

APPENDIX 1 – DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF VARIOUS OPTIONS

Options for achieving an appropriate level of masterplanning prior to development	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Relatively basic Structure Plan <u>without</u> the requirement for an ODP (or discretionary subdivision requirements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple Structure Plan to prepare • Simple for the developer at the Resource Consent stage • Simpler Plan Change to prepare in terms of not having to prepare rules relating to the ODP or disc subdivision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No certainty of big picture outcomes other than what can be achieved through v limited subdivision controls (e.g. no ability to require a through road, some open space, etc) 	Not recommended
2. Detailed Structure Plan <u>without</u> the need for an ODP (or discretionary subdivision)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High degree of certainty at the time of the Plan Change is agreed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not flexible or able to be changed (without n/c Resource Consent or another Plan Change) with changes in market demand or changes improvements in design practices • A lot of work in preparing detailed Structure Plan • Unlikely to ever be really detailed enough • Locked into a lot of detail which the developer will want to change over 20 yr build out 	Not recommended
3. Basic Structure Plan and outline development plans (ODP) <u>as a controlled</u> activity prior to any individual Resource Consents being applied for.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple to prepare the Structure Plan and Plan Change • Resource Consent process not too onerous on the developer • ODP stage still provides some control over the outcome and if developer acting in good faith and agrees with design principles then there should be no problem. • This option would be sufficient if large scale subdivision is limited discretionary (see later in paper) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough detail to ensure the big picture skeleton networks etc are provided • Not enough 'teeth' at the ODP stage to enable the council to require through roads, etc, etc 	Not recommended
4. Basic Structure Plan and outline development plans (ODP) <u>as a limited discretionary</u> activity (non-notified) prior to any individual Resource Consents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has considerable teeth at the ODP stage • Simple Plan Change to prepare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public have only basic understanding of Structure at the Plan Change stage and very likely no involvement at the ODP stage 	This has some merit

Options for achieving an appropriate level of masterplanning prior to development being applied for	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to non notification and discretion relation to design matters (largely) the Resource Consent ODP process should be relatively straight forward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only limited certainty of outcome at the time the Plan Change is agreed. 	
<p>5. Greater level of detail in the Structure Plan plus more detailed standards and design guidance with the subsequent ODPs being a controlled activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards and Structure Plan provide reasonable certainty The matters left unresolved by the Plan Change are smaller issues that will not “make or break” the development Reasonable level of certainty of outcome at the Plan Change stage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More work in drafting the provisions and Structure Plan Can’t decline a ODP if controlled Locked into big picture networks (movement, open space etc) and principles – less flexibility for the developer later on requires any detail that is mapped to be survey accurate Controlled status of the ODP provides certainty and simple Resource Consent process for the developer This would require very detailed and prescriptive performance standards (including sketches) which will need to be quite inflexible and may not always be the best solution in every situation. 	Not recommended
<p>6. As above, but with no ODP process at all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above Less control over ‘big picture’ outcome than above. 	Not recommended
<p>7. Structure Plan and masterplan forming part of the District Plan, and a rule that adherence to the masterplan will avoid the need for an ODP – otherwise ODP will be required (as per above).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus is on the physical outcome High level of certainty of physical outcome for that part that has been masterplanned Easy to understand what will occur on the site, for the layperson Could work if for small area that will be developed in foreseeable future and for which the market demand and desired outcome is well understood and not likely to change Certainty for developer to proceed with the masterplanned part without further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires considerable work now to ensure all dimensions, amount and location of open space etc are exactly right. Cost of the masterplan are expended/ committed before any certainty that the Plan Change will be adopted. If market changes (footprint size for large format retail, for e.g.) or demand for new uses (e.g. school) evolve over development period then Plan Change or non complying Resource Consent or discretionary ODP required to 	Not recommended.

Options for achieving an appropriate level of masterplanning prior to development	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>ODP process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may assist in drafting the provisions as can draft to suit the known outcome 	<p>amend / deviate from masterplan. High risk if masterplanning whole area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would need to be surveyed to be to have rules applied to it. • Not flexible to change • Need to know very detailed level of information (e.g. traffic volumes, market demand/ preferences into the future, etc) now • Unlikely to expedite the process as development would still require disc consent under Rural General rules until the Plan Changes is operative 	
<p>8. Rather than the ODP, make subdivision a limited discretionary activity – addressing all ODP matters plus servicing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids duplication of process (i.e. ODP Resource Consent then subdivision consent). • Enables council to decline a subdivision based on design • Provides developer with certainty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is likely that issues of ‘relevancy’ would be raised if the council tried to consider the wide-ranging ODP matters of discretion as part of a subdivision consent application. • If developer were to develop first then subdivide it would circumvent this requirement and leave council with no control over layout etc. E.g. Remarkables Park Zone was developed before subdivision. • Likely to encourage applications of a smaller scale than would an ODP, which would not give such a good overview. • Unlikely to be any more efficient than lodging a combined Subdivision/ ODP consent if that is the approach the developer wishes to take. • Means that all detailed servicing needs to be undertaken prior to having any certainty that they form and density will be acceptable to the council. 	<p>Not recommended - prefer detailed design related performance standards which, if breached, trigger a restricted disc subdivision.</p>

Options for staging the volume of retail space in the commercial core	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Leave to the market to stage the development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't overly complicate the District Plan Flexible to changes in economy/ market/ growth rates Enables a free/ competitive market to establish between the 3 retail areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to undercut/ undermine the existing Town Centre May result in little co-ordination (as has occurred in the implementation of the Albany Structure Plan). May not result in a desirable mix of small and larger format retail necessary for good urban design. May not locate in orderly pattern. 	Not recommended
2. Staging through infrastructure (i.e. non-complying until specific roading, wastewater and water infrastructure is built).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May deter (but not necessarily prevent) development of certain areas if the developer has to pay costs of infrastructure (e.g. can not develop business areas until the arterial is in place) Water supply could be used to stage development. Such a mechanism would be simple to draft. <p>NB: Regardless of whether the council includes it as a staging mechanism, development will not be allowed until the new water reservoir is constructed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often difficult to justify Often unenforceable as developer can provide own services in many instances (excluding water supply in this case) May be relevant for the arterial roading to be established prior to development (but this is probably too onerous and not able to be justified on an effects basis). Will not protect the function of the Town Centre The use of an adequate water supply as a staging mechanism would provide little certainty as to when the development will be allowed and does not relate well to demand or other environmental or social effects of development. 	Not recommended.
3. Impose a cap on GFA (12,000m ² , as per existing demand studies) in the District Plan of (various types of) retail/ activities in the Retail core. (e.g. permitted up to x GFA and thereafter non complying, based on objectives relating to existing Town Centre etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple Well understood Well justified for the 1st stage of retail (by the retail papers prepared) Provides simple Resource Consent process rather than requiring a full needs assessment to be undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actual GFA's subject to challenge Requires Plan Change to change the cap unless structure in the District Plan enabling this to shift without a Plan Change Places undue weight on the accuracy of projections. Not flexible if growth is 	Not recommended.

