

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of a submission on the Queenstown
Lakes Proposed District Plan

BY **QUARTZ COMMERCIAL GROUP
LIMITED**
Submitter

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TIMOTHY TURLEY WILLIAMS ON
BEHALF OF THE SUBMITTER**

Dated: 29 May 2020

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL:

Introduction

- [1] My full name is Timothy Turley Williams. I hold the Qualifications of Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University and Masters of Urban Design and Development with Distinction from The University of New South Wales. I reside in Queenstown.
- [2] I have practiced in the planning and urban design field in the Queenstown Lakes District since 2003. I am a director of Williams & Co a Queenstown based planning and urban design consultancy.
- [3] I have 16 years experience in planning, resource management and urban design roles. I have been involved in a wide range of planning and design based matters throughout the District, this has included SHA applications, master planned developments, subdivisions of a variety of scales, policy development and other resource management consultancy services. I have worked in both local government and private sector roles.
- [4] My involvement with the submission site commenced when consideration was being given to the implications of the notified Stage 3 plan provisions. This including advice in relation to the submission and further submission lodge on behalf of Quartz Commercial Group Limited.
- [5] Whilst this is not an Environment Court hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with it and I agree to comply with it. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

Scope of Evidence

- [6] In preparing this evidence I have reviewed:
- (a) The s42A reports, Strategic Overview prepared by Mr Barr, Chapter 20 Settlements prepared by Ms Bowbyes and Settlement and Lower Density Suburban Residential Zones-

Mapping prepared by Ms Devlin. I have also read Councils s32 report Townships along with associated expert reports.

[7] The evidence has been prepared to address the submission of Quartz Commercial Group Limited submission number 3328.

Background

[8] Quartz Commercial Group Limited owns Lot 1 DP 300397 & Lot 1 DP 27336, the subject Site. Quartz Commercial Group a related entity operates the Hotel, Bar and accommodation on site.

[9] The Site is currently zoned Township in the Operative District Plan (ODP) with a Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone (VASZ) over approximately three quarters of the Site. The Site is proposed to be zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential (LDSR) with a VASZ in the Proposed District Plan (PDP). Figure 1 below identifies the Site and extent of the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone as notified in the PDP. A copy of this plan is also attached to my evidence **Appendix [A]**.



Figure 1: Site and Visitor Accommodation Subzone

[10] The Site currently contains the Lake Hawea Hotel & Bar and associated visitor accommodation facilities. The facilities include:

- (a) A restaurant catering for up to 120 people.
- (b) Bar and associated garden bar.
- (c) 6 Family Suites and 3 Studios
- (d) Hostel Accommodation for up to 30 people.
- (e) Facilities to accommodate events and functions including weddings

[11] In addition to the above the Site holds several resource consents providing for specific events including:

- (a) RM160371 – Consenting use of the Site for three outdoor music events one on New Years Eve till 12.30am and two others till 11.30pm. The consent has a 15 year timeframe, lapsing on 20 June 2031. The consent allows for breaches of noise standards, specific provision for sale of alcohol and a maximum number of paying attendees of 2,500 persons per event.
- (b) RM180331 – Consenting use of the Site as part of the Contact Epic mountain bike event between 2018 and 2022 providing for use of the Site for the start and finish and staging location for the event catering for up to 650 competitors.

Submission

[12] The submission can be summarised in two parts:

- (a) A request to extend the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone over the entire Site.
- (b) Changes to the provisions that relate to activities within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone.

Extent of the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone

[13] As Figure 1 above illustrates the PDP notified version of the VASZ does not extend over the entire Site. It is noted that the PDP notified version of the VASZ mirrors that which was in the ODP. Figure 2 below illustrates the extent of the sub-zone within the ODP.



Figure 2: Operative District Plan Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone

[14] The s42a Report of Ms Devlin considers this submission point in Section 24. Ms Devlin recommends the sub-zone is extended over the entire Site as requested.

[15] In my opinion it is logical for the sub-zone to extent over the entire Site in recognition of the existing and historic Visitor Accommodation use. The extension of the sub-zone over the Site will also ensure a more efficient approach to future landuse given the specific recognition the sub-zoning provides to Visitor Accommodation activity, which would otherwise be less straightforward within the Lower Density Suburban Residential zone. Accordingly I support extension of the sub-zone across the entirety of the Site.

