



QUEENSTOWN  
LAKES DISTRICT  
COUNCIL



**Name** Fenton, Brian

<b>Position</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>SubNo.</b>
Oppose	Residential development	<p>I have always favoured this site as a splendid site for the greenfields proposed sports complex. Surely Koromiko, Penisular Bay etc developments will service the future residential demands for a growing population. My fear this is another ploy on the Council's part to forestall the placement of the sports complex in this admirable area.</p> <p>Residential development of this site will further exacerbate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the ribbon development that beggars Wanaka</li><li>- the consequent infrastructure costs,</li><li>- and add to the QLDC's recently installed sewerage facility stress.</li></ul>	4/1/1

**Name** Harris, Neville

<b>Position</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>SubNo.</b>
Oppose	Visitor accomodation	<p>As a long time resident and member of the Golf Club who has been involved over a long period of time in the development and administration of the course to its present high standards I am concerned at some aspects of the Proposed Plan Change.</p> <p>The area adjacent to the south of the golf course is proposed to become visitor accomodation overlooking the Golf Course. This is most inappropriate. The golf club has undertaken extensive planting over the years to give shelter and aesthetic value to the course and for the management of the course.</p> <p>The club boundary with the plan change had extensive tree planting and would have to be retained at all costs. The development of housing on the boundary would causer no end of disputes between future owners and the Golf Club and would become a civil matter in time.</p> <p>Not opposed to the plan change but the conflict that will occur on the golf club boundary should be addressed at this time. The land adjacent to the Golf Club should be left as open space and zoned recreation.</p>	4/2/1
Support	Sports complex	<p>Sensible to locate the soports complex in this area as it would be sheltered, would offer all that the people of Wanaka would want without being in conflict with neighbours as siting the complex on the showgrounds/camping ground would be.</p>	4/2/2
Oppose	Housing densities	<p>Should be low density with perhaps some affordable housing. The use of this land for medium density is not desirable as there are far more desirable areas in Wanaka for this type of housing.</p>	4/2/3
Support	Timing	<p>The plan change should proceed as required to give residents and future residents an indication of what is becoming available in the future, but the actual physical work will be determined by future demand.</p>	4/2/4

Name Hunter, Bill

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Whole plan change	<p>Opposed to any plan change without assurances that QLDC has the means and the will to control undesirable growth contrary to its existing plan. Stop any further district plan changes until it demonstrates that it can effectively administer the current plan.</p> <p>Over the past few years I have been appalled by the mindless and gutless response by the QLDC to approaches by developers who are seeking further developments which subvert the current district plan.</p> <p>Two examples provided. Lansdown Street where Wanaka Luxury Apartments accounts for 12 dwellings located on what were originally three lots. Not gradual infilling but a sustained effort by developers to asset strip their neighbours aided and abetted by the QLDC out to maximise subdivision fees and rate income. Most never sent through notified resource consents processes. QLDC takes pride in the number of resource consents it permits without reference to affected third parties. The initial developers of the Wanaka Luxury Apartments and one other development have since cashed up and left.</p> <p>Other example is the retirement complex in Stoney Creek. QLDC assisted the developer with its plans without public knowledge, effectively compromising its ability to oppose breaches of the district plan when the developer lodged a resource consent. When the consent was lodged QLDC did nothing, leaving the ratepayers to front an expensive Environment Court process to oppose the development.</p> <p>Opposed to the plan change as it is mindless and lacks credibility.</p>	4/3/1
Oppose	Land adjacent to Golf Course	<p>What does medium density residential with a visitor accommodation overlay mean? I can guess what will happen here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Developers will pack as much as possible into the zone and QLDC will give them every assistance.</li><li>- To maximise the view over the Golf Course and the value of development before they cash out they will pressure the golf course to remove the two rows of trees which currently act as a buffer zone between the Golf Course and the adjoining farm.</li><li>- QLDC will give them assistance using existing bylaws governing the height of trees on the boundary and if that doesn't work add some pressure as landlord of the Golf Course.</li><li>- Visitors will find golf balls at close range hurt and do property damage.</li><li>- Golfers will find the course increasingly compromised by people (visitors) availing themselves of a short cut to town.</li></ul> <p>Residential development adjoining golf courses only work if they are very low density or well away from the boundary of the courses for safety reasons.</p> <p>Medium density will inevitably be a dangerous high density development.</p>	4/3/2

