

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Stream 14:  
Wakatipu Basin hearing  
and transferred Stage 1  
submissions related to  
Arrowtown and Lake  
Hayes

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREA THERESE JARVIS  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**28 May 2018**

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / C J McCallum  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2. SCOPE.....	6
3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	8
4. ASSUMPTIONS.....	9
5. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS .....	12
LCU 1 MALAGHANS VALLEY .....	14
6. MCKEAGUE SUBMISSION (#2207).....	14
7. MCGUINNESS SUBMISSION (#2292) .....	15
8. D HAMILTON AND L HAYDEN (#2422).....	15
LCU 2 FITZPATRICK BASIN .....	16
9. THE CROWN INVESTMENT TRUST (#2307).....	16
10. ROBERT FFISKE AND WEBB FARRY TRUSTEES 2012 LTD (#2338) .....	16
11. AEM PROPERTY (2017) LTD (#2496) .....	16
12. ALEXANDER MORCOM, JACQUELINE DAVIES & VERITAS (2013) LTD (#2334) 17	17
13. D BROOMFIELD AND WOODLOT PROPERTIES LTD (#2276) .....	17
14. TD HARDLEY (#2440).....	18
LCU 4 TUCKERS BEACH.....	18
15. MIDDLETON FAMILY TRUST (#2332).....	18
16. D BROOMFIELD AND WOODLOT PROPERTIES LTD (#2276) .....	20
17. JAMES CANNING MUSPRATT (#2418) .....	21
18. J WATERSTON (#2308).....	21
LCU 5 DALEFIELD .....	22
19. G AND J SIDDALL (#2196).....	22
LCU 6 WHAREHUANUI HILLS .....	22
20. SKIPP WILLIAMSON (#2272).....	22
21. R & M DONALDSON (#2229) .....	23
22. KJ BRUSTAD (#2577).....	23
23. S BOTHERWAY (#2610).....	24
24. D S MOLONEY (#2129).....	24
25. P NANCEKIVELL (#2171).....	25
26. J ANDERSSON (#2167).....	25
27. X-RAY TRUST LTD (#2619).....	25
LCU 8 SPEARGRASS FLATS .....	26

28. LAKES HAYES EQUESTRIAN (#2380)	26
29. BEADLE (#2430)	26
30. DOYLE (#2030)	27
31. BOXER HILLS TRUST (#2385)	27
32. R KAMPMAN SUBMISSION (#2433)	28
33. WAKATIPU EQUITIES LTD (#2479)	28
34. SPEARGRASS TRUST (#2410)	28
35. QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL (#2239)	29
36. LAKE HAYES LIMITED (#2377)	29
37. WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS SUBMISSION (#2388)	30
38. R&N HART (#2101)	30
39. J ANDERSSON (#2167)	30
40. J&R HADLEY (#2559)	30
LCU 9 HAWTHORN TRIANGLE	30
41. L MCFADGEN (#2529)	30
42. R FERNER (#2464)	31
LCU 11 SLOPE HILL 'FOOTHILLS'	31
43. SHOTOVER TRUST (#2437)	31
44. L MCFADGEN (#2296), D GALLAGHER (# 2248), MK GREENSLADE (#2249), P&J MCLEOD (#2298), R&S MCLEOD (#2300)	32
45. P SMITH (#2500)	33
46. E&M HARRIS/THE ASHFORD TRUST (#2535)	33
47. M&C BURGESS (#2591)	33
48. CASSIDY TRUST (#2144)	34
49. R&M WALES (#2270)	34
50. GW STALKER FAMILY TRUST (SPRINGBANK) (#2553)	34
51. SLOPEHILL JOINT VENTURE (#2475)	35
52. D ANDREW SUBMISSION (#2049)	35
LCU 12 LAKE HAYES RURAL RESIDENTIAL	36
53. JG FRENCH & ME BURT (#2417)	36
54. McGUINNESS PA (#2447), JUIE QT LIMITED (#2488), UNITED ESTATES RANCH LIMITED (# 2126), PJ DENNISON & SJ GRANT (#2301)	36
55. LAKE HAYES LIMITED (#2377)	37
LCU 13 LAKE HAYES SLOPES	37
56. MORVEN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (#2490)	37
57. TJ & MA HARRISON (#2163)	38
58. AC ROBINS, AJ ROBINS & HJM CALLAGHAN (#2104)	38

59. E&M HARRIS, THE ASHFORD TRUST (#2535).....	39
60. LAKE HAYES CELLAR (#2378).....	39
61. JOHN MCCRAE MARTIN, C J DOHERTY & K W FERGUS (#2517) .....	40
62. JM MARTIN, CJ DOHERTY & KW FERGUS (#2517) .....	41
63. R MONK (#2281) .....	41
64. ARROWTOWN RETIREMENT VILLAGE JOINT VENTURE (#2505) .....	42
65. C BATCHELOR (#2318), DD & JC DUNCAN (#2319), LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LTD (#2291), STONERIDGE ESTATE LTD (#2314), RG DAYMAN (#2315), TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LTD (#2316), MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK (#2317).....	42
66. WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED (#2389) .....	43
 LCU 14 LAKE HAYES TERRACE .....	 43
67. AK ROBINS, ANDERSON LLOYD TRUSTEE CO LTD & RB ROBINS (#2398)..	43
 LCU 17 MORVEN FERRY .....	 44
68. WK ALLEN & FL ALLEN (#2482).....	44
69. KT DUNLOP & SA GREEN (#2609) .....	45
70. A WARD (#2244) .....	45
71. MC GUTHRIE (#2412).....	45
 LCU 18 MORVEN EASTERN FOOTHILLS .....	 46
72. LAKE HAYES ESTATE PROPERTIES LTD (#2525).....	46
 LCU 19 GIBBSTON HIGHWAY FLATS .....	 46
73. GOLDCREST FARMING LTD (#2607) .....	46
 LCU 21 ARROW JUNCTION.....	 47
74. J HENKENHAF (#2562) .....	47
 LCU 22 THE HILLS.....	 47
75. TROJAN HELMET (#2387) .....	47
76. M DOYLE (#2030).....	49
 LCU 23 MILLBROOK .....	 49
77. MILLBROOK COUNTRY CLUB (#2295 and #2605) .....	49
78. JE GRIFFIN (#2580), PH ARCHIBALD (#2501), J EGERTON & COOK ALLAN GIBSON TRUSTEE COMPANY LIMITED (#2419), M AND K CAMPBELL (#2413), BOUNDARY TRUST (#2444), SPRUCE GROVE TRUST (#2512).....	50
79. G WILLS & T BURDON (#2320) .....	51
80. A FEELEY, E BORRIE & LP TRUSTEES LTD (#2397).....	51

<b>LCU 24 SOUTH ARROWTOWN .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>81. ARROW IRRIGATION COMPANY (#852).....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>82. SHAPING OUR FUTURE (#2511), QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST (#2299).....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>83. SLOPE HILL .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>84. LAKE HAYES ESTATE MARGINS.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>85. MORVEN HILL.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>86. LCU 10 LADIES MILE .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>87. LCU 15 HOGANS GULLY AND LCU 17 MORVEN FERRY .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>88. LCU 18 MORVEN EASTERN FOOTHILLS .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>89. LCU 24 SOUTH ARROWTOWN .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>90. SHAPING OUR FUTURE (#2511), QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST (#2299).....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>91. LCU 25 SHOTOVER COUNTRY MARGINS .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>92. MCGUINNESS (2292) .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>93. THE CROWN INVESTMENT TRUST (2307) .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>94. ROBERT FFISKE AND WEBB FARRY TRUSTEES 2012 LTD (2338).....</b>	<b>68</b>

