, maple as well as indigenous species.</p> <p>22.5.37.5 The erection of solid or paling fences is not permitted.</p>	
--	---	--

22.7.2 Rural Residential Ferry Hill Sub-Zone Concept Development Plan



Variation to Stage 1 Subdivision and Development Chapter 27:

Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through text~~ for deletions.

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following restricted discretionary activity rule into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.9 All subdivision activities, unless otherwise provided for, in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.

Discretion is restricted to:

- a. Location of building platforms and accessways
- b. Subdivision design and lot layout including the location of boundaries, lot sizes and dimensions;
- c. Location, scale and extent of landform modification, and retaining structures;
- d. Property access and roading;
- e. Esplanade provision;
- f. Natural and other hazards;
- g. Firefighting water supply and access;
- h. Water supply;
- i. Network utility services, energy supply and telecommunications;
- j. Open space and recreation provision;
- k. Ecological and natural landscape features;
- l. Historic Heritage features;
- m. Easements;
- n. Vegetation removal, and proposed planting;
- o. Fencing and gates;
- p. Wastewater and stormwater management;
- q. Connectivity of existing and proposed pedestrian networks, bridle paths, cycle networks;
- r. Adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following discretionary activity rule into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.18A Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision which does not comply with the minimum net site area specified in Part 27.6 provided that the minimum net site area is not less than 4,000m² and the average area of all lots in the subdivision is not less than 1.0ha per lot..

Amend Chapter 27 by inserting the following non-complying activity rules into the table of Subdivision Activities – District Wide rules following Rule 27.5.1:

27.5.18B Within the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, subdivision with a minimum net site area less than 4,000m² or where the average area of lots in the subdivision is less than 1.0ha per lot.

27.5.26 The further subdivision of an allotment that has previously been used to calculate the average lot size net site area for subdivision in the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct,

except where the further subdivision and any prior subdivision together complies with Rule 27.6.1.

Amend Chapter 27 by amending the table under Rule 27.6.1 as follows:

Zone		Minimum Lot Area
Rural	Rural	No minimum
	Gibbston Character	
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u>	<u>80ha</u>
	<u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	<u>6000m²</u> <u>1.0ha minimum average</u>
Rural Lifestyle	Rural Lifestyle	One hectare providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares. For the purposes of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.
	Rural Lifestyle Deferred A and B.	No minimum, but each of the two parts of the zone identified on the planning map shall contain no more than two allotments.
	Rural Lifestyle Buffer.	The land in this zone shall be held in a single allotment
Rural Residential	Rural Residential	4000m ²
	Rural Residential Bob's Cove sub-zone	No minimum, providing the total lots to be created, inclusive of the entire area within the zone shall have an average of 4000m ² .
	Rural Residential Ferry Hill Subzone	4000m² with no more than 17 lots created for residential activity

Amend Objective 27.7.6 and Policy 27.7.6.1- Location Specific objectives, policies and provisions

~~**27.7.6 Objective – Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone – Maintain and enhance visual amenity values and landscape character within and around the Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone.**~~

Policies

~~27.7.6.1 At the time of considering a subdivision application, the following matters shall be had particular regard to:~~

- ~~• The subdivision design has had regard to minimising the number of accesses to roads;~~

- ~~the location and design of on-site vehicular access avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the landscape and visual amenity values by following the natural form of the land to minimise earthworks, providing common driveways and by ensuring that appropriate landscape treatment is an integral component when constructing such access;~~
- ~~The extent to which plantings with a predominance of indigenous species enhances the naturalness of the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone;~~
- ~~The extent to which the species, location, density, and maturity of the planting is such that residential development in the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone will be successfully screened from views obtained when travelling along Tucker Beach Road.~~

Insert the following after clause 27.9.3.2:

<p><u>27.9.3.3</u></p>	<p><u>Assessment Matters in relation to Rule 27.5.9 (Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity zone and Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct Subdivision Activities)</u></p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which the proposal is consistent with objectives and policies relevant to the matters of discretion.</u></p> <p>b. <u>The extent to which the subdivision provides for low impact design that avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the environment.</u></p> <p><u>Subdivision Design</u></p> <p>c. <u>The extent to which the location of future buildings, ancillary elements and the landscape treatment complements the existing landscape character, visual amenity values and wider amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone or Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, including consideration of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>i. the retention of existing vegetation and landform patterns;</u><u>ii. the alignment of lot boundaries in relation to landform and vegetation features and neighbouring development;</u><u>iii. earth mounding, and framework planting to integrate buildings and accessways;</u><u>iv. planting of appropriate species that are suited to the general area having regard to the matters set out in Schedule 24.8 – Landscape Character Units;</u><u>v. riparian restoration planting;</u><u>vi. the retirement and restoration planting of steep slopes over 15° to promote slope stabilisation and indigenous vegetation enhancement;</u><u>vii. how controls addressing such matters as building height, building colours and materials, building coverage, earthworks, retaining, fencing, gates, accessways (including paving materials), external lighting, domestic infrastructure (including water tanks), vegetation removal, and proposed plantings might be incorporated in the development in a manner ensuring ongoing compliance;</u><u>viii. the integration of existing and provision for new public walkways and cycleways/bridlepaths.</u> <p>d. <u>The extent to which existing covenants or consent notice conditions need to be retained or are otherwise integrated into the conditions governing the proposed development so as to ensure that landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.</u></p> <p>e. <u>The extent to which the development maintains visual amenity from public places and neighbouring properties.</u></p> <p>f. <u>Whether clustering of future buildings or varied allotment sizes as part of subdivision design would offer a better solution for maintaining a sense of openness and spaciousness, or the integration of development with existing landform, vegetation or settlement patterns.</u></p> <p>g. <u>The extent to which the development avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the features, elements and patterns that contribute to the value of adjacent or nearby ONLs and ONFs. This includes consideration of an appropriate setback from</u></p>
-------------------------------	---

such features as well as the maintenance of views from public roads and other public places to the surrounding ONL and ONF context.

- h. The extent to which development adversely affects Escarpment, Ridgeline and River Cliff Features shown on the planning maps, and in particular the visual amenity values of those features in views from public places outside of the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct.
- i. Whether mitigation elements such as a landscape management plan or proposed plantings should be subject to bonds and consent notices.
- j. Whether the layout of reserves and accessways provides for adequate public access and use.
- k. Whether the proposed subdivision provides an opportunity to maintain landscape character and visual amenity through the registration of covenants or consent notices requiring open space to be maintained in perpetuity.

Access and Connectivity

- l. Whether proposed sites are located and designed so that each site has a minimum frontage that provides for practical, legal and safe access from a formed public road that is suitable for both normal road going vehicles and construction traffic.
- m. Whether the location and design of any proposed pedestrian, cycle, bridlepaths and vehicle accessways on the proposed site(s) avoid or minimise any adverse effects on soil stability, landform patterns and features, and vegetation.
- n. Whether subdivision provides for safe and practical pedestrian paths and cycle ways (whether sealed or unsealed) and bridle paths that are located in a manner which connect, or have the potential to connect, to reserves (existing or proposed), roads and existing rural walkways.
- o. Whether site design recognises any impact of roading and access on waterbodies, ecosystems, drainage patterns and ecological values.
- p. Whether any subdivision provides for future roads to serve surrounding land or for road links that need to pass through the subdivision.

Infrastructure and Services

- q. Ensuring there is sufficient capacity and treatment to provide for the safe and efficient disposal of stormwater and wastewater from possible future development without adversely affecting natural water systems and ecological values.
- r. Ensuring the design of stormwater and wastewater disposal systems incorporate measures to reduce runoff rates where there may be damage caused to natural waterway systems.
- s. Whether any subdivision proposal demonstrates how any natural water system on the site will be managed, protected or enhanced.
- t. Whether subdivision provides for an adequate and reliable supply of potable water to each proposed site.
- u. Whether subdivision provides for an adequate and reliable supply of emergency water supply to each site in the event of fire.

- v. Whether subdivision has sufficient capacity for the disposal of any effluent or other wastewater flow within the boundaries of each proposed site regardless of seasonal variations and loading.
- w. Assessing where more than one site will be created, whether a shared or individual wastewater treatment and disposal system is the most appropriate, having regard to any known physical constraints.
- x. Considering the extent to which easements and consent notices should be applied to protect the integrity of stormwater and/or wastewater treatment and disposal systems.
- y. Assessing the extent to which access easements should provide for lines, including electric lines, telecommunication lines and other lines, where such lines or cables are or may be located within any private property and serve other properties or sites.
- z. Whether sites can be connected to services such as telecommunications and electricity using low impact design methods including undergrounding of services.