Options for staging the volume of retail space in the commercial core	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
and then extend this to 30,000 after 2016		slower or faster than expected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in the growth rates (up or down) may render the data inaccurate (a little early or a little late) 	
4. As above but rather than make it non-complying once the 12,000m ² is exceeded, make it restricted discretionary subject to showing that the Wanaka Town Centre is healthy, there is adequate demand for a further stage(s) will include an increasing number of specialty stores.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparent to the public/ District Plan reader Avoids a non complying Resource Consent to be gone through in order to release more development rights Better than placing absolute caps on growth beyond the initial allowable GFA as more flexible to higher or lower rates of growth Provides some immediate development rights but requires proof of market demand, available land supply and an assessment of social issues to enable subsequent stages to occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More work in drafting rules allowing for the release of more development rights Adds more complexity to the District Plan Onus on developer to prove that the cap can justify being exceeded Provides less certainty as to when subsequent stages will be allowed. 	Recommended approach.
5. Impose a GFA cap and mechanism/ structure for going beyond this (through needs assessment) by private agreement, sitting outside of the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforceable in law Avoids issues with the RMA process Doesn't clutter the District Plan with staging mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not as transparent to the public/ District Plan reader Would need to be public information so that it can be used to justify the Plan Change Requires full agreement of the landowner Requires admin planners and council staff to be aware of the agreement Becomes complicated if ownership is changed, especially if it becomes fragmented 	Not recommended
6. Have no initial cap on GFA at all but put the onus on the developer to prove a demonstrable market demand (based on supply and demand) to uplift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market/ need-driven Onus on the developer to prove "need" from the outset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't provide certainty to the developer More work for the developer Needs already established by the 	Not recommended

Options for staging the volume of retail space in the commercial core	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
any development rights		Retail assessments and therefore inefficient to wrap this into a Resource Consent process	

Options for controlling the mix of large format and specialty retail space	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Allow specialty retail as a set proportion of large format retail, based on the amount of specialty retail that would be required in order to achieve a good urban design outcome with attractive buildings, active street frontages, and a well-functioning main street environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active frontages • Good urban design outcome • Relatively easy to determine a percentage if based on UD principles rather than market demand. • Opposition from those concerned about the vibrancy of the Town Centre will be at least partly alleviated. • This would encourage work toward achieving a positive, well-functioning commercial core over time. • Provides certainty of outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion likely to be quite high (justified by UD outcomes) which may well detract from Town Centre and, hence, not effectively meet the objectives relating to that matter. • May be difficulty in tenancing this number of shops – risk of vacant shops. • Likely to attract significant opposition from those concerned about the vibrancy of the Town Centre. 	Not recommended
2. Masterplan the 1 st stage, which will dictate the amount and location of specialty retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above (see also previous section on masterplan option) • High degree of certainty of outcome which may alleviate some people's concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More work/ cost/ time pre Plan Changes being notified • Less flexible to changes in the market etc • If approval process takes some years, more scope for the masterplan to become outdated – requiring a Plan Change or non complying Resource Consent in order to amend. 	Not recommended
3. Rather than specify a proportion, require that a main street is created and that all street frontages of large format retail are lined with smaller footprint buildings (whether they're tenanted in this or the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be likely to be self regulating as the market for large format is no doubt limited at this point, which, in turn, will limit the amt of smaller format allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of specialty/ smaller format would be needed to achieve this outcome – which may well detract from the Town Centre. • Opposition from those concerned about 	Not recommended

Options for controlling the mix of large format and specialty retail space	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
<p>above e.g. will be up to the market) and make all other small retail non-complying.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less certainty than the first option • Will be given further certainty if retail core masterplan is finalized prior to notifying Plan Change. 	<p>the vibrancy of the Town Centre likely to be greater than in first option.</p>	
<p>4. Limit the number of specialty shops in the early stages to much less than would be required to effectively 'sleave' the large format retail stores or create a main street feel and accept that the urban design outcome will be substandard in the early stages. This method would need to be coupled with rules which require the applicant to show how the building forms will be converted in subsequent stages to allow the addition of specialty retail stores.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future proofs the layout for later • Ensures not too many specialty stores in the 1st stage • Likely to detract less from the Town Centre, and therefore effective at meeting those objectives relating to this. • Provides certainty in regard to the maximum number of such stores permissible in the first stage. • Allowing a small number will at least allow some sense of a main street and some co-location of complementary retail, which has benefits in terms of travel demand management. • Requires that a further Town Centre health check and retail needs assessment be undertaken prior to any further specialty retail being approved • Considered to strike a balance between urban design outcomes and market realities • This approach has been tested by (and found favour with) the Environment Court in a number of instances. (Waipa District Council and Christchurch City Council). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be unlikely to result in a good urban design outcome in the first stage. • Difficult to justify an exact number of tenancies based on their effect on the Town Centre. 	<p>Recommended approach (in conjunction with capping the number of large format retail as per below).</p>
<p>5. Make any specialty stores (e.g. less than 400m²) discretionary – subject to whether it will detract from the Town</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may encourage businesses to move from inappropriate places out of the Town Centre as such relocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little certainty • Subjective as to whether a certain tenant will detract from the Town 	<p>Not recommended</p>

Options for controlling the mix of large format and specialty retail space	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
Centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would not affect the Town Centre Less likely to draw opposition from those concerned about the Town Centre viability Inefficient in terms of requiring multiple assessments on a case-by-case basis (i.e. every time a small store requires Resource Consent). 	<p>Centre and how to determine whether it is minor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is not relying on forecasts etc to Unlikely to result in good UD outcome for a long time. 	
6. Make any specialty stores (e.g. less than 400m ²) non-complying.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be most effective at achieving objectives relating to retaining the vibrancy of the Wanaka Town Centre. Objectives and policies would need to be very strong and quite detailed in order to be effective Would prevent any small complementary stores from locating in Southern Wanaka which would result in more traffic generation over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need to somehow develop a trigger at which point specialty retail would be allowed to some degree Would not contribute at all to creating a mainstreet feel to the commercial core. Provides no certainty as to the amount of specialty stores that will establish, if any. 	Not recommended
7. As above but list some types of small footprint retail that are allowed (e.g. Small scale retail of goods produced, stored on the site, yard based retail, trade suppliers, second hand good outlets, food and beverage, small scale pharmacies within a health facility)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a precedent for this approach (in the Christchurch City Plan) Allows small footprints where the despite the small area of retail space, its not actually specialty retail (such as goods produced, stored etc on the site, yard based retail) and where the retail type does not compete significantly with the Town Centre and/or does not have significant retail distribution effects (e.g. trade suppliers, second hand good outlets, food and beverage outlets). It would limit the amount of true speciality retail that would realistically locate here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No certainty as to how much speciality retail this will allow No certainty you will actually get any true speciality retail – may simply get yard and trade based retail and other inappropriate forms of retail – as they're allowed to locate here the infrastructure will be in place for them) Those types that are allowed are not necessarily what we would want to see in the mainstreet and would not be complementary to the likely large format (e.g. a supermarket) Inflexible if there comes a point where there is limited capacity in the Town Centre for further retail development 	Not recommended

Options for controlling the mix of large format and specialty retail space	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
8. In addition to the preferred approach above, also cap the total number of tenancies allowed in the first stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively ensures that the developer does not simply create 30 tenancies of medium scale, which would not meet the demand for true large format retail, (upon which the 12,000m² is based) but could seriously undermine the primacy of the Wanaka Town Centre Provides added certainty Will more effectively protect the vibrancy and viability of the Town Centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to justify the exact number of tenancies which should be allowed. 	Recommended approach

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Make any form of retail a discretionary activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to assess a wide range of effects in relation to assessment criteria – including impact of leakage on retail centres (loss of vitality) & Business area (loss of employment land) without reference to specific standards Provides the ability to decline proposals that conflict with Policy and Objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to show how retail has greater effect than business or industrial Relies on strong objectives and policies Unless include an explanatory note re the use of discretionary activities, there is still a presumption that retailing is appropriate if the effects can be mitigated Provides very little certainty Complex drafting of assessment matters would be required Doesn't make the distinction that some forms of retail are more appropriate in this zone than others. 	Not recommended
2. Make any form of retail non complying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to decline inappropriate retail activities Ability to thoroughly assess applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits flexibility for ancillary retail or different formats that may require a more business environment Doesn't acknowledge that some forms 	Not recommended