**Attachment 1 Water And Wastewater Scheme Boundary Maps**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Andrea Therese Jarvis. I hold the position of Project Director - Civil at Holmes Consulting LP (**Holmes**). I have been in this position since October 2015. I have been with Holmes since October 2010, and prior to that held the position of Team Leader, Infrastructure Engineering for CPG NZ Ltd (now Calibre Consulting) in Queenstown.
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Auckland. I have 14 years' experience in Civil and Infrastructure Engineering. I am a member of Engineering New Zealand and Water New Zealand. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer, and an International Professional Engineer.
- 1.3 My experience includes investigations, options assessments, capacity assessments, design of water, wastewater and stormwater reticulation, design of on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal, design of subdivisions/land development (including earthworks and minor roads), contract management and administration and design management. I have undertaken this work across New Zealand.
- 1.4 My current role at Holmes involves the national management of the civil engineering team, and design and design management of the range of projects undertaken by the team, as described in 1.3 above. Holmes has provided infrastructure engineering assistance to Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC** or **Council**) for the entire time I have been with Holmes, beginning in 2010.
- 1.5 In relation to the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) I have provided advice in the form of written reports and memoranda to support the proposed Medium Density Residential (**MDR**) zones notified in Stage 1. As part of this work, Holmes have also provided a report specifically on the infrastructure capacity of the Ladies Mile area. Separately to the PDP process, we have also previously reported on infrastructure matters for a number of Special Housing Area (**SHA**) applications. In a number of situations these SHA applications relate to the same or adjacent parcels of land that are subject to Stage 1 submissions on what is called in this hearing, the Lake Hayes area.

1.6 I have now been asked by QLDC to provide evidence in relation to infrastructure matters for Hearing Stream 14. My evidence relates to:

- (a) Wakatipu Basin rezoning submissions;
- (b) Stage 1 rezoning submissions related to Arrowtown; and
- (c) Stage 1 rezoning submissions related to Lake Hayes (includes Ladies Mile).

1.7 Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

1.8 The key documents I have used, or referred to, in forming my view while preparing this brief of evidence are:

- (a) Mr Ulrich Glasner's evidence for Stage 1 rezoning submissions located in Queenstown;
- (b) Arrowtown Water Network Model Build and Calibration Report, Mott McDonald (July 2017), and 2015, 2025 and 2055 water modelling capacity results;
- (c) Lake Hayes Water Supply Network Model Report, Mott McDonald (July 2017) ((b) and (c) together are referred to as **Water Models**);
- (d) Wakatipu Wastewater Network Future System Performance Report, Beca Limited (11 May 2017) (**Wastewater Model**);
- (e) QLDC MDR Review – Infrastructure Assessment Memorandum, Project No. 113676.00, Holmes Consulting (15 May 2015);
- (f) Queenstown Country Club SHA Infrastructure Assessment Peer Review, Project No 114562.00, Holmes Consulting (19 September 2016);

- (g) Comments regarding the Infrastructure Capacity for Arrowtown (MDR s42a hearing report dated 14 September 2016);
- (h) Determining minimum lot areas for sustainable on-site wastewater drainage Jaye Hill, Hamish Lowe (for Land Treatment Collective Annual Conference, 2008); and
- (i) Arrowtown SHA Infrastructure Assessment Peer Review, Project No 114562.01, Holmes Consulting (3 November 2015).

**1.9** Attached to my evidence is **Attachment 1: Water and Wastewater Scheme Boundary Maps**.

## **2. SCOPE**

**2.1** My evidence addresses the infrastructure-related effects of the Wakatipu Basin rezoning submissions and transferred Stage 1 submissions related to Arrowtown and Lake Hayes. I consider whether there is capacity in terms of wastewater and water supply infrastructure, to service/accommodate the development facilitated by the rezonings sought by submitters. I also consider the need for adequacy of supply of water for firefighting purposes.

**2.2** I have taken a view on each of the site-specific zoning requests as to whether I oppose, or do not oppose, the relief sought, in terms of infrastructure effects.

### *Stormwater*

**2.3** As stormwater is addressed at the time of subdivision or actual development, and is required to comply with the Council's requirements under the Subdivision Code of Practice (which limits discharges to the pre-development flows), I have not assessed stormwater effects individually in relation to the rezoning requests.



## *Wastewater and Water Supply*

**2.4** As per Mr Ulrich Glasner's Stage 1 Evidence, in assessing each of the site specific submissions, I have considered three key points:

- (a) The serviceability of the area, whether it is anticipated that the site would connect to the water supply and wastewater networks, and the ease and cost of servicing to the expected level of service, including ongoing operations maintenance costs from additional facilities;
- (b) The location of the area in terms of elevation, whether the area will have adequate water pressure and can drain wastewater under gravity, and if it is adjacent to similarly zoned land to support efficient servicing of the area; and
- (c) If the area will be serviced by the network, whether there are any capacity issues, and if there are, whether there are projects to resolve them within the draft Ten Year Plan 2018-2028 (**LTP**).

**2.5** I have been referred to the Panel's Stage 1 Recommendation Reports that comment on the Council's approach to infrastructure capacity. I refer in particular to paragraphs 84 – 90 of Report 16 Upper Clutha Mapping, where I note the Council's general position was that a rezoning request should be declined where an urban zone is sought, but no or insufficient capacity currently exists in the infrastructure network and no provision is made in the Council's long-term plan for the relevant infrastructure upgrade. This approach is relevant to some of the 'urban' rezonings I consider in my evidence. I also note however, Mr Glasner's evidence that development in the Rural, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones were an exception to that approach, and that in those zones, on-site infrastructure can be privately provided, with the proviso that there was some unease with Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones being located on the periphery of urban areas, because of the expectation that Council will then provide services to them.

**2.6** I also refer to the Panel's comments in paragraph 131 of Report 17.1 Queenstown Mapping, in the table at (g) to (j), where the Panel:

- (a) agreed that the application of zones should take into account the location and environmental features of the site (which includes infrastructure);
- (b) commented that it is important to ensure there is alignment between enabling development capacity and its servicing, and recommended in relation to some 'zoning principles, that "Zone chapters are not inconsistent with long term planning for the provision of infrastructure and its capacity"; and
- (c) commented that zone changes take into account the effects on the environment of providing infrastructure onsite.

### **3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**3.1** The effect of the water demand from the proposed rezonings has been assessed against the Arrowtown, Lake Hayes and Queenstown Water Models, including the current day, 2025 and 2055 growth scenarios. In general, water supply is less of an issue for submitters seeking more intensive residential zonings where residential zoning is currently proposed, because the same FW2 level of firefighting supply is anticipated. Where zoning with a higher fire risk is proposed, that increases the anticipated firefighting requirements (e.g. commercial requiring FW3). The Water Model results are used to assess the ability to adequately service these proposed areas.

**3.2** The Water Model results for Queenstown, Lake Hayes and Arrowtown also include head loss details. High head loss indicates increased pressure losses as a result of friction within the pipe and therefore more inefficient water transportation (i.e. trying to pump too much water through a certain sized pipe). Where the Water Models show a head loss greater than 5 m/km this is above general pipe design guidance. Where rezoning requests are in an area already demonstrating high head loss, I generally do not support further development in this area unless there is a specific upgrade scheduled in the draft LTP to address the constraint.

