

Appendix 1: Copy of Appellant's Submission

FORM 5**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED URBAN INTENSIFICATION
VARIATION TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED
DISTRICT PLAN****Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991**

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name of submitter: Richard Thomas

Address for Service: Richard Thomas
C/- Southern Planning Group
P O Box 1081
Queenstown 9300

Attention:
Alex Dunn
alex@southernplanning.co.nz
027 840 2855



1. This is a submission on the Urban Intensification Variation (Proposed District Plan)

2. Trade Competition

The submitter could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

3. Omitted

4. Richard Thomas' (The Submitter) submission is that:

Site Details

- 4.1 The Submitter represent the owners of a site located at 634 Frankton Road, Queenstown. The site has a legal description of Lot 1 DP 9121.

Proposed District Plan

- 4.2 In terms of the Proposed District Plan (PDP), the site is contained within the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) and is also within the visitor accommodation subzone.

Supporting Submission Points

- 4.3 The Submitter supports the overall intent of the Variation, including the following amendments within the MDRZ as proposed by the Variation (numbering based off the notified version of the Variation):

Chapter 8 – Medium Density Suburban Residential Zone

- a) The amendments to the zone purpose of the MDRZ.
- b) Policy 8.2.1.4 which acknowledges low-rise apartments within the zone.
- c) Objective 8.2.3 which acknowledges the changing future character of the zone.
- d) Policy 8.2.3.1 which acknowledges amenity values will change over time as intensification occurs.
- e) Policy 8.2.3.2 which requires high quality living environments with associated outcomes.
- f) Policy 8.2.5.2 (noting this should be 8.2.5.3 as there are two policies referenced as 8.2.5.2) as it relates to acknowledging planned infrastructure upgrades.
- g) The deletion of 8.3.2.5 which requires the identification of net site area around each residential unit when more than one residential unit is proposed.

- h) Matter of discretion d) within Rule 8.4.10.3 as it relates to providing a range of unit sizes and typologies to advance housing diversity.
- i) Rule 8.5.1.3 which provides for a maximum height of 11 metres, plus an additional 1 metre for pitched roof forms.
- j) The deletion of existing Rule 8.5.5 as it relates to a maximum density of one residential unit per 250m² net site area.
- k) Rule 8.5.5 which requires outdoor living space for each residential or visitor accommodation unit.
- l) Rule 8.5.6 which requires outlook space for each residential or visitor accommodation unit.

Chapter 27 – Subdivision & Development

- a) The inclusion of the words 'greater diversity in housing typologies' in Policy 27.2.1.4.
- b) The inclusion of the words 'and the anticipated future character intended for the respective zones' within Policy 27.2.3.2(d).
- c) Within Rule 27.7.32, deleting the words 'infill development' and replacing it with 'residential development'.
- d) Changing the minimum dimension area from 12m x 12m to 10m x 12m.

Opposing Submission Points

4.4 The submitter opposes the following provision within the MDSR Zone:

Medium Density Residential Zone

- a) Rule 8.5.7 which results in recession planes also applying to sloping sites.

4.5 Commentary on the opposing submission point is detailed below.

Rule 8.5.7 – Recession Planes

- 4.6 Currently, recession planes only apply to accessory buildings on sloping sites. The proposed rule would result in recession planes applying to all buildings on sloping sites. Applying recession plans on sloping sites will severely restrict building height and will not encourage intensification.
- 4.7 It is submitted that not enough consideration has been given to the unique topography of Queenstown, which contains extremely steep residential areas.
- 4.8 It is submitted that for sloping sites, the recession plane requirement for residential units be removed.

5 The submitter seek the following decision from the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

- 5.1 The Submitter supports and seeks that the Council confirms the points contained within Point 4.3 of this submission.
- 5.2 The submitter seeks confirmation that the current visitor accommodation subzone is not impacted by the variation as the subzone mapping is not shown on the Variation maps.
- 5.3 As outlined above, the submitter opposes and seeks the following decision from the Council:
- a) Remove the requirement that buildings on sloping sites are to comply with recession planes under Rule 8.5.7.
- 5.3 The proposed changes to the MDRZ contained in this submission are necessary to give better effect to the outcomes proposed in the Variation in terms of the appropriate intensification of the MDRZ, and further, the proposed changes are necessary to most appropriately give effect to the higher order provisions in the PDP, the relevant objectives and policies within the MDRZ, and ultimately Part 2 of the Act.
- 5.4 The submitter also seeks such further or consequential or alternative amendments necessary to give effect to this submission, and to:
- (a) promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.
 - (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - (c) ensure the methods proposed are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Variation.
 - (d) enable social, economic and cultural well being;
 - (d) represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of other means available in terms of section 32 and other provisions of the Act.

6. The submitter wishes to be heard in support of their submission.

7. If others make a similar submission the submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature



Alex Dunn (on behalf of the Submitter)

5 October 2023