Provisions applying within a VASZ

[16] In summary, the submission primarily sought to have the provisions that applied to the VASZ within the ODP continue to apply within the PDP VASZ. In this regard the ODP Township VASZ framework within Chapter 9 provided a series of bulk and location controls specific to

visitor accommodation landuse within the VASZ whereas the PDP framework does not provide this same level of recognition. In the PDP the VASZ framework defaults to the LDSRZ provisions. Having reviewed the s32 report prepared in respect of the Townships it is not apparent to me whether any specific consideration was given to this matter when considering the re-zoning of the Township to LDSR and the interplay with the existing VASZ and associated provisions in Chapter 9.

- [17] Objective 7.2.8 and associated policies provide a framework for both visitor accommodation within VASZ and residential visitor accommodation within the LDSRZ as follows:

7.2.8 Objective - Visitor accommodation, residential visitor accommodation and homestays are enabled at locations, and at a scale, intensity and frequency, that maintain the residential character and amenity values of the zone.

Policies 7.2.8.1 - Provide for visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation in the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zones that are appropriate for the low density residential environment, ensuring that adverse effects on residential amenity values are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Policy 7.2.8.2 - Restrict the establishment of visitor accommodation in locations outside the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zones to ensure that the zone maintains a residential character.

Policy 7.2.8.3 - Ensure that residential visitor accommodation and homestays are of a scale and character that are compatible with the surrounding residential context and maintain residential character and amenity values.

Policy 7.2.8.4 - Provide opportunities for low intensity residential visitor accommodation and homestays as a contributor to the diversity of accommodation options available to visitors and to provide for social and economic wellbeing.

Policy 7.2.8.5 - Manage the effects of residential visitor accommodation and homestays outside the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone by controlling the scale, intensity and frequency of use and those effects of the activities that differentiate them from residential activities.

- [18] In my opinion Policies 7.2.8.3 – 7.2.8.5 place a specific emphasis on managing the scale and intensity of residential visitor accommodation outside of VASZ. Notably Policy 7.2.8.5 seeks to manage the effects of RVA and homestays outside of VASZ by managing the scale, intensity and frequency of use. In my opinion the inference of this is that within VASZ there is a more enabling regime, and flexibility within a VASZ is anticipated. Policy 7.2.8.2 supports this where it seeks VA and RSZ outside of VASZ to maintain residential character. However, in my opinion, for this site, where a historic visitor accommodation use exists, and a longstanding planning framework has been in place providing for visitor accommodation activity, a default requirement requiring a low density form of development is neither efficient or effective.
- [19] In my opinion the locational nature of VASZ, their historic use for visitor accommodation activity and the ability to evaluate these specific sites in more detail enables a more refined and enabling planning regime for visitor activities to be established in recognition that they are not low density in character. In my opinion this enabling regime can occur whilst achieving objective 7.2.8 whereby the residential character and amenity values of the zone can be achieved whilst enabling visitor accommodation activities within these specific locations.
- [20] In accordance with s32(1)(b)(i) the following changes to the provisions are an alternative reasonably practicable option that represents a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives. Attached to my evidence, **Appendix [B]** is an evaluation in accordance with 32(1)(b)(ii) & (iii) that summarises the matters discussed in detail below. This assessment confirms the proposed changes are the most effective and efficient and therefore appropriate provisions to achieve the objectives. In terms of s32(2)(c) it is not considered that there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. Taking this overall evaluation into account I provide the following specific consideration of the VASZ framework.

Visitor Accommodation Activity Status

[21] Under the ODP Chapter 9 visitor accommodation within the VASZ has a controlled activity status whereas in the PDP it is restricted discretionary. In my opinion continuing the ODP controlled activity status would provide better recognition of the sub-zone framework and specifically those matters I have discussed above in seeking to enable visitor accommodation activities whilst ensuring the residential character and amenity of the zone is maintained.

[22] The controlled activity framework and matters of control are very similar to the matters of discretion. The table below provides a comparison of the two rules.