- 3.3** The effect of the wastewater loads from the rezonings sought have been assessed against the Wastewater Model including the current day, 2025 and 2055 growth scenarios. The Wastewater Model extends to Arrowtown. I have considered whether the network has capacity for the rezoning requested, and whether any lack of capacity will be resolved through planned projects in the draft LTP.
- 3.4** I note that if an area is rezoned, the timeframe of when it could be developed will depend on the related LTP project/s. In some cases there are capacity issues but as the change is quite minor in terms of additional capacity requirements I do not oppose some of those rezonings.
- 3.5** It is much more efficient to service new developments where capacity already exists. In my opinion, it is not in the Council's best interests for its water supply and wastewater networks to extend further into currently zoned rural land outside the Urban Growth Boundary, due to the increase in operational, maintenance and renewal costs for QLDC over the long term.
- 3.6** Rural and Rural Lifestyle zonings outside the scheme boundary are not anticipated to connect to the Council network but be privately serviced onsite at the developer's cost. These types of developments will not affect the Council's Infrastructure network (nor ongoing maintenance costs) and therefore I generally do not oppose this type of development.

#### **4. ASSUMPTIONS**

- 4.1** My assumptions are in line with those made by Mr Ulrich Glasner in his Stage 1 evidence for the Queenstown and Upper Clutha rezoning hearings. For completeness, key points are repeated below.
- 4.2** To assess the impacts of rezoning a property on the water and wastewater network, it is necessary to estimate the likely yield in terms of the number of residential lots.

**4.3** Where a submission has included an estimate of the number of residential lots, I have generally relied on that information. Specifically, I have relied on the estimate in submissions if there is one, and where robust information has been provided to support the estimate. Where no information was provided, or where in my opinion a greater number of lots could realistically be developed, I have estimated the number of lots and explained this in my assessment.

**4.4** The minimum lot sizes for the different zones (decisions version) provide a guide for estimating the number of lots:

- (a) Lower Suburban Density Residential – 450m<sup>2</sup>;
- (b) Medium Density Residential – 250 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (c) High Density Residential – 450 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (d) Large Lot Residential A – 4,000 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (e) Large Lot Residential B – 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (f) Rural Lifestyle – 2 hectare average, with individual allotments up to 1 hectare;
- (g) Rural Residential – 4,000 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (h) Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone – 80 hectare minimum for new subdivisions; and
- (i) Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, 1 hectare average, with individual allotments up to 6,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

**4.5** However, for larger sites requesting urban re-zoning, it is not just a simple matter of dividing the total lot size by the minimum lot size, because land is needed for other development requirements such as roading, reserves, stormwater etc. Therefore I have assumed that for any site the area that can be developed into residential lots is the total area of the site minus 32% to account for those other development requirements.

**4.6** In my assessment I have assumed the maximum allowed development under the zone requested by the submitter.

**4.7** My opinions on wastewater and water are based on the:

- (a) Arrowtown Water Network report and results (referenced above);
- (b) Lake Hayes Water Supply Network report and results (referenced above); and
- (c) Queenstown Wastewater network modelling results provided at the time of the MDR Infrastructure Assessment (also referenced above).

**4.8** Throughout my analysis, I have assumed that all servicing including connections and upgrades would be at the developer's cost, this may be through development contributions or directly where stated.

**Impact of development within wastewater and water supply scheme boundaries that exceeds capacity**

**4.9** The impact of development within the wastewater and water supply scheme boundaries (shown on **Appendix 1**), which exceeds current capacity, depends on the scale and location of the exceedance. For example, if the development is a small development (up to 15 household equivalent), close to either the water intake or the final wastewater pump station before the treatment plant, the length of pipe upgrade required would be minimal. However, if the site is close to the edge of the network and is a large development, the impact could be significant as a long length of network would be required to be upgraded. This is because the wastewater would flow through this long length of existing network to reach the final wastewater pump-station, or a long length of water main to produce adequate flow/pressure from the reservoir/water source.

**4.10** Servicing development outside the scheme boundary would add to the scale of any upgrades required.

**4.11** I now assess individual submissions in the sections below.

## 5. REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS

### Rezoning in 'rural' areas

5.1 I note that most of the rezoning requests outlined below are rural in nature. For those located within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (**Amenity Zone**), I have been referred to the following policies in the notified chapter:

***Policy 24.2.4.4** Ensure development does not generate servicing costs that fall on the wider community.*

***Policy 24.2.4.5** Ensure development infrastructure is self-sufficient and does not exceed capacities for infrastructure servicing.*

5.2 I understand that development within the Amenity Zone (and within the Precinct, under Council's proposed development densities) are expected to be serviced privately via onsite means. The effects on infrastructure are therefore limited, but can take into account the effects on the environment of providing infrastructure onsite.

5.3 Although I refer to each of these submissions separately, I generally do not oppose these rezonings, but record the expectation that these sites will be serviced privately at the developer's cost, and due to this on-site servicing, there is no increase in the QLDC infrastructure requirements (physical and financially). There should be no expectation that the on-site infrastructure will ultimately be joined to Council schemes.

### Rezoning in 'urban' areas, or rezonings located within 'rural' areas but seeking 'urban' densities

5.4 However, there are some requests that, if granted, are expected to result in a request to extend water and wastewater scheme boundaries, and some of the rural requests may then have reticulated networks immediately adjacent.

- 5.5** Objective 3.2.2 of the Strategic Directions chapter is that “*Urban Growth is managed in a strategic and integrated manner*”. 3.2.2.1 is that “*Urban Development occurs in a logical manner so as to (amongst other things) be integrated with existing, and planner future, infrastructure*”. Objective 3.2.1.9 is “*Infrastructure in the District that is operated, maintained, developed and upgraded efficiently and effectively to meet community needs and to maintain the quality of the environment*”.
- 5.6** To ensure efficient and effective infrastructure development, it is generally preferable to have these lots connect to a municipal scheme where one is available. This will mitigate against adverse cumulative effects (such as having a high number of onsite wastewater systems and/or bores in a relatively small area). These adverse effects include increased nutrient loads entering groundwater or surface water, and bacteriological contamination. Should each individual lot be serviced by an onsite wastewater system and an independent groundwater bore, for example, the ability to maintain all recommended separation distances for the protection of the groundwater bores becomes more challenging. Multiple groundwater bores in a small area, drawing from the same aquifer, have the potential to result in oversubscribed water sources. There is also the potential via scheme boundary creep, for the adverse infrastructure effects to be greater than currently assessed.
- 5.7** As described above, there is also the potential for cumulative adverse effects as a result of multiple onsite wastewater disposal systems in a relatively small area, and multiple groundwater bores. The paper by Jaye Hill and Hamish Lowe, referenced above, describes the typical minimum lot sizes that are considered to be sustainable. Their investigation takes into account nutrient loading and the ability to treat wastewater onsite without adverse environmental effects. They found that where secondary wastewater treatment is provided, this can be supported on lots 2,000 m<sup>2</sup> or larger. Where only primary treatment with an outlet filter is provided, at least 5,500 m<sup>2</sup> is required. Based on this, the minimum lot sizes for the Wakatipu Basin Rural Lifestyle Precinct are considered to be sustainable.

- 5.8** I acknowledge that nutrient levels in ground or surface water is a Regional Council matter, rather than a function of QLDC to consider. However, I consider it helpful for integrated decision making reasons to keep these adverse environmental effects in mind as the question of appropriate zoning is made by the district council.
- 5.9** However, it is also noted that onsite wastewater systems generally function better under relatively constant wastewater loads, and intermittent use (for example via absentee owners) can result in these systems providing lower levels of treatment than expected. I recommend that minimum treatment levels are defined in the Subdivision Code of Practice for onsite wastewater systems where ORC consent is not required, to be at least secondary treatment standard (as defined in AS/NZS1547:2012) for lots smaller than 6,000 m<sup>2</sup>. I appreciate this is a document that sits outside of the PDP, and the Panel making recommendations on this PDP, has no jurisdiction over that Code of Practice.