Name King, Loris

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Oppose	Mix of housing types	<p>I have serious reservations about the mix of housing types in this area. I feel we still have other more suitable land available for these developments and also feel strongly that affordable housing must be interspersed within other low density residential subdivisions - not clustered together.</p>	4/4/1
Oppose	Visitor accommodation	<p>Not the most appropriate area for visitor accommodation. In the past we have urged Council to zone areas for visitor accommodation on higher ground around the rim or back of town. If they are on higher ground they will not block out neighbour's sunlight and views. These areas took advantage of the views that visitors expected and because of the land formation and underground water, were often more challenging to build on so therefore more within the scope of larger companies rather than individuals. Eg the Pines Resort and the undeveloped land on Lakeside Road.</p> <p>There is still higher ground at the back of development on the south west side of Lake Wanaka and this could continue in a westerly direction to meet up with the other visitor accommodation already operating on the Mount Roy side of Mount Aspiring Road.</p>	4/4/2
Support	Sports complex	<p>The land adjacent to the Golf Course should be zoned as reserve land for recreation. It is an ideal site for the proposed sports complex and the majority of people wanted the complex to be located out of town somewhere in the vicinity of Ballantyne Road/Three Parks area.</p> <p>Zoning a large area of this plan change for present and future recreation purposes would give certainty to a major issue facing this community, and stave off major hold ups other contentious sites will pose.</p>	4/4/3
Support	Timing	<p>Important for the plan change to happen now so there is some certainty in what is proposed. The zoning is the immediate issue - the work can come later.</p>	4/4/4

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Location	The plan change provides for a logical extension of the Wanaka township to join up to the Three Parks Area. It will connect with Three Parks rather than being open rural land between Three Parks and the Wanaka township.	4/5/1
Support	Supply	It ensures that not all land for future development is held in one ownership, thus keeping competition in the market place for section prices.	4/5/2
Support	Constraints	The site is suitable for the development, and being closer to the town centre does not have the same servicing issues as other potential areas for urban expansion.	4/5/3
Support	Council Strategic Planning	The proposed plan change is consistent with the Wanaka 2020 and Wanaka Structure Plan, and provides for the type of development anticipated in the Wanaka Structure Plan.	4/5/4
Support	Type of development	Provides for a range of housing densities including low and medium density. Medium density is not widely available in Wanaka. The development is considered appropriate for this type of development.	4/5/5
		Provides space for visitor accommodation, and is the only space identified for visitor accommodation in the Wanaka Structure Plan.	
Support	Timing	It is considered the plan change should occur now to provide certainty for a logical sequence of development, and prevent the decline in appearance during transition in land uses.  The plan change can provide for a staged release of land to ensure the progression of development and provision of infrastructure.	4/5/6