	ODP Provisions	PDP Stage 3
Visitor Accommodation	<p>Controlled, control in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - External appearance of buildings. - Setback from internal boundaries. - Setback from Roads - Access - Landscaping - Screening of outdoor storage 	<p>Restricted Discretionary, discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The location, nature and scale of activities; b. Parking and access; c. Landscaping; d. Noise generation and methods of mitigation; e. Hours of operation, including in respect of ancillary activities; and f. The external appearance of buildings.

[23] Given the purpose of the VASZ is to provide visitor accommodation a controlled activity status is considered a more efficient and effective method to achieve this outcome specifically Policy 7.2.8.1. A controlled activity status provides a more certain pathway for visitor accommodation activity and better aligns with the sub zone method of identifying specific locations for visitor accommodation activity to occur. Where the visitor accommodation activity is well established in cases such as the site I consider there is further justification for a controlled

activity status. Accordingly, I recommend the following change to Chapter 7.

	Activities located in the Low Density Residential Zone	Activity Status
7.4.6A	Visitor Accommodation in the Visitor Accommodation Sub- Zone Discretion is restricted to: a. The location, nature and scale of activities; b. Parking and access; c. Landscaping; d. Noise generation and methods of mitigation; e. Hours of operation, including in respect of ancillary activities; and f. The external appearance of buildings.	RD C

Premises Licensed for Sale of Liquor

[24] Under the ODP, Rule 9.2.3.3 iv Premises Licensed for the Sale of Liquor are a discretionary activity whereas in the PDP it does not appear there are any specific rules and therefore default *Rule 7.4.12 Activities which are not listed in this table* would apply making such an activity non-complying. As described in the background section above a key component of the activities on the site is the sale of liquor and this would not be uncommon with visitor accommodation activities more generally. Given the specific intention of VASZ to provide for visitor accommodation activity it is considered a clear consent pathway should be established for the sale of liquor. In my opinion having this activity fall to a default rule is neither efficient or effective within a VASZ framework.

[25] I note in this respect the proposed Chapter 20 Settlement Zone appears to have acknowledged this matter whereby a specific activity status is provided for licensed premises located within a VASZ. In my opinion it would be logical that a similar provision apply within the LDSRZ VASZ.

[26] Accordingly I would support the provision of sale of liquor within VASZ as a restricted discretionary activity, to reflect the framework that exists within the ODP and Chapter 20 Settlement Zone where such an activity is more appropriate. I recommend the following rule be added to

Chapter 7. I note this follows the same drafting as in Chapter 20 Rule 20.4.10.

	Activities located in the Low Density Residential Zone	Activity Status
7.4.24	<p><u>Licensed Premises located in the Visitor Accommodation Sub Zones, where the licensed premises is ancillary to a visitor accommodation activity.</u></p> <p><u>Exemption: It is permitted to sell alcohol:</u></p> <p><u>(i) to any person who is residing (permanently or temporarily on the premises; and/or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) to any person who is present on the premises for the purpose of dining up until 12am.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>a.the scale of the activity;</u></p> <p><u>b.parking, access and traffic generation;</u></p> <p><u>c.effects on amenity, including that of adjoining sites and public reserves;</u></p> <p><u>d. the configuration of activities within the building and site (e.g outdoor seating, entrances);</u></p> <p><u>e. noise;</u></p> <p><u>f. hours of operation;</u></p> <p><u>g. lighting; and</u></p> <p><u>h. servicing.</u></p>	RD

Airports

[27] The provision for landing of helicopters associated with events, in particular weddings is of particular relevance to the submitter and the operation of the Site into the future but is also not uncommon in association with visitor accommodation of the scale that is established within VASZs. Under the ODP landings of this nature are considered an Airport and require a non-complying activity consent (Rule 9.2.3.4). Under the PDP provisions are provided for both Airports and Informal Airports. Informal Airports are defined as:

Means any defined area of land or water intended or designed to be used for the landing, departure movement or servicing of aircraft and

specifically excludes the designated 'Aerodromes', shown as designations 2, 64, and 239 in the District Plan.

This excludes the airspace above land or water located on any adjacent site over which an aircraft may transit when arriving and departing from an informal airport.

[28] Rule 7.4.12 makes any airport prohibited other than Informal Airports for emergency landings, rescues and fire fighting. I note no equivalent rule is proposed in Chapter 20 Settlement Zone.