#### *Scheme Boundaries*

- 5.10** In my response to submissions I refer to the current Scheme Boundaries. These are shown in maps in **Attachment 1**. I note that these show current scheme boundaries.

### **LCU 1 MALAGHANS VALLEY**

#### **6. MCKEAGUE SUBMISSION (#2207)**

- 6.1** Wayne and Mi Ae McKeague have sought that the notified Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (**WBLP**) is extended to cover a larger portion of the property at 55 Dalefield Road, which was notified as Amenity Zone.
- 6.2** The site is located approximately 8 km from Arrowtown and 4 km from Arthurs Point. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of current Scheme Boundaries shown on **Attachment 1**.



**6.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective.

**7. MCGUINNESS SUBMISSION (#2292)**

**7.1** McGuinness Pa Limited have sought that 66 Dalefield Road and other properties in the area are rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct, subject to various modifications to the Precinct provisions.

**7.2** The site is located approximately 8 km from Arrowtown and 4 km from Arthurs Point. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is not located within the Scheme Boundaries.

**7.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective, if the site is serviced privately at the developer's cost. This is because there is no increase in the QLDC infrastructure requirements as the water and wastewater will be serviced onsite.

**8. D HAMILTON AND L HAYDEN (#2422)**

**8.1** D Hamilton and L Hayden have sought that the notified Precinct is extended to cover the entire property at 76 Hunter Road. The subject land was notified as Amenity Zone.

**8.2** The site is located approximately 6 km from Arrowtown and 6 km from Arthurs Point. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is not located with the Scheme Boundaries.

**8.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to WBLP, from an infrastructure perspective, if the site is serviced privately at the developer's cost. This is because there is no increase in the QLDC infrastructure requirements as the water and wastewater will be serviced onsite.

## **LCU 2 FITZPATRICK BASIN**

### **9. THE CROWN INVESTMENT TRUST (#2307)**

**9.1** The Crown Investment Trust have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning of its land located south of Fitzpatrick Road and north of the Shotover River. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**9.2** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

### **10. ROBERT FFISKE AND WEBB FARRY TRUSTEES 2012 LTD (#2338)**

**10.1** Robert Ffiske and Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning on their land.

The subject land is located north of Fitzpatrick Road and south of Littles Road. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is not located within Scheme Boundaries.

**10.2** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

### **11. AEM PROPERTY (2017) LTD (#2496)**

**11.1** AEM Property (2017) Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning for its land, which is located north of Fitzpatrick Road and south of Littles Road. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply and is located outside of the Scheme Boundary.

**11.2** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

**12. ALEXANDER MORCOM, JACQUELINE DAVIES & VERITAS (2013) LTD (#2334)**

**12.1** Alexander Morcom, Jacqueline Davis and Vertias (2013) Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning of their land.

**12.2** The subject land is located north of Fitzpatrick Road and south of Littles Road. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply and is located outside of the Scheme Boundaries.

**12.3** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

**13. D BROOMFIELD AND WOODLOT PROPERTIES LTD (#2276)**

**13.1** D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning on their land, although have sought a number of boundary adjustments..

**13.2** The submission refers to a number of sites, as follows:

(a) Within the Fitzpatrick Basin Landscape Character Unit:

- (i) LOT 2 DP 474658.
- (ii) Lot 24 DP 493649.
- (iii) Lot 26 DP 493649
- (iv) Lot 9 DP 483357.
- (v) Lot 2 DP 475338.

(b) Within the Tucker Beach Landscape Character Unit:

- (i) Lot 1 DP 473899.
- (ii) Lot 1 DP 323310.
- (iii) Lot 2 DP 473899.

**13.3** The Fitzpatrick basin sites are located north of Moorhill Road and north and south of Littles Road. The area is not connected to a Council wastewater supply or water supply scheme, however there is a private water supply scheme servicing the lots.

**13.4** The relief sought (minor boundary alignments) does not increase the density of development on this land, which can be serviced privately onsite.

**13.5** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**14. TD HARDLEY (#2440)**

**14.1** Timothy Drummond Hardley has sought for the land within the Fitzpatrick Basin to be rezoned from notified Precinct to Amenity Zone.

**14.2** The land in question is the land south of Littles Road on both sides of Fitzpatrick Road and bordered by the Shotover River to the South. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of the Scheme Boundary.

**14.3** The relief sought decreases the proposed density of development on this land.

**14.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective, including for the reasons set out at paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3 above.

**LCU 4 TUCKERS BEACH**

**15. MIDDLETON FAMILY TRUST (#2332)**

**15.1** Middleton Family Trust have sought that the land generally located between Lake Johnson and the Shotover River, in the Tucker Beach area, located on Map 31, be rezoned from the notified Amenity Zone and Precinct to both Precinct and a new 'Tuckers Beach Residential Precinct', as depicted on the structure plan contained in Attachment [A] to the submission. The submission also seeks amendments to Chapter 24 contained in Attachment [B]; and in conjunction with this that the Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**) be applied to the boundary of the proposed Tuckers Beach Residential Precinct.

- 15.2** The site as described above is located at the terminal end of Tucker Beach Road. The area is not connected to a Council wastewater supply or water supply scheme, and lies outside of the Scheme Boundaries. The submission seeks an extension to the UGB, which I understand from a policy perspective means that urban development would be enabled and anticipated, inside of that UGB.
- 15.3** The proposed Tuckers Beach Residential Precinct, as depicted on the structure plan appended to the submission, has the potential to add more than 200 residential lots to this area as a new Low Density Residential zone.
- 15.4** Although it is not specifically described, the extension to the UGB sought is implied to require extension of the water and wastewater schemes to service this development.
- 15.5** No evidence has been supplied in support of the scheme extensions. The lot sizes will be too small to be serviced onsite, and therefore the only options to service this proposed development are community onsite systems or an extension of the QLDC network.
- 15.6** The existing wastewater reticulation network within Tucker Beach Road utilises a pressure sewer network at the western end, feeding into a 150 mm PVC gravity main closer to SH6. The current pipe sizing will not provide sufficient capacity for the Tuckers Beach Residential Precinct as proposed by the submitter.
- 15.7** The water supply network does not currently extend to this area. The 2025 water network models show an area of reduced pressure (15-30 m at minimum pressure) adjacent to this zone. This implies the existing network will likely struggle to support the development without upgrades.
- 15.8** The part of the submission seeking a Precinct does not appear to increase the density of development on the land beyond that which can be serviced privately. It is assumed that, should this portion of the submission stand alone, the intention to extend the UGB would not apply to this aspect. I refer also to paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3 above.

**15.9** Consequently, I oppose the relief sought in terms of extending the UGB and the proposed Tuckers Beach Residential Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective, because there is no information available to demonstrate how the area will be serviced and the lot sizes will be too small for servicing onsite.

**16. D BROOMFIELD AND WOODLOT PROPERTIES LTD (#2276)**

**16.1** D Broomfield and Woodlot Properties Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning of a number of sites, as follows:

(a) Within the Fitzpatrick Basin Landscape Unit:

- (i) Lot 2 DP 474658.
- (ii) Lot 24 DP 493649.
- (iii) Lot 26 DP 493649
- (iv) Lot 9 DP 483357.
- (v) Lot 2 DP 475338.