Natural Environment and Cultural values

- aa. Considering the extent to which the subdivision provides for ecological restoration and enhancement. Ecological enhancement may include enhancement of existing vegetation, replanting and weed and pest control.
- bb. Assessing the extent to which the subdivision and subsequent land use on the proposed site(s) adversely affects the historical, cultural or spiritual significance of any site or waahi tapu of significance to iwi.
- cc. Assessing the extent to which the subdivision design and layout preserves and enhances areas of archaeological, cultural or spiritual significance.
- dd. Assessing the extent to which the integrity of any identified heritage feature(s) is maintained and enhanced.
- ee. Considering the benefits of the removal of identified wilding exotic trees.

Earthworks and Hazards

- ff. Considering how earthworks can be undertaken in a manner which mitigates and remedies adverse effects from soil erosion and the generation of sediments into receiving environments.
- gg. Considering whether earthworks are likely to have adverse effects on landscape character or visual amenity values which cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- hh. Considering the extent to which subdivision will increase the risks associated with any natural hazard and/or how the subdivision avoids, remedies or mitigates any hazard prone area.
- ii. Considering the extent to which contaminated or potentially contaminated soil is able to be treated or disposed of.
- jj. Where the subdivision land includes waterbodies, considering the extent to which remediation measures and methodologies can be employed to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on human health, water quality, and to the downstream receiving environment.

	<p>kk. <u>Considering whether consent notices or other protective instruments are needed to ensure that any hazard or contamination remediation measures and methodologies are implemented at the time of development.</u></p>
--	--

27.8 Rules - Location Specific Standards

Delete.

~~27.8.6 Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone~~

~~27.8.6.1 Notwithstanding any other rules, any subdivision of the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall be in accordance with the subdivision design as identified in the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone.~~

~~27.8.6.2 Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall be retained for Landscape Amenity Purposes and shall be held in undivided shares by the owners of Lots 1-8 and Lots 11-15 as shown on the Concept Development Plan.~~

~~27.8.6.3 Any application for subdivision consent shall:~~

~~a Provide for the creation of the landscape allotments(s) referred to in rule 27.8.6.2 above;~~

~~b Be accompanied by details of the legal entity responsible for the future maintenance and administration of the allotments referred to in rule 27.8.6.2 above;~~

~~c Be accompanied by a Landscape Plan that shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme. The landscape Plan shall ensure:~~

~~• That the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone is planted with a predominance of indigenous species in a manner that enhances naturalness; and~~

~~• That residential development is subject to screening along Tucker Beach Road,~~

~~27.8.6.4 Plantings at the foot of, on, and above the escarpment within Lots 18 and 19 as shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone shall include indigenous trees, shrubs, and tussock grasses.~~

~~27.8.6.5 Plantings elsewhere may include maple as well as indigenous species.~~

~~27.8.6.6 The on-going maintenance of plantings established in terms of rule 27.8.6.3 above shall be subject to a condition of resource consent, and given effect to by way of consent notice that is to be registered on the title and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~

~~27.8.6.7 Any subdivision shall be subject to a condition of resource consent that no buildings shall be located outside the building platforms shown on the Concept Development Plan for the Ferry Hill Rural Residential sub-zone. The condition shall be subject to a consent notice~~

~~that is registered on the title and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~

~~27.8.6.8 — Any subdivision of Lots 1 and 2 DP 26910 shall be subject to a condition of resource consent that no residential units shall be located and no subdivision shall occur on those parts of Lots 1 and 2 DP 26910 zoned Rural General and identified on the planning maps as a building restriction area. The condition shall be subject to a consent notice that is to be registered and deemed to be a covenant pursuant to section 221(4) of the Act.~~

27.13 Structure Plans and Spatial Layout Plans

Amend 27.13.3 Waterfall Park Structure Plan




Amend 27.13.4 Millbrook Structure Plan



Structure Plan Legend


- R : Residential
- V : Village
- F : Recreational Facilities
- S : Resort Services
- G : Golf Course and Open Space
- H : Helipad
- LP : Landscape Protection
- LPM : Landscape Protection (Malaghans)
- Activity Area Boundary

Zone Boundary



MILLBROOK RESORT ZONE - STRUCTURE PLAN
 REFERENCE 2423-3K40 - SCALE = 1:5000 AT A1 - 1:10000 AT A3 - December 2018

27.13.1 Ferry Hill Rural Residential Subzone




Variation to Stage 1 Chapter 36 Noise:


Underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions.