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
		<p>of retail are more appropriate in this zone than in the commercial core or Wanaka Town Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presumption against retailing with burden of proof on applicant to show effects are minor or that they are not contrary to policy & objectives, which may well be overly onerous. • 	
<p>3. Apply the rule from the Ballantyne Ponds Plan Change – allowing only retail ancillary to the service/ yard based activity and up to 10% of the total floor area and make it prohibited to exceed this in all but the yard-based zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient for the processing planner and applicants if the same zone provisions apply • Would be cost effective in terms of Plan Change drafting as it utilizes existing provisions. • At the time of preparing this Plan Change, the Ballantyne Ponds Plan Change is not yet operative and therefore still subject to change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would need to consider carefully whether any retail activities would be so bad that they should be Prohibited rather than Non Complying – may be difficult to justify given acceptance in other Business zones 	<p>Not recommended</p>
<p>4. List the specific types of retail that are appropriate in the business zone (and permit them) and make all other retail non complying</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows those types of retail that are either trade related and/or more appropriately based in the business zone than in the Town Centre or commercial core (due to their scale, or nuisance effects), and/ or will not significantly redistribute activity away from the Town Centre/ commercial core. • Provides good certainty in terms of what is allowed and what is not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is entirely opposite to the approach taken for the provisions of the residential subzones (which is effects-based) • Requires very detailed definitions to be drafted or referred to (from an external document such as the ANZSIC codes). • Requires strong policies relating to protecting the Town Centre and commercial core and preserving the business land for its intended use in order to decline those retail types not listed. 	<p>Recommended approach, in conjunction with allowing a capped amount of ancillary retail (of any type)</p>
<p>5. Further to the option above, use ANZSIC codes to define the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The codes are so comprehensive that you would be unlikely to ever find a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planners are generally unfamiliar with this approach, which may result in 	

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
appropriate types of retail	<p>retail type that is not covered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be inconsistent with the approach taken in the • It would not be immediately apparent as to what types of retail fall into which categories and therefore one would very often need to consult the external document, which is not always an efficient process. • Nth Shore City council's plan provides a precedent for the use of the codes. • 	<p>inefficiencies in processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of rules based on ANZSIC codes is time-consuming due to the sheer length of the document and the fact that uses are not necessarily grouped on the basis of resource management effects 	
6. Further to the option above, provide detailed definitions of the appropriate types of retail, within the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All definitions sit within the District Plan rather than in a reference document (such as the ANZSIC codes) which is considered easier and more efficient • As it doesn't rely on an external document which is continually updated, subsequent Plan Changes are avoided • As the definitions have been developed for resource management/ planning purposes, they are effects-based, which the ANZSIC codes are not. • As with the ANZSIC codes it still enables very detailed definitions to be drafted. • Has the benefit of enabling the definitions to be based on ones that have been tested through the Environment Court (Christchurch City Council). 	Requires definitions to be drafted	
7. In addition to the above, further restrict those listed permitted types of retail to sell goods only to trade and institutional customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some types (e.g. food suppliers) can and should be limited only to wholesale retail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic to expect many types of retail to only sell to trade (for example building material suppliers and the like) • Very difficult to determine a workable and enforceable rule (do you restrict 	<p>Not recommended.</p> <p>Note: Wholesaling (of any goods) should be a specific listed permitted type of</p>

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
		<p>completely, cap it at a percentage of transactions, visitations, or make a general statement that retail activities should be 'predominantly' trade related.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, deemed to be inefficient and probably ineffective. 	retail.
8. Allow ancillary retail up to a certain cap.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables a small amount of retail if it is genuinely ancillary to the on site activity, even if it relates to a retail product that would normally be more appropriate in a Town Centre (e.g. clothing). This acknowledges reality that many businesses now have a retail component, be it wholesale or direct to public. The market should limit the amount of goods that will realistically satisfy the rule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will be necessary (and incur a cost) to enforce the % GFA that is allowed to be used for retail and to ensure that 'storage' area is not used as a showroom. On their own, floor area controls could still result in the proliferation of small retail units within the business subzone, which could have a cumulative impact Raises complications for enforcing the rules (difficult to know what should be measured etc) 	Recommended as part of a suite of rules
9. Control the issue through traffic volumes.			Deemed to be ineffective in this context so the costs and benefits were not considered
10. Controls on the scale and location of retail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to regulate the overall level of provision with regard to identified local need, and contribute to achieving integration of activities and good spatial definition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address the need to stage land release in relation to need Need to have a greater understanding of the categories of retail activities 	Deemed to be ineffective in this context so the costs and benefits were not considered
11. Specify a maximum quantity of retail in business zones within a certain radius.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precedent exists in the Christchurch City Plan Acknowledges that once there is a certain critical mass of retail in an area, it has a greater redistribution effect away from the Town Centre and the commercial core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex provisions to draft (requiring a significant amount of data) and justify, Need to keep an updated inventory of all uses in order to see if thresholds are breached with any given application 	Not recommended Note: As the issue here is not only about redistribution effects but about preserving the business land for its anticipated purpose, this is

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides another layer of control on the amount and type of retail in the zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would mean all retail would need to be at least a controlled Resource Consent in order for this 'check' to be undertaken Could be complex to administer (have to take account of approved but unimplemented consents as well as existing provision) Would require detail on the quantity of retail by categories May not be necessary if different types of retailing are focused on different areas and any other category/format is discretionary or non complying. 	not considered necessary.
<p>12. Apply the rules from the existing Business Zone in the District Plan, which makes retailing comprising over 500m² net floor area (NFA) a Discretionary Activity (unless ancillary or manufactured on site) and where retailing comprises less than 500m² NFA it is non complying.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least costly option. Consistency with the rest of the District Plan which may result in efficiencies for processing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be relatively ineffective, based on previous experience. The Business and Industrial Zones share the same set of issues, objectives and policies, rendering them relatively ineffective at stopping unwanted activities. E.g. It is a non-complying activity to undertake retail activities less than 500m² yet there are numerous examples of them being granted. 	Not recommended.
<p>13. Apply the rules from the existing Industrial Zone in the District Plan, which makes any retailing non-complying except the retailing of goods manufactured on the site, and ancillary products up to 20% of the gross floor area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for Option 12 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be relatively ineffective, based on previous experience. It is a non-complying activity to undertake retail activities within the Industrial Zone, however the policies and objectives do not necessarily support this. Recent case law has indicated that if industrial land needs to be used for industrial purposes, and retail activities are in conflict with the Plan's objectives and policies, then 	Not recommended.

Preventing the 'leakage' of retail into the business subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
		retail activities are not appropriate. However, in the case of the QLDC Plan, the objectives and policies do not support such an argument.	