(b) Within the Tucker Beach Landscape Unit:

- (i) Lot 1 DP 473899.
- (ii) Lot 1 DP 323310.
- (iii) Lot 2 DP 473899.

**16.2** The Tucker Beach sites are located south of the Shotover River, west of Tucker Beach Road, west of Hansen Road and surrounding Lake Johnson and north and south of Littles Road. The area is not connected to a Council wastewater supply or water supply scheme, and lies outside of the Scheme Boundaries.

**16.3** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

**17. JAMES CANNING MUSPRATT (#2418)**

- 17.1** James Canning Muspratt has sought that the land subject to his submission is rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct.
- 17.2** The site is located above Graces Terrace, on the slopes of Ferry Hill above Tucker Beach Road. The site is bisected by the Council water and wastewater supply Scheme Boundaries, with approximately 3 hectares of the 15 hectare site within the scheme.
- 17.3** The site was notified as Rural Lifestyle Zone in Stage 1, which was overtaken by the Wakatipu Basin Variation. The Rural Lifestyle Zone applies an average density of 1 lot per 2 hectares, and a minimum lot size of 1 hectare. This gives a theoretical yield of 3 lots able to discharge to the water and wastewater schemes (based on the 3 hectares within the Scheme Boundaries). The Precinct, as applied to the same 3 hectares, could theoretically yield 5 lots able to discharge to the water and wastewater schemes. It is assumed that the Scheme Boundaries are not extended across the remainder of the site.
- 17.4** Consequently, the increase in infrastructure demand is small, and similar to the current demand, and I therefore do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective.

**18. J WATERSTON (#2308)**

- 18.1** Jon Waterson has sought that land subject to his submission is rezoned from Rural to Precinct.
- 18.2** The site is located above Tucker Beach Road, on the lower slopes of Ferry Hill. The site is within Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 18.3** The site was zoned as Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub-Zone in the ODP. This applies a minimum lot size of 4,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

- 18.4** In addition to the rezoning, the submission also seeks modification to the Precinct rules for this area to maintain the same minimum lot sizes as would apply in the Rural Residential Sub Zone.
- 18.5** The net increase in infrastructure demand compared to the notified PDP appears to be nil.
- 18.6** Consequently, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct or the amendments requested, from an infrastructure perspective.

### **LCU 5 DALEFIELD**

#### **19. G AND J SIDDALL (#2196)**

- 19.1** Gerald and Janice Siddal have submitted in support of the PDP, and in particular on the Precinct for land on Dalefield Road. The site is located at 111 Dalefield Road, roughly opposite Mountain View Road. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 19.2** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

### **LCU 6 WHAREHUANUI HILLS**

#### **20. SKIPP WILLIAMSON (#2272)**

- 20.1** Skipp Williamson has submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning of the subject land, with relief sought in a number of categories including boundary adjustments.
- 20.2** The submission refers to a number of sites, as follows:
- (a) Lot 2 DP 360366.
  - (b) Lot 2 DP 27602.
  - (c) Lot 1 and 2 DP 27112.
  - (d) Lot 1 and 2 DP 319853.
  - (e) Lots 1 and 2 DP 313306.



(f) Lot 2 DP 310422.

**20.3** The sites are located either side of Mooney Road, to the East of Hunter Road. The area is not connected to a Council wastewater supply or water supply scheme, and lies outside of the Scheme Boundaries.

**20.4** The relief sought relates to minor boundary adjustments and does not increase the density of development possibly on this land, which can be serviced privately onsite.

**20.5** Consequently, and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**21. R & M DONALDSON (#2229)**

**21.1** R & M Donaldson have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning for their property, with relief sought in a number of categories relating to location and type of buildings to be constructed, and minimum lot size provisions.

**21.2** The site is located adjacent to Millbrook resort. The area is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply, and sits outside the Scheme Boundaries.

**21.3** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

**22. KJ BRUSTAD (#2577)**

**22.1** Kirstie Jean Brustad has sought for the Precinct zoning on the land at 53 Mooney Road to be modified, particularly with regard to minimum lot sizes, construction of dwellings and landscape provisions.

**22.2** The site is located on the northern side of Mooney Road, approximately 5km from Arrowtown as the crow flies. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and sits outside the Scheme Boundaries.

- 22.3** The submission refers to Chapter 27 of the PDP with regard to infrastructure, which specifically notes a requirement that allotments are a suitable size and shape, and are able to be serviced and developed to the anticipated land use of the applicable zone. The applicable zone in this case is Precinct, and does not anticipate servicing via an extension to the Scheme Boundaries.
- 22.4** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land (even with the changes sought by the submitter) can be serviced privately onsite.
- 22.5** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**23. S BOTHERWAY (#2610)**

- 23.1** Simon Botherway has sought that the proposed Precinct zone is extended to cover the entire property at 27 Mooney Road, which was notified as part Amenity Zone / part Precinct.
- 23.2** The site is located approximately 6 km from Arrowtown and 6 km from Arthurs Point. The area is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply, and is outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 23.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective.

**24. D S MOLONEY (#2129)**

- 24.1** Denis Shaun Moloney has sought for the land within the Mooney Road area to be rezoned from notified Precinct to Amenity Zone.
- 24.2** The land in question is the land either side of Mooney Road. The area is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 24.3** The relief sought decreases the proposed density of development on this land.

**24.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**25. P NANCEKIVELL (#2171)**

**25.1** Patricia Nancekivell has sought for the land within the Mooney Road area to be rezoned from notified Precinct to Amenity Zone.

**25.2** The land in question is the land either side of Mooney Road. The area is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply and is located outside of the Scheme Boundaries.

**25.3** The relief sought decreases the proposed density of development on this land.

**25.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**26. J ANDERSSON (#2167)**

**26.1** This submission is considered in Mr Walter Clarke's evidence, for the Council.

**27. X-RAY TRUST LTD (#2619)**

**27.1** X-Ray Trust Limited and Avenue Trust have submitted generally in support of the proposed Precinct and Amenity Zones at 412-433 and 471 Speargrass Flat Road.

**27.2** The sites are located on the northern side of Speargrass Flat Road, approximately 3.5km from Arrowtown and 1 km from Lake Hayes as the crow flies. The area is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and sits adjacent to, but outside the Scheme Boundaries.

**27.3** The relief sought does not seek any rezoning and the density of development on this land can be serviced privately onsite.

## **LCU 8 SPEARGRASS FLATS**

### **28. LAKES HAYES EQUESTRIAN (#2380)**

- 28.1** Lake Hayes Equestrian has sought that land located north of Speargrass Flat Road and west of Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road be rezoned from Precinct to Rural or Amenity Zone.
- 28.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 28.3** The relief sought will decrease the proposed density of development on this land.
- 28.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

### **29. BEADLE (#2430)**

- 29.1** Peter, Jillian and Simon Beadle are opposed to the introduction of the Precinct and seek for it to be cancelled. In the alternative they seek for the land bounded by Waterfall Park Road, Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road, Speargrass Flat Road and Dalesman Lane to be excluded from the Precinct and be included in the Amenity Zone. I consider the alternative relief.
- 29.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 29.3** The relief sought decreases the proposed density of development on this land.
- 29.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**30. DOYLE (#2030)**

- 30.1** Murray Doyle has sought for the flats bordering Speargrass Road/ Hogan Gully Road/ Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road to be rezoned from notified Precinct to Amenity Zone, and for the area encompassing The Hills Golf Course to be rezoned from Amenity to Precinct.
- 30.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 30.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective

**31. BOXER HILLS TRUST (#2385)**

- 31.1** Boxer Hills Trust supports the Precinct over the land east of Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road in the vicinity of Hogans Gully Road but seeks modifications to the minimum lot size provisions of that precinct
- 31.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council wastewater supply. An area of the land is within the Council water scheme boundary.
- 31.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. The submission implies lot sizes smaller than 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> would be possible, although no minimum lot size is stated. As some of the land in question is within the water Scheme Boundary, there are potential adverse infrastructure effects.
- 31.4** Consequently, I oppose the relief sought from an infrastructure perspective, because there is no information available to demonstrate how the area will be serviced and the lot sizes have the potential to be too small for servicing onsite.