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Location	<p>Enables the logical extension of Wanaka outwards to join with the recently approved Three Parks development. It would be sensible to connect and integrate Three Parks to Wanaka through an urban area rather than having Three Parks separated from town by a rural area.</p> <p>Allows better road, pedestrian and cycle connections between Three Parks and the town centre.</p>	4/6/1
Support	Supply	Having a supply of land available for building increases market competition and can help lower section prices. Ensures that not all land identified for future development is held in one ownership.	4/6/2
Support	Constraints	Investigations to date have revealed that this site is suitable for development. Closer proximity to the town centre and does not have same sensitivities or servicing issues as other potential areas for urban expansion.	4/6/3
Support	Integrated	Integrated planning for the remaining rural area rather than ad hoc resource consent applications or individual site specific plan changes.	4/6/4
Support	Consistency with Council Strategic Planning	Consistent with and implements Wanaka 2020 and Wanaka Structure Plan. Provides for the types of development anticipated in the Wanka Structure Plan 2007.	4/6/5
Support	Type of development	<p>Support mix of medium and low density housing shown on Wanaka Structure Plan and discussion pamphlet. Provides for a range of densities. Medium density is not widely available in Wanaka. The location is appropriate for these types of development.</p> <p>Support the location of VA and note this is the only area identified for VA in the Wanaka Structure Plan.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of parks and reserves along SH84 to preserve the appearance of the entrance to Wanaka and along the Golf Course to provide open space for public amenity and pleasant cycle and walking access along the Golf Course and within the development to increase the amenity within any future development.</p> <p>Support an area of mixed business consistent with Three Parks and business activities on the south western side of Ballantyne Road and the location and appearance of the existing Wanaka sub station.</p> <p>It is appropriate for the existing Three Parks zones to be used, as this provides consistency, is efficient and is cost effective. These zones are appropriate and developed for the adjacent site with similar constraints and issues.</p> <p>Support development in accordance with good urban design principles.</p>	4/6/6
Support	Potential for sports, recreational and community facilities	Could provide a location for the Proposed Wanaka Sports Facilities on the edge of Three Parks Commercial Core.	4/6/7
Support	Timing	<p>Although there is sufficient supply of residential land in Wanaka the plan change should occur now. Need to provide for certainty for a logical sequence of development, allows for owners to plan for their long term future, helps to prevent any decline in appearance or standard of maintenance during the transition in land uses.</p> <p>Should provide for staged release of land to ensure logical progression of development and provision of infrastructure.</p>	4/6/8

*Name Norman, Chris*

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Roading	Support link road off SH84 along the south east boundary of the golf course to meet Golf Course Road at Ballantyne Road. This will be a crucial across town route that will help ease congestion from Brownston Street. Already in the mornings with traffic coming onto the roundabout from Anderson Road traffic can build up on SH84 as far back as the fire hazard sign.	4/7/1
Support	Visitor accomodation	<p>Support VA adjoining a green outlook (Golf Course) but I do not see the Golf Course ever departing with their tall shelterbelt of trees so this would never be a great outlook for this zone. However if the VA was moved south this would allow an area of green belt and then VA, and then medium density residential.</p> <p>The advantages would be that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The green belt of Mount Iron/Alberttown would in affect be linked to the green belt of Golf Course Road. The Northern Nine holes of the golf course remain an exclusive domain of the golf club whereas the public do use the trails that have been created on the Southern nine holes of the golf course (South of Ballantyne Road).</li><li>-The Visitor Accommodation Overlay would be given a true green outlook that is far enough back from the shelter belt that it would be offered mountain views.</li><li>-The Visitor Accommodation Overlay would be separated from the busy 'link road' improving the quality of accommodation.</li><li>-There would be no Low Density Residential zoning along the busy Ballantyne Road. This would be replaced by a strip of medium density that would sit more happily against the Mixed Business Zone of Three Parks and Industrial Zoning across Ballantyne Road.</li><li>-There would be no Low Density Residential against the Commercial / Retail zoning (shown in red) to the Northeast corner of the Structure Plan.</li></ul> <p>This would create far happier relationships between various zones and would guarentee an important green linkage that is discussed in the Structue Plan but is absent from the Three Parks proposal.</p>	4/7/2