[29] The prohibited activity status therefore provides no consenting path for helicopter landings as envisaged for the Site in association with the visitor accommodation activity and associated events. The Site is reasonably unique, as it is not surrounded by residential activity. In fact it only has residential activity on its southeastern boundary, providing flight path options where aircraft takeoff and landing can occur without having to fly over residential houses. Notwithstanding these specific circumstances as noted above, it is not unusual to anticipate visitor accommodation activities within VASZ potentially having or seeking to consider helicopter flights for guests. In association with weddings for example it is reasonably common for parties to utilise helicopters to access the mountains surrounding the district for photos as part of a wedding function.

[30] Therefore, in my opinion a prohibited activity status is not justified within a VASZ. It is acknowledged within the wider LDSRZ that helicopter landings would be inappropriate and a prohibited activity status justified. However, the planning framework specifically provides for VASZ and therefore specific provision for airports within VASZ distinct from the wider LDSR can be provided for. Given the complimentary nature of visitor accommodation use, events and helicopter use I would support a discretionary activity status for Informal Airports within VASZ. This framework would allow full discretion to consider the particular circumstances and geographic setting of each VASZ whilst acknowledging airports may be appropriate in some VASZs. Accordingly I recommend the following rule be added to Chapter 7.

	Activities located in the Low Density Residential Zone	Activity Status
<u>7.4.25</u>	<u>Informal Airports within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone</u>	<u>D</u>

Building Height

[31] The building height limit within the PDP applying to the Site would be 7m. Again there is no distinction for height of buildings within VASZ. As has been discussed previously the site by the nature of its use does not reflect a low density residential character and the Site has a number of unique locational attributes that mean the site is not bound by residential development to any great extent. Given the need to provide parking on site and manoeuvring for buses etc greater flexibility around design and in particular height is considered advantageous to provide greater design opportunities. In my view this provides greater opportunity to support flexibility in height whilst enabling visitor accommodation to establish on the site.

[32] In this regard providing a framework where additional height can be explored subject to greater scrutiny of design would encourage opportunities for better design outcomes. The current framework and non-complying activity status for a breach of the 7m limited in my view would not be conducive to such an outcome. However, given the character of the Site, in my opinion greater opportunity for height can be provided for that maintains the character and amenity of the zone whilst supporting the enabling nature of objective 7.2.8. I note in terms of provision for additional height Chapter 20 Rule 20.5.13 provides for additional height within Commercial Precincts so it is evident the proposed plan framework contemplates such methods within specific locations.

[33] In terms of an appropriate height limit, typically height is best related to the potential built form outcomes i.e single, two or three levels etc. In this regard typically a 7m height limit allows for two stories although this is tight taking into account the roof form. In my opinion to support

greater flexibility a 3 storey building form would be appropriate for the Site with flexibility for roof articulation. I would support a three-storey limit within a maximum height of 12m therefore allowing design flexibility to encourage a varied and interesting roof form.

[34] To ensure appropriate control over the design associated with this extra height I would recommended a sliding scale such that height up to 7m was permitted, 7-12m restricted discretionary and above 12m non-complying. This follows the framework established in other PDP zones where additional height is provided for. In my view the matters specified in Rule 7.4.6A would provide an appropriate basis for assessing height between 7 and 12m but I would recommend several additional matters to encourage a varied roof form and due consideration to potential effects to adjoining properties is taken into account as follows:

- modulated roof forms, including screening of plant and services;
- the avoidance of large monolithic buildings
- sunlight access to adjoining residential properties and/or public space;

[35] Accordingly, I recommend the following changes to Chapter 7.

	Standards for activities in the Low Density Residential Zone	Non-Compliance status
7.5.1	<p>Building Height (for flat sites)</p> <p>7.5.1.1 Wanaka and Hawea¹: Maximum of 7 metres.</p> <p>7.5.1.2 Arrowtown: Maximum of 6.5 metres.</p> <p>7.5.1.3 All other locations: Maximum of 8 metres.</p> <p><u>7.5.1.4 Rules 7.5.1.1 to 7.5.1.3 do not apply to the Visitor Accomodation Sub-Zone in Hawea</u></p>	NC
	<p>Building Height (for sloping sites)</p> <p>7.5.2.1 Arrowtown: Maximum of 6 metres.</p> <p>7.5.2.2 Lake Avenue Height Restriction Area on Planning Map 33: No building or any part of a building shall protrude through 343.50 MASL.</p>	NC