**32. R KAMPMAN SUBMISSION (#2433)**

**32.1** Rene Kampman has sought that an area of land to the north of Speargrass Flat Road, centred around Hunter Road be rezoned from the notified Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**32.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is not located within Scheme Boundaries.

**32.3** Although the change in zoning will allow for an increased density, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**33. WAKATIPU EQUITIES LTD (#2479)**

**33.1** Wakatipu Equities Limited has sought that the property at 258 Speargrass Flat Road be rezoned from Rural to Precinct.

**33.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of the Scheme Boundaries.

**33.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3 I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**34. SPEARGRASS TRUST (#2410)**

**34.1** Speargrass Trust has sought that the property at 174 Speargrass Flat Road be rezoned from Rural to Precinct or Rural Lifestyle.

**34.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**34.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed (for Precinct) that properties will be serviced privately onsite.

**34.4** As set out earlier in my evidence, I also understand that Rural Residential Zones are expected to provide on-site infrastructure. As this land is not located close to any existing schemes and there is unlikely to be any expectation for joining to Council schemes, and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**35. QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL (#2239)**

**35.1** Queenstown Lakes District Council has sought that an area of land located south of Millbrook Resort Zone and to the north of Speargrass Flat Road (Pt Lot 3 DP 5737) be rezoned from Precinct to Amenity Zone.

**35.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**35.3** The relief sought will decrease the proposed density of development on this land.

**35.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**36. LAKE HAYES LIMITED (#2377)**

**36.1** Lake Hayes Limited has sought that the property at 270 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road retain its Stage 1 PDP zoning of Rural Lifestyle rather than the notified Precinct under Stage 2.

**36.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes.

**36.3** As the Rural Lifestyle zone has a minimum lot size of 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> and the Precinct has a minimum lot size of 6,000 m<sup>2</sup>, the relief sought will not change the current density of development on this land].

**36.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**37. WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS SUBMISSION (#2388)**

**37.1** Mr Crowther addresses this submission in his evidence.

**38. R&N HART (#2101)**

**38.1** Mr Crowther addresses this submission in his evidence.

**39. J ANDERSSON (#2167)**

**39.1** Mr Crowther addresses this submission in his evidence.

**40. J&R HADLEY (#2559)**

**40.1** Mr Crowther addresses this submission in his evidence.

**LCU 9 HAWTHORN TRIANGLE**

**41. L MCFADGEN (#2529)**

**41.1** Len McFadgen has sought that the property at 210 Domain Road be rezoned from Amenity Zone to a new Lifestyle Precinct 'A', which would provide a minimum lot size of 4,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

**41.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**41.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed (for this Precinct 'A') that properties will be serviced privately onsite.

**41.4** As set out earlier in my evidence, I also understand that Rural Residential Zones are expected to provide on-site infrastructure. As this land is not located close to any existing schemes and there is unlikely to be any expectation for joining to Council schemes, and for



the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**42. R FERNER (#2464)**

**42.1** Ray Ferner supports the Precinct at the property at 10 Ayrshire land but seeks modifications to the minimum lot size provisions of that precinct, along with other modifications irrelevant to my evidence.

**42.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council wastewater supply. A part of the land appears to be serviced by a private water supply scheme, but none of the land is within the water or wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**42.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, as the site is outside of the council Scheme Boundaries and is currently serviced privately, the effects on council infrastructure are negligible.

**42.4** The submission implies lot sizes smaller than 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> would be possible, although no minimum lot size is stated.

**42.5** Consequently, I oppose the relief sought from an infrastructure perspective, because there is no information available to demonstrate how the area will be serviced and the lot sizes have the potential to be too small for servicing onsite.

**LCU 11 SLOPE HILL 'FOOTHILLS'**

**43. SHOTOVER TRUST (#2437)**

**43.1** Shotover Trust has sought that the land located at 362 Lower Shotover Road be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct or Rural Lifestyle.

**43.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**43.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed (for Precinct) that properties will be serviced privately onsite.

**43.4** As set out earlier in my evidence, I also understand that Rural Residential Zones are expected to provide on-site infrastructure. As this land is not located close to any existing schemes and there is unlikely to be any expectation for joining to Council schemes, and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**44. L MCFADGEN (#2296), D GALLAGHER (# 2248), MK GREENSLADE (#2249), P&J MCLEOD (#2298), R&S MCLEOD (#2300)**

**44.1** This group of submissions are very similar in wording, with only the lots in question varying, so I have been assessed as a group. In summary the submitters are generally in support of the proposed Precinct for their land, but seek changes to minimum lot sizes as well as other amendments. The specific land for each submitter is:

- (a) L McFadgen: land located at the corner of Domain and Speargrass Flat Roads;
- (b) D Gallagher: land on the northern side of Speargrass Flat Road;
- (c) MK Greenslade: land on the eastern side of Lower Shotover Road, south of Speargrass Flat Road; and
- (d) P & J McLeod, and R & S McLeod: land located on the eastern side of Domain Road, south of Birchwood Road.

**44.2** The sites are not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and sit outside the Scheme Boundaries. There are existing private water schemes supplying some of the sites.

**44.3** The relief sought in terms of minimum lot sizes and set backs does not increase the density of development on this land beyond that which can be serviced privately.

**44.4** The submitters also oppose the requirement to exclude stock from standing in the bed or margin of a water body. Removing this requirement has the potential to adversely impact on water and stormwater quality. This has the potential to introduce contaminants into surface water or groundwater, from which council and private water supplies take drinking water. I oppose this relief for these reasons.

**44.5** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**45. P SMITH (#2500)**

**45.1** Philip Smith has sought that the land at 26 Slope Hill Road be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct, as well as amendments to the provisions.

**45.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.

**45.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. The site is approximately 6 hectares in area, and therefore up to 6 lots could be created under the requested rezoning. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed that properties will be serviced privately onsite.

**45.4** Consequently and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**46. E&M HARRIS/THE ASHFORD TRUST (#2535)**

**46.1** This submission is commented on in another section below.

**47. M&C BURGESS (#2591)**

**47.1** M & C Burgess have sought that the land located east of Lower Shotover Road that was zoned Rural Lifestyle in Stage 1, and was notified as Amenity Zone in Stage 2, is rezoned to Precinct.

**47.2** The land in question is not within the Council water and wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**47.3** Consequently and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**48. CASSIDY TRUST (#2144)**

**48.1** Cassidy Trust has sought that the land at 144 Lower Shotover Road is rezoned from the notified Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**48.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**48.3** However, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**49. R&M WALES (#2270)**

**49.1** Robert and Marie Wales have sought that the land at 94 Lower Shotover Road is rezoned from notified Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**49.2** The land in question is not within the Council water and wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**49.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**50. GW STALKER FAMILY TRUST (SPRINGBANK) (#2553)**

**50.1** GW Stalker Family Trust has sought that the land to the north of Lower Shotover Road around Springbank Grove is rezoned from notified Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**50.2** The land in question is not within the Council water and wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**50.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**51. SLOPEHILL JOINT VENTURE (#2475)**

**51.1** Slopehill Joint Venture has sought that their land located at Slope Hill Road is rezoned from notified Amenity Zone to its Proposed District Plan Stage 1 zoning of Rural, or Precinct.