*Name NZ Transport Agency*

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Other	General	<p>The proposed plan change appears to be appropriately aligned with the expectations of the community as detailed in a number of community planning documents.</p> <p>We note there is a considerable amount of land already zoned for residential in Wanaka. However the population projections indicate significant growth will continue. It is prudent to further increase the supply of residential land in Wanaka. Having a supply of land that exceeds demand is beneficial as it removes a reason for allowing 'out of zone' development that is not in keeping with the long term vision of the community.</p> <p>We support the concept of planning to provide a clear direction for the future. Rezoning provides an opportunity for the coordinated development of a site. This is preferable to piecemeal development of numerous ad hoc resource consents that often do not provide good integrated planning outcomes.</p>	4/8/1
Support	Coordinating development	<p>We support the concept of coordinating development of the North Three Parks site with that of the adjacent Three Parks Zone. We support the concept of Three Parks providing residential areas of varying densities along with some retail and business areas as it will reduce the need to travel to the existing facilities in Wanaka.</p> <p>Also like communities generally interact with each other so should not be physically seperated. Locating North Three Parks adjacent to Three Parks is advantageous as it provides an opportunity for the two communities to interact while reducing the demand to travel.</p>	4/8/2
Support	Integration	<p>If the propopsed plan change progresses some consideration should be given to the physical connections between Three Parks and North Three Parks to ensure they are well integrated. The Three Parks Structure Plan provides for a network of roads with a logical hierarchy. We suggest North Three Parks should adopt a similar approach and and utilise the same connections to the major arterial routes as Three Parks thus eliminating the need to create additional intersections. This is particulalry important for State Highway 84.</p>	4/8/3

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Other	Stormwater quality and quantity	<p>Stormwater quality and quantity is of extreme importance for greenfield developments. This is identified in the RPS for Otago and the Regional Plan:Water for Otago. RPS policy 6.5.5 (a) and Regional Plan Policy 5.4.2(2) are both relevant.</p> <p>The ORC considers the following principles should be applied to the proposed development through the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The rate of stormwater discharge shall remain equal to or less than that of pre-development up to the 1 in 100 average recurrence interval event;</li> <li>- The quality of stormwater discharge shall remain equal to or better than that of pre-development;</li> <li>- That the disposal of stormwater is managed to avoid erosion, land instability and property damage.</li> </ul> <p>These principles will ensure that flood risk is not exacerbated and that stormwater discharge does not degrade the quality of the receiving environment or cause erosion, land instability or property damage.</p>	4/9/1
Other	Groundwater	<p>The site is located above the Wanaka Basin Cardrona Gravel Aquifer as mapped in the regional plan. Information held by the Council indicates that the depth to groundwater below the site varies from approximately 7 metres to 28 metres.</p> <p>ORC is concerned about groundwater interception and contamination as detailed in the regional Plan issue 9.2.3, Objective 9.3.3 and Policies 9.4.1, 9.4.18 and 9.4.19. There is the potential for ground water exposure and interception (via excavation for underground car parking etc) and groundwater contamination (via discharges from industrial and other land uses). This should be considered as part of the plan change.</p> <p>ORC request that the general earthworks rules in the district plan relate to this site also as they include provisions relating to the exposure of groundwater.</p>	4/9/2
Other	Natural hazards	<p>ORC records show the site is potentially susceptible to seismic hazard. The North West Cardrona Fault runs adjacent to the Cardrona River, approximately 900 metres from the site.</p> <p>This fault is described as active, there being evidence of Holocene activity (last 10,000 years). The fault has a recurrence interval of 7,500 years with a fault rupture displacement of 2 metres. The estimated magnitude of the seismic event is 7.0. The site has a ground class of deep or soft soil which may result in shaking from seismic events.</p> <p>ORC acknowledges that the risk is small but recommends that the means of addressing the threat are considered at the plan change development stage.</p>	4/9/3
Other	Potentially contaminated land	<p>Sheep dipping and wool/hide/skin processing may have previously occurred on the subject site. These activities have the potential to have contaminated the site. ORC recommends that an investigation is undertaken by a suitably qualified professional into potential contamination.</p> <p>If contaminants are found above relevant guidelines the site will need to be made fit for the proposed residential use. Consent for disturbance of land would also be required under the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago.</p>	4/9/4

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	General	<p>Suitable zone change consistent with and implements Wanka 2020 and Wanaka Structure Plan.</p> <p>It provides for types of development within the plan and would be a very sensible change.</p> <p>Also it allows for a better connection between the Three Parks and the town centre.</p>	4/10/1

Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	SubNo.
Partly Support	Mix of housing types	<p>Want a greater mix of housing type. Instead of a block of medium density and a block of low density we should have a small block of each interdispersed through the development. This would result in a more integrated neighbourhood with greater diversity (and look less like lego land). Visually mixed density lots look more interesting and varied and less clinical and uniform. Better not to zone areas as affordable and create pits in the market. Instead integrate affordable housing into the fabric of the neighbourhood. Affordable housing should not be labelled as less desired but should be embraced by the community. We need to provide housing for singles and young families who want to establish themselves in our community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include high density housing to further increase diversity and to maximise the efficient use of land.</li> <li>• There are no details of the mixed business zoning in the leaflet. Do not want this as it is part of the second town centre area. Wanaka does not need a second centre-will result in a fragmented town with no heart. Lots of undeveloped land in the town centre and many only single storey. Important not to discourage further development of the current town centre as businesses move away for cheaper rent. Council should concentrate on the current business and residential zones.</li> </ul>	4/11/1
Partly Support	Provision for affordable housing, open space and community and recreational facilities	Affordable housing -see previous comment. Childrens playgrounds should be provided, possibly even BBQ areas.	4/11/2
Oppose	Timing	Too early. It will discourage development within existing residential areas e.g. Kirimoko, Riverside and Peninsular Bay. Wait to see if growth projections are accurate.	4/11/3
Partly Support	Appropriate location	Do we need more VA? Can't we provide for expansion and/or intensification of existing VA?	4/11/4
Other	What sort of district plan controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building envelope to exclude solar panels to encourage people to use solar panels (A solar saver scheme like Nelson would be optimal).</li> <li>• Rainwater and greywater tanks should be compulsory (like Kapiti Council). Water table is decreasing and we should not waste resources. Being a leader in water conservation would benefit our clean green image.</li> <li>• Stormwater from roads should be dealt with via rain gardens.</li> </ul>	4/11/5

<i>Position</i>	<i>Plan Provision</i>	<i>Decision Requested</i>	<i>SubNo.</i>
Support	Activity mix	PC4 should reflect the Wanaka Structure Plan. Willowridge seeks that rezoning is limited to low and medium density residential activity and visitor accomodation.	4/12/1
Support	Roading	<p>Important that the roading in PC4 is consistent with the roading proposed in PC 16 and the wider future road network (as identified in the Wanka Structure Plan and Transportation Strategy).</p> <p>An additional road linkage at the north western corner of the PC4 area (forming the intersection with Golf Course Road) eventually linking with the Three Parks commercial core should be considered. This would provide a direct and efficient link from the three parsk and othern Three Parks areas for the existing Wanaka town centre.</p> <p>Roading should be fixed on a structure plan, which should comprise part of the zone provisions. All development should be in accordance with this structure plan. To ensure compatibility with the PC16 road network Willowridge seeks input into the location of the roading on the PC4 structure plan prior to finalisation and notification of PC4.</p>	4/12/2
Support	Open space overlay	<p>Willowridge seeks to alter the open space overlay for PC 16 via its appeal and is currently discussing with QLDC to reach agreement over the location of open space for PC16. Willowridge submitts that there is an opportunity for PC4 to link with and expand the open space network that Willowridge seeks to create through PC16. This could result in an open space and recreational resource which would be of significant value to both the future Three Parks and North Three Parks residents as well as the wider Wanaka community.</p> <p>To take advantage of this oppotunity Willowridge submitts that an open space overlay is developed for PC4. Willowridge seeks input on the location of the open space provided for in this overlay.</p>	4/12/3
Oppose	Affordable housing	It is unecessary for PC4 to provide specifically for affordable housing. PC 24 seeks to introduce affordable housing obligations into the district plan. Willowridge has appealed this plan change on the basis that such obligations are unecessary and onerous. Willowridge submitts that no affordable housing obligations should be levied on PC 4.	4/12/4
Support	Overall plan change	<p>Willowridge supports plan changes that seek to implement the Wanaka Structure Plan and requests that PC4 is not notified until the Environment Court has issued a decision on PC16 and that decision is beyond appeal. This will ensure that PC4 can accuratley reflect the final decision on PC16, particularly in terms of roading and open space.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to meet with you prior to the drafting of PC4 to discuss these submittsions in more detail.</p>	4/12/5