Options for preserving the business subzone for its intended purpose (and avoiding conflicts between incompatible uses) and whether stand-alone offices and residential uses need to be prevented from establishing there.	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Allow stand alone (i.e. non ancillary) offices and residential units throughout the subzone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows flexibility of use • May provide a form of affordable housing • Would help to provide a buffer between the business and LDR subzones • May provide more affordable office space • Would provide a 'use' for upper floors of buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would result in conflicts between uses and reverse sensitivity issues. • This may increase land values and, in turn, price out anticipated, low value business uses, hence, disabling people to provide their social and economic wellbeing. • This would provide no certainty of landuse • This would require more complex provisions to be drafted to ensure all buildings/ developments are designed to avoid or at least reduce conflicts • Is unlikely to provide a high quality living or office environment or sense of residential cohesion • May undermine the potential of the commercial core to become a vibrant mixed use area if apartments and offices are drawn to the business area instead (by lower values or the early release of land, for example). • Seems difficult to justify the need given 	Not recommended

Options for preserving the business subzone for its intended purpose (and avoiding conflicts between incompatible uses) and whether stand-alone offices and residential uses need to be prevented from establishing there.	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
		that there is ample land provided for these uses in other parts of the Zone.	
2. As above but residential units to being only for the purpose of custodial management.	<p>As above, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the added merit of ensuring that some business use also occurs on the site • Would ensure that the whole subzone could not become a pseudo residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above but very difficult if not impossible to enforce, incurring cost and time to both the council and landowners. 	Not recommended
3. Prevent (i.e. make non-complying) throughout the subzone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would avoid conflicts between uses and reverse sensitivity issues. • This would maintain land values at a level that anticipated business uses, could afford. • This would be simple to draft. • Would ensure that business uses can operate at noise levels etc that may otherwise be unacceptable if they shared a site with or were adjacent to offices and/ or residential uses. • Would preserve the business use for its intended purpose and encourage these uses to locate in the more appropriate commercial core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would rely on strong objectives and policies to enable residential and office uses to be declined • Means that a buffer to the LDR subzones would need to be achieved in other ways. • May mean that apartment living and office space is less affordable in the very long term (when scarcity becomes an issue) • Would mean many buildings would be 1 storey (as limited business activities want to be upstairs) which in the very long term, could be considered an inefficient use of land. This is also not conducive to producing an attractive streetscene on the east west arterial. 	It is recommended that <u>residential units</u> are prevented from establishing anywhere in the business subzone whilst <u>stand-alone offices</u> are allowed in the mainstreet precinct but prevented elsewhere.
4. Allow offices and residential uses in the mainstreet precinct of the business subzone but make it non-complying in the remainder of the subzone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would avoid conflicts between uses and reverse sensitivity issues. • This would maintain land values in the majority of the subzone at a level that anticipated business uses could afford. • This would be more complicated to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would rely on strong objectives and policies to enable residential and office uses to be declined in the majority of the subzone • Means that a buffer to the LDR subzones would need to be achieved 	

Options for preserving the business subzone for its intended purpose (and avoiding conflicts between incompatible uses) and whether stand-alone offices and residential uses need to be prevented from establishing there.	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>draft than the above option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would ensure that business uses can operate in the majority of the zone at noise levels etc that may otherwise be unacceptable if they shared a site with or were adjacent to offices and/ or residential uses. • Would preserve the business use for its intended purpose and encourage these uses to locate in the more appropriate commercial core. • Would encourage buildings within the main street precinct to be 2 storey (as enabling viable above ground uses) limited business activities want to be upstairs) which is efficient use of land and conducive to producing an attractive streetscene on the. 	<p>in other ways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May result in some reverse sensitivity issues within the mainstreet precinct – especially if residential use is allowed. 	

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
<p>1. Allow non-residential uses throughout the residential subzones and leave to the market to dictate</p>			<p>It is widely accepted that regulatory intervention is the only viable option for dealing with this issue. Leaving it to the market will not be effective at protecting residential amenity and therefore has not been further considered</p>

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
2. Applying regulation to control the amount, type, and location of non-residential uses in the residential subzones	<p>Controls will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve residential amenity and help foster an evolving residential cohesion and character in these subzones • Provide a level of certainty to residents • Still enable people to provide for their economic wellbeing as there is ample land being zoned for non-residential uses within the South Wanaka Zone. • Still result in a mixed use environment in the MDR zone over time as it is within close proximity to the commercial core and will, in the long term, have a mixed use precinct within it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drafting of rules incurs a financial cost • The processing and monitoring of consents incurs a financial cost (but is considered to be justifiable in this case). • The fact people will be unable to establish commercial and community facilities in this zone as of right will encourage them to locate in the zones created for this purpose, where land may be more expensive. 	Recommended approach, at the high level
Activity-based rule(s).		•	
3. Listing which non-residential uses are permitted, controlled, discretionary, and non-complying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less demanding (and therefore less time-consuming and costly) to draft the provisions compared to an effects-based approach. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to ensure that all possible non-residential uses are listed • 	Not recommended
4. Making all non-residential uses non-complying and relying on their effects and/ or, in many instances, strong objectives and policies to enable them to be declined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong protection of the residential area which should ensure there is no adverse effect on residential amenity. • Provides high level of certainty • Ensures the market prices the land accordingly – hence, preserving affordability of residential land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unjustifiably stringent on some uses, which have minor effects and are consistent with the objectives and policies • As non complying activity status does not generally involve the drafting of assessment matters, very little guidance would be provided as to what exceptional circumstances may result in an activity being appropriate • As some level of non-residential use is anticipated this does not portray the right message to users of the Plan. 	Not recommended
Effects-based rule(s).			
5. Make most or all non-residential uses permitted or controlled but subject to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is similar to the approach in the rest of the District Plan and therefore is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to capture all effects on residential amenity and determine 	Not recommended

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
standards relating to scale (e.g. floor space), nature of the activity, traffic generation, noise, whether workers need to reside on site, the number of employees, hours of operation, etc.	efficient to administer.	<p>appropriateness based on standards alone. E.g. a dairy which fails the number of employees standard may be appropriate, as might a large, well designed community hall even though it fails the floor area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to consider whether it is most appropriately placed within the development through standards alone. • It is more demanding (and therefore more time-consuming and costly) to draft the provisions compared to an activity based approach. 	
6. Make all non-residential uses a discretionary activity, supported by assessment matters which cover the same sort of matters as would performance standards but in a manner which is more flexible (i.e. it is not always a case of passing or failing an assessment matter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This approach is considered appropriate in principal, based on the reasons for classifying an activity as discretionary, as outlined in Environment Court decision <i>QLDC v Wakatipu Environmental Society C75/2001</i>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ where it is not suitable in all locations in a zone ○ where the effects of the activity are so variable that it is not possible to prescribe standards to control them in advance ○ where an activity defaults to discretionary because it can not meet all the standards for a permitted activity ○ where activities are not suitable in most locations in a zone or part of a zone but may be suitable in a few locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not acknowledge that some activities are anticipated (e.g. visitor accommodation in the MDR zone and retirement villages provided the site is approved as part of the ODP) and others (e.g. panel beating) are unsuitable and clearly contrary to the policies. Unlike the Rural General zone, there is enough information to identify these exceptions now and provide for them in the rules. • May give the impression that because the activity is discretionary rather than non-complying, then it is appropriate subject to conditions. • This does not provide as much certainty as simply listing those activities that are/ are not allowed or listing quantifiable standards that must be met as it requires a full assessment of effects. This is likely to be more costly to applicant. 	Not recommended