**51.2** The land in question is not within the Council water and wastewater Scheme Boundaries.

**51.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**52. D ANDREW SUBMISSION (#2049)**

**52.1** Don Andrew has sought that the eastern end of the Slopehill Road Basin is rezoned from notified Wakatipu Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**52.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes, although it is adjacent to both boundaries.

**52.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective. I wish to emphasise, due to the location adjacent to current Scheme Boundaries, that there may be environmental benefits to expanding the Scheme Boundaries in this area. The land in question is within the greater catchment of Lake Hayes, and increased density of on-site wastewater systems in this area may have adverse environmental effects. The submission does not seek this relief however, and so the infrastructure effects have not been assessed.

## **LCU 12 LAKE HAYES RURAL RESIDENTIAL**

### **53. JG FRENCH & ME BURT (#2417)**

- 53.1** John French and Mary Burt have sought that the property at 229 Lake Hayes Road be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct.
- 53.2** The land in question is within the Council water scheme and connected to a Council wastewater supply.
- 53.3** The ODP zoning on this property is Rural Residential. With a land area of 3.4992 hectares, the existing zoning allows for a theoretical capacity of 2-3 lots. The Precinct would provide for 3-4 lots.
- 53.4** The relief sought will increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, the overall increase in density of development will be minor. It would be an inefficient use of infrastructure to require the additional 1-2 lots to provide on-site infrastructure.
- 53.5** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

### **54. McGUINNESS PA (#2447), JUIE QT LIMITED (#2488), UNITED ESTATES RANCH LIMITED (# 2126), PJ DENNISON & SJ GRANT (#2301)**

- 54.1** The submitters seek that the zoning at the north of Lake Hayes be amended to remove the Amenity Zone and Precinct, and reinstate the zones as notified under the Stage 1 PDP maps (which was Rural Residential) or maintain a similar zoning to the current ODP.
- 54.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes, and the density of development in this area is generally in line with the ODP Rural Residential zone.
- 54.3** The relief sought will generally retain the current density of development on this land, and further development to the same density is anticipated within the water supply and wastewater schemes.

**54.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**55. LAKE HAYES LIMITED (#2377)**

**55.1** Lake Hayes Limited has sought that all Stage 2 maps be amended to remove the new areas of Amenity Zone and Precinct, and reinstate the zones as notified under the Stage 1 PDP maps.

**55.2** The land in question contains areas of varying connection to the Council water and wastewater supply.

**55.3** I have considered rezonings within the Wakatipu Basin on specific areas of land elsewhere, and refer to those where relevant. Otherwise, where the relief would result in a less intensive zone, I have no objections to the relief sought. Where the land would revert to Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle, on-site infrastructure is still expected, at the developer's own costs.

**55.4** On this basis, I do not oppose the relief sought, although I refer to my responses to specific relief sought as overriding this general, Basin-wide relief.

**LCU 13 LAKE HAYES SLOPES**

**56. MORVEN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (#2490)**

**56.1** Morven Residents Association has sought that all property located on the western side of Morven Hill, above the State Highway, have the Amenity Zoning removed and that it either revert to its existing ODP Rural Residential zone, or the notified Rural Residential zone under Stage 1 or is rezoned Precinct.

**56.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes, and the density of development in this area is generally in line with the operative Rural Residential zone.

**56.3** The relief sought will generally retain the current density of development on this land, and further development to the same density is anticipated within the water supply and wastewater schemes.

**56.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3.

**57. TJ & MA HARRISON (#2163)**

**57.1** TJ & MA Harrison have sought that the property located at 61 Jean Robins Drive, Lake Hayes, have the notified Amenity Zoning removed and that it retains its Stage 1 Rural Residential zone.

**57.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes, and the density of development in this area is generally in line with the operative Rural Residential zone.

**57.3** The relief sought will generally retain the current density of development on this land, and further development to the same density is anticipated within the water supply and wastewater schemes.

**57.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**58. AC ROBINS, AJ ROBINS & HJM CALLAGHAN (#2104)**

**58.1** AC Robins, AJ Robins and HJM Callaghan have sought that the property located at 13 Jean Robins Drive, Lake Hayes, be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct.

**58.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes, and is currently zoned Rural Residential under the ODP.

**58.3** The requested rezoning will result in a comparable density of development to that allowed under the current ODP zoning.

**58.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.



**59. E&M HARRIS, THE ASHFORD TRUST (#2535)**

- 59.1** The Ashford Trust have sought that the land located on the eastern side of Lower Shotover Road, be rezoned from Amenity Zone to either Stage 1 Rural Residential or Precinct.
- 59.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries, but adjacent to the Water Scheme Boundary.
- 59.3** The relief sought may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed (for Precinct and Rural Residential) that properties will be serviced privately onsite.
- 59.4** As set out earlier in my evidence, I also understand that Rural Residential Zones are expected to provide on-site infrastructure. Therefore, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**60. LAKE HAYES CELLAR (#2378)**

- 60.1** Lake Hayes Cellar has sought that the Amisfield Winery site (Lake Hayes Cellar land) be rezoned from notified Rural to either a Rural Residential zone (as requested under Stage 1) , or is included within a new bespoke 'Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct'.
- 60.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes. LHC holds approved resource consents, now implemented, to establish and operate a winery (RM970591), to establish signage (RM040075), construction additions to the winery building (RM041030 and RM0060442) and to hold an art exhibition (RM071218), providing a commercial overlay over the underlying Rural zoning.
- 60.3** The rezoning requested allows for similar use to the current commercial activities on the land, with modifications in terms of hours of operation and noise. The submission also requests modification to

policies to allow low density residential development to occur within rural and Precinct zones. If this was applied to the subject site, as the land is 1.6863 hectares, the potential development yield for this zoning is 25 residential lots.

**60.4** This increases the infrastructure load significantly over the existing ODP zoning. This is not a small development (which I consider to be fewer than 15 lots). Without further evidence supporting a rezoning request that allows LDR equivalent density, I oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**60.5** The alternative request to retain the existing zoning, with the commercial overlay allowed by Resource Consents, has no impact from an infrastructure perspective. Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought to retain the existing zoning, from an infrastructure perspective.

**61. JOHN MCCRAE MARTIN, C J DOHERTY & K W FERGUS (#2517)**

**61.1** John McCrae Martin, Colin John Doherty and Kenneth William Fergus have sought for land on the eastern side of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road (Lot 1 DP 320468) to be rezoned from Amenity to Low Density Residential. The land is zoned Rural under the ODP.

**61.2** The land in question lies partially within the Council water and wastewater schemes.

**61.3** The rezoning requested allows for low density residential development, which at 4.3156 hectares, has a potential development yield for this zoning of 65 residential lots.

**61.4** This increases the infrastructure load significantly over the existing zoning. This is not a small development (which I consider to be fewer than 15 lots). Without further infrastructure evidence supporting a rezoning request that allows LDR development, I oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**62. JM MARTIN, CJ DOHERTY & KW FERGUS (#2517)**

- 62.1** JM Martin, CJ Doherty & KW Fergus have sought that Lot 1 Deposited Plan 320468 that is directly adjacent to the Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road be rezoned from notified Amenity Zone to Low Density Residential.
- 62.2** The land in question is within the Council water and wastewater schemes.
- 62.3** The relief sought will increase the current proposed density of development on this land. The area covers approximately 1.4ha and it is estimated that an additional 22 residential dwellings would need to be allowed for under the Low Density Residential zone.
- 62.4** This increases the infrastructure load significantly. Without further infrastructure evidence supporting a rezoning request for LDR equivalent density, I oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**63. R MONK (#2281)**

- 63.1** Roger Monk has sought that the entirety of the Landscape Character Unit (**LCU**) 24 be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct, and that LCU 13 be rezoned back to its Stage 1 Rural Residential.
- 63.2** LCU 24 is generally not connected to a Council water or wastewater supply, and is located outside of Scheme Boundaries.
- 63.3** The relief sought for LCU 24 may increase the proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed (for Precinct) that properties will be serviced privately onsite.
- 63.4** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought for LCU 24, from an infrastructure perspective.