¹ Recommended addition as identified in the Stage 3 Notification

	<p>7.5.2.3 In all other locations: Maximum of 7 metres.</p> <p>7.5.2.4 <u>Rules 7.5.2.1 to 7.5.2.3 do not apply to the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone in Hawea</u></p>	
	<p><u>Building Height – Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone Hawea</u></p> <p>7.5.3.1 <u>Building height of 7m</u></p>	<p><u>RD</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p>a. <u>those matters listed in Rule 7.4.6A;</u></p> <p>b. <u>how the design provides for modulated roof forms, including screening of plant and services;</u></p> <p>c. <u>the avoidance of large monolithic buildings</u></p> <p>d. <u>sunlight access to adjoining residential properties and/or public space.</u></p>
	<p>7.5.3.2 <u>Maximum building height of 12m and three stories</u></p>	<p><u>NC</u></p>

Building Coverage & Landscape Permeable Surface Coverage

[36] The ODP provided for a building coverage of 70% within a VASZ (Rule 9.2.5.2 c) and no control over landscape permeable surface. The PDP provides no specific provision for building coverage within a VASZ so the default 40% coverage applies (Rule 7.5.5). Similarly there is no specific provision for landscape permeable surface coverage within a VASZ so the default 30% would apply. I note however that within Chapter 20 Rule 20.5.5 provides for additional building coverage within VASZ with an 80% allowance provided.

[37] In my opinion in recognition of the specific provision for a VASZ and providing for visitor accommodation within these subzones (as has been provided in Chapter 20 in terms of building coverage) a more targeted building and landscape coverage should be provided. In this respect buildings within a VASZ will have a different form and density to that of a traditional residential house on a suburban lot which the 40% coverage and 30% permeable surface requirement relate to. As discussed above the policy framework specifically acknowledges a distinction in terms of the scale and intensity of use within a VASZ to that outside of these subzones.

[38] Taking these factors into account I support continuing the 70% Building Coverage as provided in the ODP within VASZs. In terms of landscape permeable surface it is important to recognise greater demand for onsite parking and manoeuvring space will be required with visitor accommodation activity within VASZ. Accordingly, I would support removing a specific rule for landscape permeable surface and leaving this matter to the controls associated with the visitor accommodation activity (Rule 7.4.6A) which provide for the consideration of landscaping.

[39] In my opinion a 70% building coverage and removal of specific landscape permeable surface requirement will provide a more efficient and effective method for implementing the relevant objectives of the plan. Accordingly, I recommend the following changes to Chapter 7.

	Standards for activities in the Low Density Residential Zone	Non-Compliance status
7.5.5	Building Coverage; <u>7.5.5.1 A maximum of 40%</u> <u>7.5.5.2 Within a Visitor Accomodation Sub-Zone, a maximum of 75%</u>	D
7.5.6	Landscaped permeable surface coverage At least 30% of the site area shall comprise landscaped (permeable) surface. <u>Rule 7.5.6 does not apply within the Visitor Accomodation Sub-Zone</u>	NC

--	--	--

Building Separation within Sites and Building Length

[40] No building separation requirement was provided for within the ODP VASZ that applied to the site whereas a requirement to provide a 4m separation between buildings applies by default within the PDP as no specific provision relating to VASZ applies within the LDRSZ. The particular nature and intensity of visitor accommodation activities within VASZ is not low density in character and therefore requiring a separation between buildings creates inefficiencies in the layout and arrangement for the visitor accommodation that is not considered necessary given the purpose of the VASZ is to provide for visitor accommodation. I also note Chapter 20 provides no rule requiring a separation of buildings within a site (either within or outside of a VASZ).

[41] It is acknowledged that at the interface of the VASZ and residential zone setbacks are logical to provide an appropriate interface to the residential neighbours but within the site between buildings this is not considered effective or efficient in providing for visitor accommodation activity. This is particularly the case given a general control over design and requirement for consent exists in accordance with Rule 7.4.6A. Accordingly I support deleting the building separation requirement within VASZs and leaving consideration of building layout and design to Rule 7.4.6A.