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables assessment matters to be included in the Plan, which provide both tests and guidelines as to what will be acceptable and likely to be granted (<i>QLDC v Wakatipu Environmental Society C75/2001</i>). • There are similarities between this and the regime in the Rural General zone and therefore a level of understanding exists between District Plan users. • Considered to be flexible for the consideration of applications on a case-by-case basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p>7. As above plus include an explanation that the discretionary status should not be taken to mean that non-residential activity will necessarily be granted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option has the benefits as outlined above for a full discretionary regime, plus: • It clarifies the interpretation and application of discretionary status in this particular instance • This approach already has a precedent in the Queenstown Lakes District Council Plan in the Rural General zone and is therefore a) tested in law; b) understood by the professionals and developers. • As all non-residential <u>buildings</u> are restricted discretionary activity, the activity therein being a discretionary activity does not necessarily add considerably to the cost or time delays. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above except that: • Any misinterpretation of the discretionary status is minimised. 	Not recommended
<p>8. As above but make <u>most</u> non-residential uses being discretionary, with only those uses with very particular characteristics being listed as either permitted or controlled or, at</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option has the benefits as outlined above for a full discretionary regime • This also acknowledges that some activities are anticipated (e.g. home occupations, visitor accommodation in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above, except that: • More complex to draft as it is a hybrid of the various approaches, requiring various activity statuses, and standards, and assessment matters. 	Not recommended (see below for recommended approach)

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
the other end of the spectrum, non-complying	<p>the MDR zone and retirement villages provided the site is approved as part of the ODP) and others (e.g. panel beating, selling of liquor, industrial activities) are unsuitable and clearly contrary to the policies and are therefore non-complying or prohibited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty than a full discretionary regime for all non-residential activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be more complicated for the user 	
9. As above plus a number of performance-based standards (relating to noise, hours of operation, and the location/ design of carparking) which, if breached, make the activity non-complying.	<p>This option has the same benefits as outlined above, except</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It makes it very clear that there are particular standards which, if breached, would render the activity inappropriate in the residential subzones. <p>NB – The discretionary activity assessment matters can still be considered as “relevant provisions of the Plan”, pursuant to section 104(1)(b).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option provides certainty in regard to particular standards that shall not be breached • Provides a greater hurdle for the applicant when these standards are breached, particularly where it presents a threat to the integrity of the Plan (precedent effect) • 	This is the recommended approach
10. Require all non-residential uses to be identified and approved for particular sites as part of the Outline Development Plan resource consent, with all others being non complying or having to be approved through subsequent Outline Development Plans as a restricted discretionary activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying all non-residential sites at the ODP stage would enable the ‘big picture’ effects to be considered and planned for/ avoided/ mitigated at that stage. For example, good masterplanning of these non-residential sites (e.g. the size and location of the lot relative to open spaces, arterial roads and intersections) could mitigate or avoid issues of traffic generation and conflicts at the boundary with residential uses. • This is considered appropriate and reasonable in the context of visitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible this is advantageous but considered unreasonable and unrealistic to require it in all instances as flexibility of the use of sites and buildings is essential over time and it is not possible to know the location of all non-residential uses over a 50 year time period. • As the specifics of the use would not be known at the ODP stage (e.g. the vpd or the building design) there would still be a need for subsequent Resource Consents once this 	Not recommended

Options for managing non-residential uses in the residential subzones in order to ensure that only appropriate uses occur	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>accommodation and retirement villages because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They are a hybrid residential / non-residential type of use, ○ Their effects are quite predictable and quite different from other non-residential uses, ○ Their effects can be well-managed at the masterplanning stage (enabling them a simpler Resource Consent path thereafter), ○ It is reasonable to expect a developer to be able to commit to such uses at the masterplanning stage as 1) the demand can be predicted at the masterplanning stage, and 2) the use is not reliant on an existing surrounding catchment (as is a dairy), and 3) there is a broad market (i.e. number of potential purchasers) for such development sites (as compared to a dairy site, for example). 	<p>information is available. This results in duplication of process and inefficiencies.</p>	

Options for providing for mixed use within parts of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
Whether to have a mixed use precinct at all			
<p>1. Include the mixed use precinct in the Plan Change but defer it until a certain amount of development is complete within the commercial core</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of the precinct clarifies what the long term intention for the land is. • Ensures that the subdivision pattern and roading hierarchies in the area are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to determine an appropriate and defensible deferral trigger • Requires strong objectives and policies to ensure deferral is able to be enforced through Resource Consent 	<p>Recommended approach.</p>

Options for providing for mixed use within parts of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>sufficient to enable conversion to mixed use at a later stage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that uses that establish in the area in the interim will be able to be easily converted to mixed use when the precinct zoning is uplifted. • Requires a more complex suite of rules within the residential subzones • Avoids the need for any further Plan Change in order to add the precinct at a later date. • 	<p>process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will prevent retirement villages and visitor accommodation precincts from locating there as they will not be able to convert easily, if at all, to mixed use at a later stage. • Questionable how effective the deferral mechanism would be. 	
<p>2. Include the precinct in the Plan Change but, rather than defer it, rely on the fact that development needs to be in accordance with the Structure Plan staging plan, which indicates it will be developed as the latter stages (stage 3).</p>	<p>As above, except that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency with the Structure Plan staging plan would enable the council to impose conditions (to ensure conversion if appropriate, etc) or decline the application to develop this area ahead of time. 	<p>As above, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It removes the concerns re drafting and enforcing the deferral mechanism • Requires strong objectives and policies to decline an application for an ODP that is inconsistent with the indicative staging on the Structure Plan • Questionable how strong the staging shown on the Structure Plan will be in terms of preventing inconsistent staged development. 	
<p>3. Exclude from the Plan Change and review in 10 years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would avoid the complexity of having a separate precinct within the District Plan. • Would prevent (as much as possible) the spread of commercial beyond the edge of the commercial core, as subject to strict non-residential provisions of the residential subzone • Would enable council to reassess any need for it at a later date when it is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes that the zone will be reviewed in 10 years, which may not necessarily be the case. • Unless zoned Rural General in the meantime (and not developed at all), then no requirement to ensure that development that takes place could be converted to mixed use in time. • Uses may establish there that are not able to be converted (e.g. retirement 	

Options for providing for mixed use within parts of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) subzone	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>clearer as to what the demand is likely to be for such uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would encourage the transitional mixed use area to establish at the edge of the commercial core but within that zone rather than as a separate mixed use precinct (as a way of mitigating conflicts between the core and the MDR zone. There is probably no problem of this resulting in a shortage of commercial land given the extensive size of that subzone. • Would avoid (or at least, defer) any potential issues with traffic congestion along the main arterial road, resulting from mixed use. 	<p>village or visitor accommodation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If mixed use doesn't establish here in the long term, then the quality of residential environment for those properties along the mainstreet arterial road may be low quality, due to traffic noise and requirements to build dwellings relatively close to the road boundary. • Questionable what other uses (other than mixed use) are appropriate along the arterial road. 	
<p>4. Exclude the precinct but still require ground floor levels of buildings adjacent to the commercial core or mainstreet arterial to be a minimum stud height in order to enable easy conversion to commercial usage in the future</p>	<p>As above, except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum stud height, in part, ensures the buildings can be converted into mixed use buildings in the longer term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It raises issues in that if the building ends up not converting to mixed use, then it will have a very high stud on the ground floor, will have other design elements that are generally incompatible with quality residential living (such as public and private entrances), and maybe an inefficient use of the site due to the additional carparking needs that may or may never actually be needed but, regardless, need to be shown as achievable at the time of building. 	

