

**Appendix A – Relief sought**

Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
<b>Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin</b>		
<p><b>Rule 24.5.7 Height of buildings</b></p> <p><b>Rule 24.5.7.1</b> <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 6m.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p> <p><b>Rule 24.5.7.2</b> <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: NC]</p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>A maximum building height of 8m as a restricted discretionary activity is appropriate in the Basin.</p> <p>There are circumstances where higher buildings are appropriate and lead to positive design and landscape outcomes. Allowing for an 8m height limit as a restricted discretionary activity provides for flexible planning and promotes positive design outcomes where a taller building is appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.7 Height of buildings:</p> <p><b>Rule 24.5.7.1</b> <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be <u>6</u>m.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p> <p><del><b>Rule 24.5.7.2</b> <i>The maximum height of buildings shall be 8m.</i></del></p> <p><del>[non-compliance: NC]</del></p>
<p><b>Rule 24.5.8 Setback from roads</b></p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be 75m in the Precinct and 20m elsewhere in the Rural Amenity Zone.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p> <p><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></p> <p><i>a. Building location, character, scale and form;</i></p> <p><i>b. External appearance including materials and colours;</i></p> <p><i>c. Landscaping/planting (existing and proposed).</i></p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>A 75m setback from roads in the Precinct is unworkable for the majority of lots in existence and thus creates an arbitrary standard that cannot be complied with.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.8 – Setback from roads</p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be <u>75</u>10m in the Precinct and 20m elsewhere in the <del>Rural Amenity</del> Zone.</i></p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p>
<p><b>Rule 24.5.13 Farm Buildings</b></p> <p><i>Farm buildings</i></p> <p><i>a. The maximum gross floor area of any farm building shall be 50m<sup>2</sup>.</i></p> <p><i>b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or</i></p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>A maximum gross floor area of 50m<sup>2</sup> is unreasonably limited. A maximum of 150m<sup>2</sup> better provides for farming activities while maintaining landscape character and amenity values.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.5.13 Farm Buildings</p> <p><i>Farm buildings</i></p> <p><i>a. The maximum gross floor area of any farm building shall be <u>150</u>m<sup>2</sup>.</i></p> <p><i>b. All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or</i></p>

Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
<p>greys (except soffits).</p> <p>c. Pre-painted steel and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%.</p> <p>d. All other surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. Building location, character, scale and form;</p> <p>b. External appearance including materials and colours; and</p> <p>c. Landform modification/planting (existing and proposed).</p>		<p>greys (except soffits).</p> <p>c. Pre-painted steel and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%.</p> <p>d. All other surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p>[non-compliance: RD]</p>
<p><b>Schedule 24.8 Landscape Character Units</b></p> <p><b>Landscape Character Unit 24: Arrowtown South</b></p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>As currently drafted the description of LCU 24 does not accurately reflect the character of the area.</p> <p>The second paragraph under 'Sense of Place' is opposed. Whilst the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA is of a density and design similar to urban development, the idea that the Village compromises the greenbelt effect of the wider LCU 24 around Arrowtown is opposed.</p> <p>The Queenstown Country Club is not within LCU 24 so this is likely to be an error which should instead refer to the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 24.8 LCU 24 as follows:</p> <p>1. On page 24-66 under 'Sense of Place', delete the second paragraph:</p> <p><del>However, this 'greenbelt' effect, together with the legibility of the escarpment as a robust defensible edge to Arrowtown has been significantly compromised by the Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village SHA which confers a distinctly urban character in a prominent and sizeable part of the unit.</del></p> <p>2. On page 24-67 under 'Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development': Delete reference to Queenstown Country Club' and replace with 'Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village'.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 27 Subdivision</b></p>		

Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought																		
<p><b>27.6 rules – Standards for Minimum Lot Areas</b></p> <p><i>27.6.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, an average net site area less than the minimum specified.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="219 416 752 794"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Zone</th> <th>Minimum Lot Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rural</td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</td> <td>80ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</td> <td>6000m<sup>2</sup> 1.0ha minimum average</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone		Minimum Lot Area	Rural	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80ha		Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	6000m <sup>2</sup> 1.0ha minimum average	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>The minimum lot area approach is opposed in the first instance and a discretionary subdivision regime with no minimum lot sizes is preferred.</p> <p>In the alternative, it is considered appropriate to have no minimum lot size in the WBRAZ, in accordance with the approach taken for the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>The 80ha minimum lot size in the WBRAZ is an illogical and arbitrary value that is not representative of existing landholdings in the Wakatipu Basin, which will not be able to be reasonably enforced, and which will unreasonably limit appropriate development.</p> <p>In the WBLP an <u>average</u> density approach is proposed (should rule 27.6.1 not be deleted), with 4000m<sup>2</sup> as the average minimum. This minimum is appropriate for the WBLP as it reflects existing land use and provides for an appropriate degree of limited further development, which can be regulated by the standards proposed in Chapter 24 to maintain landscape character and amenity values.</p> <p>An <u>average</u> minimum as opposed to a minimum lot size allows for flexible design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and development which leads to optimal landscape outcomes and better utilisation of land.</p>	<p>1. Delete Rule 27.6.1 (as it relates to the Wakatipu Basin) and replace with a discretionary subdivision regime.</p> <p>In the alternative</p> <p>2. Amend 27.6 rules – Standards for Minimum Lot Areas</p> <p><i>27.6.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, an average net site area less than the minimum specified.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1518 651 2175 971"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Zone</th> <th>Minimum Lot Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><del>Rural</del> Wakatipu Basin</td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone</td> <td><del>No minimum</del> 80ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct</td> <td><del>6000m<sup>2</sup></del> 4000m<sup>2</sup> minimum <u>average</u> <del>1.0ha minimum average</del></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone		Minimum Lot Area	<del>Rural</del> Wakatipu Basin	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	<del>No minimum</del> 80ha		Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	<del>6000m<sup>2</sup></del> 4000m <sup>2</sup> minimum <u>average</u> <del>1.0ha minimum average</del>
Zone		Minimum Lot Area																		
Rural	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	80ha																		
	Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	6000m <sup>2</sup> 1.0ha minimum average																		
Zone		Minimum Lot Area																		
<del>Rural</del> Wakatipu Basin	Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone	<del>No minimum</del> 80ha																		
	Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct	<del>6000m<sup>2</sup></del> 4000m <sup>2</sup> minimum <u>average</u> <del>1.0ha minimum average</del>																		

Provision (PDP decision version)	Reason for appeal	Relief sought
<b>Planning Maps</b>		
<b>Planning Maps 13d and 26</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>Zoning of the McDonnell and Lake Hayes Land and LCUs 24 and 13 as Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone is opposed as this zoning does not reflect the actual established character of these areas as rural residential in nature, and fails to recognise the capacity of the areas to absorb further appropriate development. It inappropriately limits the building rights of the landholder and does not recognise the social, cultural and economic benefits of rural living development.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone the McDonnell Land legally described as Lot 3 DP 506191 and the entirety of LCU 24 to WBLP with a minimum lot density of 4000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>2. Rezone the Lake Hayes Land legally described as Lot 1 DP 358538 and the entirety of LCU 13 to Rural Residential Zone as notified in Stage 1.</li> </ol>