[42] Similar to a setback requirement from adjoining residential properties a building length rule can assist to reduce the scale and bulk of buildings in relation to neighbouring properties. The ODP rule relating to continuous building length was effective in this regard as it related the length to the adjoining boundary. The relevant wording stated:

Where the aggregate length of buildings measured parallel to any internal boundary exceeds 16m

[43] However the ODP rule does not relate or measure this length in relation to the boundary. Therefore any building length over 16m regardless of its proximity to the boundary is in breach of this rule.

[44] Given the nature and scale of visitor accommodation activities within a VASZ as illustrated by the activity on the subject Site, requiring all buildings to have lengths less than 16m does not reflect the particular nature and scale of activity. Given the requirement for consent for visitor accommodation activities within a VASZ (Rule 7.4.6A) it is considered inefficient to have an added requirement that all building lengths must be less than 16m regardless of their proximity to boundary. The requirement for the visitor accommodation activity to gain resource consent allows for an assessment of the building design to ensure its is of an appropriate scale and form. Therefore I support excluding activities within a VASZ from the building length rule.

[45] Accordingly I recommended the following changes and additions to Chapter 7.

	Standards for activities in the Low Density Residential Zone	Non-Compliance status
7.5.9	<p>Building Separation within Sites For detached residential units on the same site, a minimum separation distance of 4m between the residential units within the development site applies.</p> <p>Note: This rule does not apply to attached dwellings.</p> <p><u>Rule 7.5.9 does not apply within the Visitor Accomodation Sub-Zone</u></p>	<p>RD Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. whether site constraints justify an alternative separation distance; b. whether an overall better amenity values outcome is being achieved, including for off-site neighbours; c. design of the units, with particular regard to the location of windows and doors, so as to limit the potential for adverse effects on privacy between units; d. in Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, as described within the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016.

7.5.10	<p>Building Length</p> <p>The length of any building facade above the ground floor level shall not exceed 16m.</p> <p><u>Rule 7.5.10 does not apply within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-Zone</u></p>	<p>RD</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>a. external appearance, location and visual dominance of the building(s) as viewed from the street(s) and adjacent properties;</p> <p>b. in Arrowtown, consistency with Arrowtown's character, as described within the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016</p>
--------	--	--

Car Parking

[46] The car parking requirements applicable to the Site prior to notification of Chapter 3 were in accordance with ODP. However, due to the staged nature of the District Plan review the car parking chapter, (Chapter 14) was reviewed in Stage 2 with a new chapter proposed, Chapter 29. As the site has now been re-zoned to a Stage 1 Chapter by default the parking as per Stage 2 applies.

[47] As the site is now zoned LDSRZ rather than Township, a more restrictive parking requirement applies to unit type visitor accommodation activity (Rule 29.8.13) than previously applied, as there is no specific provision for visitor accommodation within a VASZ rather the default LDSRZ provisions apply. Table 2 below sets out a comparison of the ODP and PDP. I note the parking requirement for guest room type visitor accommodation does not change as no specific provisions apply to the LDSRZ in Chapter 29 (so the 'all other zones' provision applies which is the same as in the ODP).

	ODP Provisions – Rule 14.2.4.1 Table 1	PDP Stage 3 – Rule 29.8.13
Unit Type Visitor Accommodation	<p>All Other Zones:</p> <p><u>Visitor Parking:</u> 1 per unit up to 15 units; thereafter 1 per 2 units. In addition 1 coach park per 30 units.</p> <p><u>Staff:</u> 1 per 10 units</p>	<p>Low Density Residential Zone:</p> <p><u>Visitor Parking:</u> 2 per unit</p> <p><u>Staff:</u> 0</p>

[48] I note in terms of Chapter 29, Rule 29.8.14 still provides for the same parking provision as applied to the Site in the ODP. However as the Site is proposed to be zoned LDSRZ the more restrictive parking requirement of 2 per unit will apply.

[49] I am not aware of any parking issues resulting from the Site over the long period of time it has been established. Requiring two parks per unit rather than 1 per unit up to 15 represents a significant increase in the parking requirements. Given the VASZ overlay approach and plan framework seeking to provide for visitor accommodation activity within VASZ in my opinion the ODP parking provision should continue for the Site. Accordingly, I recommended the following change to Chapter 29.