Options relating to carparking provisions	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. As per the rest of the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least costly option as doesn't require further drafting Consistency with the rest of the Plan and therefore easily understood by users of plan and likely to be some efficiencies in processing, as a result Much of it has been tested and there is case law and/ or legal opinions guiding administration of the provisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a small number of known issues with the current provisions There is no acknowledgement that proximity to Public Transport may enable a lower rate of car ownership (and therefore less residential parking requirements in such areas) 	Not recommended
2. As per the rest of the District Plan with some minor amendments to rectify minor known problems with the rules and to allow reduced carparking requirements in lieu of the proximity of the site to existing Public Transport.	<p>As per above except that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures the known problems are addressed rather than simply duplicated Enables council to include rules which will be triggered once Public Transport is established in the area and is therefore, forward- looking and more likely to result in less car use/ ownership than the existing rules would. Users of the Plan are already used to there being some zone specific exemptions/ rules in the transport section and therefore the precedent is set for this. 	<p>As per above except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option does require some additional drafting, which needs to be carefully justified Raises some inconsistencies between Southern Wanaka and other parts of the district 	Recommended approach
3. Significant amendments to the rest of the District Plan, enabling less carparking to be provided in lieu of the provision of Public Transport, end-destination infrastructure and other initiatives which reduce private car use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would encourage TDM and Public Transport to be established as less carparking would need to be provided (as a trade off) More likely to result in less car use and encourage Public Transport to be established than the first 2 options It may result in a more consolidated urban form if developers opt to provide less car parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would require significant drafting and justification – which may be difficult to justify in the Wanaka context and the scale of the existing and foreseeable transport issues. Difficult to justify why the provisions should apply only to the Southern Wanaka Zone (what makes it different to many other new development areas) Difficult to justify as it is likely to be a 	Only recommended in respect of later stages of development in the commercial core

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may be possible to require a reduced ratio of carparking in the commercial core <u>in later stages</u> once a walkable catchment has been provided, there is a greater likelihood of Public Transport, and greater opportunities for shared carparking (and hence parking efficiencies). 	significant time before Public Transport is operating in the zone.	
4. As per Option 3 but also put a maximum cap on the amount of allowable carparking in the commercial core.	<p>As in option 3 above except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be the most effective option in terms of encouraging other modes of transport It would result in a more consolidated urban form (in the commercial core) 	<p>As above except that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provisions would require significant research to draft and justify. Due to the nature of the first stages of retail (being predominantly large format retail), for a considerable time there will be a fairly high level of car travel for visitors. The rules would almost compel other modes of transport to be used as carparking would be restrained (i.e. under-provided, compared to the usual ratios) – this may result in inefficiencies by requiring Public Transport even if it is economically inefficient to do so. 	Not recommended

Options for streamlining the resource consent process by enabling developers to apply for a Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) rather than separate consents for the Outline Development Plan (ODP) and the building	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Rely on the ODP process followed by the building and activity Resource Consents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This framework is tested (Jacks Point etc) and the planners and development community are familiar with them, which may result in efficiencies Means the developer can get certainty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council will be left assessing buildings case-by-case which will not necessarily result in as good an outcome/ streetscape. Does not provide the more 	Not recommended.

	<p>that the ODP is granted before investing in the design of the built form (which may be more efficient)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ODP requires less upfront investment than a CDP. • Due to the lesser level of detail required of an ODP (compared to a CDP) the ODP is likely to cover a greater area and therefore enable council to assess the bigger picture more effectively. 	<p>streamlined, single Resource Consent process – which the CDP does (in Option 2 below).</p>	
<p>2. Offer the option of applying for a CDP rather than an ODP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An approved CDP avoids the need to obtain Resource Consents for an ODP or the buildings upon the area covered by the CDP, which may result in efficiencies for the developer and council. • A CDP would work well for the first stage of the commercial core (i.e. up to 12,000m² etc) where, provided the design etc is acceptable, the risk of consent being declined is relatively low. • A CDP provides the council with certainty of the built form for a larger part of the zone (e.g. length of the mainstreet) than would normally be the case. This is likely to result in a superior outcome than assessing buildings one-by-one/ site by site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds significant complexity to the Zone provisions • The provisions are untested and the planners and development community are unfamiliar with them, which may result in inefficiencies. • The additional investment and level of certainty that the developer needs to have (e.g. tenants needs, presales, etc) are likely to encourage the CDP to cover a much smaller area than the council would expect to see in an ODP and therefore the ability to consider the big picture may be lost. <p>Costs to the developer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires significant upfront investment without certainty that the ODP aspects will be granted • A CDP would be most applicable in the commercial core which is also where the most uncertainty exists for the developer in terms of whether the ODP will be granted for later stages (due to the added staging issues). As such, the risk to the developer's upfront investment is greatest there. 	<p>This is the recommended approach.</p> <p>Note: Whilst there are costs to this approach, many of these are private costs which fall on the developer. As this is a voluntary option offered to the developer it is up to the developer to weigh up these costs and elect to do this option if he so wishes.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any amendments to the ODP through negotiation with and/ or conditions imposed by the council (e.g. amendments to block size) would require a re-work of the built form, which may be inefficient/ costly. 	
<p>3. As above plus provide an incentive by indicating that the council may process a CPD without full Resource Consent drawings of the buildings, provided it has adequate information to consider the matters of control/ discretion and the assessment matters.</p>	<p>As above except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information required for the Resource Consent application could be less onerous for the developer Less certainty of the outcome for the council 	<p>As above except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the council accepts less detail as would ordinarily be required then there is still opportunity for a poor building design outcome Introduces uncertainty as to how much detail is required/ what the key points are that need to be addressed, resulting in difficulties in terms of interpretation and administration of the rules. 	Not recommended
<p>4. Rather than offer the option of a single Resource Consent for a CDP, encourage applicants to apply for a combination Resource Consent (for both the ODP and building, and where possible and required, the activity therein).</p>	<p>This has similar benefits to Option 2 above, except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two consents are lodged jointly as opposed to one In practical terms the processing will be very similar or this may be simpler as it may be clearer exactly what rules apply. More simple and less costly in terms of drafting the provisions More simple to administer Does not deter the applicant from applying for a large scale ODP to the same degree as Option 2 does. May encourage a combined application for an ODP for a larger area and for the buildings for a subset of the area covered by the ODP, which would be a positive outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants are not encouraged to do this to the same extent as they are if a specific CDP provision is included Similar costs to the developer as option 2 Less ambiguity as to what information/ level of detail is required/ discretion is retained. 	Not recommended

Options for achieving high quality residential areas	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Apply the existing objectives, policies, and rules/ standards from the LDR and HDR zones of the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the activity classes largely appropriate and do not seem to cause significant problems • There is familiarity in the community with how the provisions work • Would provide for consistency between zones • No work involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential problem with the visitor accommodation rule • Potential problem with the CRD rules • Objectives and policies may not be sufficiently robust • The HDR provisions are currently subject to appeal and therefore are not confirmed • Many of the provisions are unnecessary or inappropriate in a Greenfields context • Some bulk, location and building design provisions are not consistent with the latest thinking in regard to good urban design practice and achieving good outcomes. 	Not recommended
2. Amend the objectives and policies (mainly around urban design), the status of various activities and rules of the existing zone in order to overcome the known problems and achieve good urban design outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide a robust regime of activity classes and objectives and policies • Able to reflect best practice in urban design • An opportunity to draft provisions that may in turn be useful to consider when other residential zones are reviewed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More work in drafting • Inconsistency between zones which could result in inefficiencies in terms of processing 	Recommended
3. Retain existing standards		Most of them can be improved upon and further design guidance provided	Not recommended
Particular performance standards:			
<u>Building Coverage in the residential subzones</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have no rule 2. Have no rule and, instead rely on the permeability rules which specify maximum hard surfacing but provide an exemption from this 3. Impose a maximum building coverage 	<p>Option 3 was decided to be the most effective as the permeability rule is about permeability issues rather than amenity and character issues. The permeability rule would have been sufficient had it not allowed the exemption to exceed the 50 and 70% hard surfacing where mitigating factors are included in the design. this exemption leaves it too uncertain as to whether sites might be covered to a much greater degree with building than is really envisaged in these subzones</p>		