36.5 Rules – Standards Table 2: General Standards

	Standard				Non-Compliance Status
	Activity or sound source	Assessment location	Time	Noise limits	
36.5.1	<u>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</u>	Any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit.	0800h to 2000h	50 dB LAeq(15 min)	NC
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB LAeq(15 min) 75 dB LAFmax	NC
36.5.2	<u>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</u>	Any point within any site	0800h to 2000h	50 dB LAeq(15 min)	NC
			2000h to 0800h	40 dB LAeq(15 min) 75 dB LAFmax	NC




- Legend**
- Open Cemetery
 - Historic Heritage Features
 - Transmission Corridor
 - Queenstown Airport Outer Control Boundary (Ldn55)
 - Roads
 - State Highway
 - Ridge/Escarpment Line
 - Parcel/Road Boundary
 - Landscape Classification (ONF, ONL, RCL)
 - Urban Growth Boundary
 - Heritage Overlay Area
 - Significant Natural Area
 - Unformed Roads
 - Designated Areas
 - Building Restrictions
 - Heritage Protection Order
 - Ski Area Sub-Zone
 - Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone
 - Business Mixed Use
 - Airport Zone
 - Active Sports and Recreation
 - Civic Spaces
 - Community Purposes
 - Informal Recreation
 - Nature Conservation
 - Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct
 - Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
 - Arrowtown Town Centre
 - Local Shopping Centre
 - Residential Arrowtown Historic
 - Large Lot Residential A
 - High Density Residential
 - Medium Density Residential
 - Lower Density Suburban Residential
 - Rural
 - Gibbston Character
 - Rural Lifestyle
 - Rural Residential
 - Water (zone Rural unless otherwise shown)
 - Millbrook
 - Waterfall Park






- Legend**
- †† Open Cemetery
 - Historic Heritage Features
 - Protected Tree
 - Protected Avenue of Trees/Other Vegetation
 - Aurora Distribution Lines - For Information Only
 - Roads
 - State Highway
 - Ridge/Escarpment Line
 - Parcel/Road Boundary
 - Landscapes Classification (ONF, ONL, RCL)
 - Urban Growth Boundary
 - Heritage Overlay Area
 - Significant Natural Area
 - Unformed Roads
 - Designated Areas
 - Historic Heritage Precinct
 - Heritage Protection Order
 - Town Centre Transition Overlay
 - Rural Industrial Sub-Zone
 - Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone
 - Community Purpose - Golf Course
 - Active Sports and Recreation
 - Civic Spaces
 - Community Purposes
 - Informal Recreation
 - Nature Conservation
 - Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct
 - Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
 - Arrowtown Town Centre
 - Local Shopping Centre
 - Residential Arrowtown Historic
 - Medium Density Residential
 - Lower Density Suburban Residential
 - Rural
 - Rural Lifestyle
 - Water (zone Rural unless otherwise shown)
 - Millbrook
 - Waterfall Park

26





- Legend**
- Open Cemetery
 - Historic Heritage Features
 - Protected Tree
 - Aurora Distribution Lines – For Information Only
 - Roads
 - Parcel/Road Boundary
 - Landscape Classification (ONF, ONL, RCL)
 - Urban Growth Boundary
 - Unformed Roads
 - Designated Areas
 - Historic Heritage Precinct
 - Heritage Protection Order
 - Town Centre Transition Overlay
 - Rural Industrial Sub-Zone
 - Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone
 - Community Purpose - Campground
 - Community Purpose - Cemetery
 - Community Purpose - Golf Course
 - Active Sports and Recreation
 - Civic Spaces
 - Community Purposes
 - Informal Recreation
 - Nature Conservation
 - Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct
 - Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
 - Arrowtown Town Centre
 - Local Shopping Centre
 - Residential Arrowtown Historic
 - Medium Density Residential
 - Lower Density Suburban Residential
 - Rural
 - Rural Lifestyle
 - Water (zone Rural unless otherwise shown)
 - Millbrook

ONL

ONF

28

27