Table 29.4			
Minimum Parking Requirements		Resident/Visitor	Staff/Guest
29.8.13	Unit type visitor accommodation (includes all units containing a kitchen facility. E.g. motels and cabins) in the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Low Density Residential Zone except within a Visitor Accomodation Sub-zone.</u> • Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone 	2 per unit. Footnote (3)	0



Appendix [A]

LEGEND

-  Stormwater Sump
-  Fire Hydrant
-  Lid
-  Manhole
-  drip line of selected tree
-  boundary
-  retaining wall
-  Visitor Accommodation Zone

Contour Interval: Major 1.0m (shown)
Minor 0.25m (dwg file)

1. Subject boundaries shown are from DP 27336 DP 300387 & SO 16473 and adjoining boundaries from LINZ XML.
2. Visible services have been surveyed only.
3. Aerial image shown was obtained by a drone survey and has been ortho-rectified. It is current as of 1/11/2017 and the horizontal position is reliable to +/- 0.1 metres.
4. Underground service lines have been added from Queenstown Lakes District Council GIS Webmap data and are indicative only of their approximate position.



REVISION	DESCRIPTION	DATE
A	ORIGINAL ISSUE	08/10/19

Hawea Hotel Including Visitor Accommodation Zone Capell Avenue, Hawea

PREPARED FOR				SCALE	
Quartz Development Group				1:1000 @ A3	
SURVEYED				DATE	
ST/MP	01/11/17	CHECKED	LW	DATE	08/10/19
DRAWN	DATE	APPROVED	DATE	DRAWING REFERENCE	
JR	08/10/19	LW	08/10/19	U4157_M1	
SHEET				REVISION	
1 of 1				A	

Level 2 Brownston House, 21 Brownston St., Wanaka, Ph: (03) 443 5577, Email: contact@southernland.co.nz, www.southernland.co.nz



COPYRIGHT: THE COPYRIGHT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS FOR THE INFORMATION SHOWN ON THIS PLAN REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF SOUTHERN LAND LTD. IT MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PRIOR CONSENT OF SOUTHERN LAND LTD.

APPENDIX [B] – s32 Evaluation Summary

32AA Further Evaluation – 32(1) (b) Examination of whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives

<p>As discussed in detail in this evidence a number of changes to the rules relating to VASZ are proposed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the status of Visitor Accommodation to a Controlled Activity 2. Provide for premises licensed for sale of liquor as a restricted discretionary activity 3. Provide for Informal Airports as a discretionary activity 4. Provide for additional height within the Hawea VASZ 5. Provide for additional building coverage (75%) and remove requirements for landscape permeable surface 6. Delete requirements for building separation and building length 		
Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions provide a more enabling framework within VASZ so there is a potential cost to residential neighbours in terms of character and amenity effects. However the framework through the controlled activity status can ensure the design, location, appearance and landscaping are suitable at interface locations. • There are potential costs associated with licensed premises, informal airports and height largely as above on adjoining residential properties. However the method of identifying specific VASZ can manage this potential effect whilst the activity status can ensure due regard is given to residential amenity and interface matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As traversed in detail in this evidence benefits in terms of recognizing the particular attributes and built form within VASZ are considered to arise. • Given the established nature of activities within VASZ it is considered beneficial to give greater recognition to this whilst also acknowledging that they do not exhibit a low density residential character. • Some of the changes proposed such as for informal airports will be significant in establishing a pathway for consent approval given the current status of such activity is prohibited. • Similarly for licensed premises, providing clear recognition of this activity given it comes hand in hand with visitor accommodation is also considered beneficial in providing a package of provisions that respond to the specific identification of locations for visitor 	<p>The changes to the provisions are considered more effective and efficient than the notified provisions. They provide a more focussed framework and recognition of visitor accommodation activity. In particular they recognise that the functional and built form attributes differ within VASZ from a typical low-density residential environment. These changes when combined with the method of identifying VASZ ensures the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.</p>

APPENDIX [B] – s32 Evaluation Summary

	<p>accommodation to occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allows for the continued viable operation of these recognised VASZ and as such the economic benefits they provide in the District.• Specifically in terms of licensed premises, the proposed change aligns with that within Chapter 20 Townships therefore providing greater consistency.	
--	---	--