Options for achieving high quality residential areas	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
<p>on any site (of 40% in LDR and 60% in MDR).</p>			
<p><u>Outdoor Living Space in the residential subzones</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have no rule 2. Apply the rule as per the existing Queenstown Lakes District Council plan 3. Apply an improved rule, which incorporates the principles of good urban design practice by adding a rule requiring access to a minimum amount of sunlight and not allowing it to be between the front façade of the unit and the road boundary. 	<p>Option 3 is considered the most appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst it adds further complexity for the PIM officer, requiring a certain minimum amount of access to sunlight is considered justified due to its importance. • Avoiding outdoor living in the front yard is considered appropriate in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Help avoid solid fences being erected along the road boundary (in order to achieve privacy and security) which, in fact, reduces safety preventing passive surveillance and provides an unpleasant streetscape. ○ Prevent the public/private conflict and ambiguity of ownership that often results from outdoor living on the street edge. • It is noted that where it is impossible to achieve both these criteria the sunlight will prevail provided a good outcome on the street can be achieved (this is outlined in assessment matters) 		
<p><u>Road setback and streetscene</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have no rule 2. Apply the rule as per the existing Queenstown Lakes District Council plan 3. Apply an improved rule, which incorporates the principles of good urban design practice by requiring require the living area to face the street, buildings to be between 3 and 4.5 m from the road and garages to be setback 	<p>Option 3 is considered the most appropriate. These amendments to the rule (all aimed at improving passive surveillance and avoiding streets that are dominated by fences and garage doors) are fundamental characteristics of CPTED (crime prevention) which, in turn, encourages walking and social interaction.</p>		

Options for achieving high quality buildings	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Permitted (with or without standards),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least costly option for the developer and council. • Well drafted design standards can effectively improve design outcomes for some building types (e.g. detached dwellings) and trigger discretionary or non complying consent where the standards are not met • Provides high degree of certainty that a site will be able to be developed • Provides a high degree of flexibility provided the standards are not too prescriptive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could result in some poor design, especially in relation to commercial, non-residential, mixed use, or higher density buildings. 	Permitted activity status with design-based standards is considered appropriate for single dwellings but not sufficient for other types of buildings.
2. controlled (with or without standards),	<p>As above except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added certainty of outcome than permitted • There are examples where more desirable outcomes achieved through this process and effective negotiation between the applicant and the council in the industrial and other commercial zones in the district 	<p>As above except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater cost to the applicant and the council at the development stage. • Requires more drafting at the Plan Change stage • No ability to decline an application and therefore still considerable scope for poor design • Provides more guidance as to what design is appropriate (through matters of control and assessment matters) • There are examples where the council was unable to influence the design as much as it would have liked in the Town Centre zones in particular, in the district 	Recommended approach for the Business subzone (excluding the mainstreet precinct).
3. Restricted Discretionary, with Assessment matters (and with or without standards),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides council with considerable influence and the ability to decline if necessary • Still provides level of certainty to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More costly than either of the above options • Less certainty to the developer than either of the above options 	Recommended approach for all buildings in the Commercial Core subzone, the visitor accommodation

Options for achieving high quality buildings	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>developer that it will be granted provided well designed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieves a superior design outcome that the above options. Provides focus and clarity regarding the matters that can be considered and on what basis it can be declined and/ or conditions imposed. Adding prescriptive design-based standards, where possible and effective, means that where these are breached, those matters can also be considered along with those which discretion has been limited to. Where the standards have not been breached there is no need to consider the matter, making it more efficient than simply listing the matter generally within the RDIS rule. 		<p>and tourism subzone, the Business (mainstreet precinct), and the MDR zone, and for all non-residential buildings and multi-unit developments in the LDR subzone.</p>
<p>4. Discretionary with Assessment matters (and with or without standards),</p>	<p>As above except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not the same benefits regarding certainty and clarity 	<p>As above except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less certainty for the developer No guidance as to what matters council may consider and therefore likely to be more costly than any of the other options 	<p>Not recommended as considered unnecessary.</p>
Options for limiting the creation of rear sites	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
<p>1. Permitted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with the rest of the Plan and therefore easiest to administer Potentially greater efficiencies in the use of land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk that there will be a large number of rear lots and infill subdivision Cost savings would be minimal as require a Resource Consent for the ODP and subdivision regardless 	<p>Not recommended</p>

Options for limiting the creation of rear sites	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least costly for the developer and council as no special Resource Consent is required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rear lots result in adverse effects on neighbours such as reduced privacy for the numerous properties that it shares boundaries with. Congestion on the street, a reduction in active frontages facing the street and Rear sites will be unable to meet the rules relating to streetscene Rear lots require access lanes to them, which reduces the amount of active street frontage facing a street. 	
<p>2. Consider the creation of rear sites through the ODP application and assessment matters rather than any specific rule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More flexibility for the developer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less certainty over what amount of rear sites are acceptable Less ability to decline than through a non-complying performance standard Relies on strong objectives and policies to decline Inconsistent with the rest of the District Plan, which may bring inefficiencies in terms of processing More costly to the applicant than the permitted option 	Not recommended
<p>3. Make all rear sites non-complying</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certainty to the developer regarding what is acceptable Provides council with the greatest ability to decline and avoid such sites from being created 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relies on strong objectives and policies to decline Inconsistent with the rest of the District Plan, which may bring inefficiencies in terms of processing More costly to the applicant than the permitted option. There may be rare occasions where rear sites are, on balance, the best urban design outcome, in terms of connectivity, travel distances, etc and therefore non complying may not be most appropriate 	Not recommended
<p>4. Make all rear sites restricted discretionary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges that there may be occasions where rear sites are, on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides less certainty than above 	Not recommended

Options for limiting the creation of rear sites	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<p>balance, the best urban design outcome, in terms of connectivity, travel distances, etc and therefore non-complying may not be most appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More complicated drafting of assessment matters required to provide adequate guidance on when rear sites would and would not be appropriate and to highlight that approval would be the exception rather than the norm. • Risky that more rear sites than is desirable would be allowed • Cumulative effects would need to be managed somehow. • Inconsistent with the rest of the District Plan, which may bring inefficiencies in terms of processing • More costly to the applicant than the permitted option. 	
<p>5. Make it non-complying for any more than 5% of sites to be rear sites (within any ODP area)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges that there may be occasions where rear sites are, on balance, the best urban design outcome, in terms of connectivity, travel distances, etc and therefore non-complying may not be most appropriate. • Provides certainty of an upper cap on the amount of rear sites that can occur • Some discretion is retained in regard to the location and design of any/ all rear sites (even where the 5% has not been breached) through the ODP Resource Consent process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By stating a maximum (5%) this may encourage developers to go up to the maximum • The 5% is an arbitrary percentage and would be difficult to justify • Means there is scope for rear sites and that these may have some adverse effects in terms of urban design 	<p>Recommended approach</p>
<p>6. Make it non-complying for any more than 10% of sites to be rear sites (within any ODP area) except in MDR sites where all rear sites will be non-complying.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	

Options for achieving good internal residential amenity	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. No rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the rest of the District Plan • Would leave it up to the market to provide the level of amenity/ quality that it deems is appropriate • less costly process for the applicant • May result in more affordable homes 	Will not necessarily always result in a good level of amenity	Not recommended
2. Include internal amenity as a matter of assessment under the controlled or restricted discretionary consent that is required for the building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will enable the planner to condition the design to provide a better living environment • By not having minimum standards (as in option 3 below), the applicant is encouraged to provide the best possible amenity rather than just meet minimum requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More costly to administer/ for the applicant than having no rules/ provisions. • Costs incurred in drafting the standards. • By stating them as a matter of control or discretion at the time of building, it needs to be considered for all applications, even those where the standard of amenity seems appropriate • Less certainty as to what is an acceptable standard (than in Option 3 below) and therefore could add to processing costs 	Not recommended
3. Include minimum standards as rules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective at ensuring a minimum standard of living environment • If standards are not overly onerous, then this should just ensure against the worst case scenarios and not penalize the • By stating them as rules the matter is not considered at all provided they are met, making it more efficient than it being a matter of control or discretion at the time of building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with the rest of the District Plan and untested in this environment • Costs incurred in drafting the standards • Would be more costly process for the applicant • May add to the building cost and therefore result in less affordable homes • Having a minimum requirement may encourage the developer/ owner to build to the minimum and no more. 	Recommended approach

Options for encouraging travel demand management to be considered as part of development	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Do nothing			Not recommended, as considered to be ineffective at achieving the relevant objectives and policies.
2. Voluntary guidelines to encourage developers to undertake initiatives to reduce car use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is less costly than drafting regulations as there is not the same need to be specific about the requirements. • More flexible to enable a developer or occupier of a building to address the issues in a way that suits their individual situation. • This is likely to be less controversial than imposing regulation. • Least costly for the developer in term of administration and compliance. • With regard to trying to achieve behavioral change, this may be at least as effective as mandating that travel plans etc be done - as such regulation will be relatively ineffective if the people are not willing. • If travel plans have been voluntarily prepared there are less likely to be the same compliance and monitoring problems as the employers/ employees genuinely want to make it work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most instances there is less certainty as to whether it will be effective • Likely to be less effective than regulation at achieving infrastructural facilities to be provided (such as showers, etc) 	This is the recommended approach for encouraging travel plans to be prepared – see Option 4 below.
3. Regulation which requires developers to undertake initiatives to reduce car use through additional rules and assessment matters as part of resource consents for Outline Development Plans and buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty as to what will be provided in terms of end destination facilities (such as showers and lockers) • More likely to result in at least a minimum level of facilities being provided onsite, than guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More costly than guidelines as the specific requirements (for showers, bike stands etc) need to be well researched and justifiable. • Less flexible so the minimum specs may not suit all occupiers of a 	This is the recommended approach for achieving end destination facilities (such as showers, bike parks, etc) – see Option 4 below.

Options for encouraging travel demand management to be considered as part of development	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescriptive requirements make it easier for a planner and developer to know whether appropriate facilities are being provided and therefore enables an efficient Resource Consent processing (note – if the standards are met then this matter need not be considered in the Resource Consent process) 	<p>commercial building and may not deal well with changes in use of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to be more controversial than guidelines • More costly for the developer in term of administration and compliance. • Mandatory travel plans may be quite inefficient if the people concerned are not genuinely interested and very difficult to monitor compliance. 	
4. A mixture of voluntary behavioural change approaches (such as travel plans) and mandatory rules (such as			This is the recommended approach (see 2 and 3 above).

Options for ensuring good quality subdivision	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Controlled activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least costly • Consistent with the rest of the District Plan • Provided the ODP is a necessary precursor then the urban layout, roading, open spaces, lot layouts, etc have all been addressed through a restricted discretionary Resource Consent process • The issues of consideration are limited largely to servicing and the finalization of cadastral boundaries • Avoids unnecessary duplication 		Recommended approach
2. Restricted discretionary		More costly and deemed to be duplication of the ODP considerations	Not recommended

3. Controlled for small and restricted discretionary for larger scale		More costly and deemed to be duplication of the ODP considerations	Not recommended
4. Full discretionary		More costly and deemed to be duplication of the ODP considerations	Not recommended

Options for providing for visitor accommodation in the Southern Wanaka zone without adversely effecting residential cohesion and uses in commercial areas	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
1. Make visitor accommodation a controlled activity and leave the mix up to the market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility for the developer to develop as per market demand/ highest value end use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of this achieving desired outcomes in the HDR zone (i.e. a sustainable community) Driven by the investment market rather than demand 	Not recommended
2. Specify a % mix of visitor accommodation and residential uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be appropriate in a greenfields situation such as this Creates a mixture of uses, which is common to many of the residential areas in Wanaka 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffective at dealing with protecting residential coherence, Provides little certainty Ineffective at dealing with reverse sensitivity/ conflicts between the uses Difficult to administer/ monitor Difficult to justify the chosen percentage split 	Not recommended
3. Provide a specific subzone for visitor accommodation where low density residential would be prevented from occurring and visitor accommodation would be the favoured use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would effectively protect residential coherence in the residential subzones Provides certainty Reduces reverse sensitivity/ conflicts between the uses 		The creation of the Tourism and community facilities subzone is recommended as part of the preferred approach
4. Separate the MDR zone into specific subzones – one for visitor accommodation and the other for residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures there is land that is purely for MDR residential and will be developed as such thereby providing this choice to the market Will foster the establishment of MD residential neighbourhoods Means that units are built specifically for the residential purpose rather than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Means need to get the quantum (ha) correct and justifiable at the Structure Plan/ Plan Change stage –which would be difficult especially in that this subzone is in the latter stages of development. Splits uses more which reduces flexibility of use over time. 	Not recommended

Options for providing for visitor accommodation in the Southern Wanaka zone without adversely effecting residential cohesion and uses in commercial areas	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
	a hybrid visitor accommodation/ res unit which serves neither use well.		
5. Require ODP to identify residential and visitor accommodation precincts within various subzones within the zone which serve real demand and meets the objectives and policies for the zone	As in Option 4 above, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less work up front/ in re-working the Structure Plan • The market for the two uses will be better understood at the ODP stage than it is now • Enables the urban layout etc to be planned at the ODP stage in a manner which maximize amenity and reduces conflicts of uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More work at the ODP stage 	Recommended approach, in combination with Option 3 above.

Options for addressing affordable housing	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
Matters to be considered in the assessment of an outline development plan include the provision of Affordable Housing in accordance with Appendix 11 of the District Plan.	<p>Increased certainty at that stage of development allows for detailed consideration of what is proposed and how Affordable Housing might be achieved.</p> <p>Proposals can incorporate appropriate locations and low cost solutions.</p>	<p>Less certainty for developer of what the costs will be at this stage (offset to some extent by default mitigation rates in Appendix 11 which should provide for reasonable estimations to be made).</p> <p>Lack of certainty of the outcome of Plan Change 24 or other Policy under the AH:ETA Bill. If they fail, no Affordable Housing may be delivered.</p>	
<p>Through a private agreement outside the District Plan. (as in Mt Cardrona, Riverside, Jacks Point, Pen Bay)</p> <p>Balance of provisions that encourage some housing types that are conducive to lower</p>	<p>Certainty for developer as this won't be a regulatory barrier in the future.</p> <p>Money up front for housing trust (but could be staged).</p>	<p>Difficult to specify locations of Affordable Housing and achieve aims of mix throughout development etc.</p> <p>Less certainty that 'market solutions' for Affordable Housing would ever eventuate.</p>	

Options for addressing affordable housing	Benefits	Costs	Recommendations
costs.		Possibility that over time the requirement under Plan Change 24 or the AH:ETA would have been higher.	
Combination of options 1 and 2.	Should guarantee a minimum amount will be delivered as community affordable housing.	Still leaves some uncertainty for a developer as to requirement.	Preferred option.