- 63.5** LCU 13 is generally within the Council water and wastewater schemes. The land as described in the submission is currently zoned Rural Residential.
- 63.6** The relief sought with regard to LCU 13 will retain the current proposed density of development on this land.
- 63.7** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought for LCU 13, from an infrastructure perspective.

**64. ARROWTOWN RETIREMENT VILLAGE JOINT VENTURE (#2505)**

- 64.1** Arrowtown Retirement Village Joint Venture has sought that land subject to the Arrowtown Retirement Village is rezoned with a zoning that is consistent with resource consent SH160141.
- 64.2** The SHA consent process assessed the infrastructure demand associated with the Arrowtown Retirement Village.
- 64.3** The relief sought will retain the current proposed density of development on this land, assuming the density is identical to that proposed under SH160141.
- 64.4** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective, if the proposed zone goes no further than what is already consented.

**65. C BATCHELOR (#2318), DD & JC DUNCAN (#2319), LAKE HAYES INVESTMENTS LTD (#2291), STONERIDGE ESTATE LTD (#2314), RG DAYMAN (#2315), TUI TRUSTEES (2015) LTD (#2316), MANDEVILLE TRUST / S LECK (#2317)**

- 65.1** C Batchelor, DD & JC Duncan, Lake Hayes Investments Ltd, Stoneridge Estate Ltd, RG Dayman, Tui Trustees(2015) Ltd and Mandeville Trust/ S Leck have sought that Map 13d be amended so that the land east of Lake Hayes including land south east and north west of State Highway 6 and east of Lake Hayes-Arrowtown Road, from the State Highway turnoff through to the notified Precinct at

Hogans Gully Road and generally west of the ODP Bendemeer Zone be rezoned to a new 'Precinct A' and Precinct B'.

- 65.2 The land in question is partially within the boundaries of the Council water and wastewater schemes.
- 65.3 The relief sought will increase the current proposed density of development on this land, however it does not increase the density beyond what can be handled onsite.
- 65.4 Consequently, and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**66. WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED (#2389)**

- 66.1 Mr Walter Clarke is providing evidence on this submission.

**LCU 14 LAKE HAYES TERRACE**

**67. AK ROBINS, ANDERSON LLOYD TRUSTEE CO LTD & RB ROBINS (#2398)**

- 67.1 AK Robins and Anderson Lloyd Trustee Co Limited have sought that the properties located at 64 Jean Robins Drive and 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway, be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct or Low Density Residential.
- 67.2 The property at 64 Jean Robins Road is within the Council water and wastewater schemes. The property at 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.
- 67.3 Designating 64 Jean Robins Road as Precinct will retain the current proposed density of development on this land.
- 67.4 Designating 64 Jean Robins Road as Low Density Residential will increase the current proposed density of development for this land.

- 67.5** Designating 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway as Precinct will increase the current proposed density of development on this land. However, any increase is unlikely to impact on the capacity of the surrounding infrastructure as it is assumed that properties will be serviced privately on-site.
- 67.6** Designating 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway as Low Density Residential will significantly increase the current proposed density of development on this land and require an extension to the existing Council infrastructure.
- 67.7** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, , I do not oppose the designating of 64 Jean Robins Road and 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway as Precinct from an infrastructure perspective. I do oppose the designating of 64 Jean Robins Road and 672 Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway as Low Density Residential from an infrastructure perspective.

#### **LCU 17 MORVEN FERRY**

##### **68. WK ALLEN & FL ALLEN (#2482)**

- 68.1** WK and FL Allen have sought that the properties at 49 & 53 Morven Ferry Road have the notified Amenity Zone removed. The submitters have further sought that all Rural General zoned land that is not contained within the ONF and directly adjoins and is accessed off the triangle formed by the junction of Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction be rezoned as Rural Lifestyle or similar zoning that provides for rural living.
- 68.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.
- 68.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**69. KT DUNLOP & SA GREEN (#2609)**

**69.1** KT Dunlop & SA Green have sought that all Rural General zoned land (including the property at 55 Morven Road) that is not contained within the ONF and directly adjoins and is accessed off the triangle formed by the junction of Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction be rezoned as Rural Lifestyle or similar zoning that provides for rural living.

**69.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.

**69.3** .For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**70. A WARD (#2244)**

**70.1** Anthony Ward has sought that the Precinct be extended to an area 100 metres beyond the land bounded by Arrow Junction Road, Morven Ferry Road and Lake Hayes – Arrow Junction Highway, or that the Precinct be extended to include the land at 123 Morven Ferry Road (18ha) Rapid 88 Arrow Junction Road (CT OT15D/603 Lot 2 DP 23630).

**70.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.

**70.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**71. MC GUTHRIE (#2412)**

**71.1** Maxwell Campbell Guthrie has sought that the land subject to his submission (described as Lots 1, 2 & 3 DP344972 located on Morven Ferry Road) be rezoned Precinct, rather than Amenity Zone as notified.

**71.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.

- 71.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

## **LCU 18 MORVEN EASTERN FOOTHILLS**

### **72. LAKE HAYES ESTATE PROPERTIES LTD (#2525)**

- 72.1** Lake Hayes Estate Properties Limited has sought that the Wakatipu Basin Chapter 24 zoning on Map 13d be replaced with the notified Stage 1 PDP Zoning.
- 72.2** The land in question is a mixture of within and outside the Council water or wastewater schemes.
- 72.3** I have considered rezonings within the Wakatipu Basin on specific areas of land elsewhere, and refer to those where relevant. Otherwise, where the relief would result in a less intensive zone, I have no objections to the relief sought. Where the land would revert to Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle, on-site infrastructure is still expected, at the developer's own costs.
- 72.4** On this basis, I do not oppose the relief sought, although I refer to my responses to specific relief sought as overriding this general, Basin-wide relief.

## **LCU 19 GIBBSTON HIGHWAY FLATS**

### **73. GOLDCREST FARMING LTD (#2607)**

- 73.1** Goldcrest Farming Limited has sought that the land within Landscape Character Unit 19 (Gibbston Highway Flats) Map 13d be rezoned from Amenity Zone to Precinct B.
- 73.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.



- 73.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

#### **LCU 21 ARROW JUNCTION**

**74. J HENKENHAF (#2562)**

- 74.1** Joerg Joachim Henkenhaf has sought that the land subject to his submission (located at 3 Whitechapel Road) is identified as Precinct with a minimum lot density of 3000m<sup>2</sup>.
- 74.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater schemes.
- 74.3** As outlined in paragraph 5.7, lot sizes smaller than 5,500 m<sup>2</sup> will require secondary wastewater treatment to ensure sustainable onsite servicing.
- 74.4** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective, with the condition that secondary onsite wastewater treatment will be required.

#### **LCU 22 THE HILLS**

**75. TROJAN HELMET (#2387)**

- 75.1** Trojan Helmet Limited has sought that planning Map 26 be amended to rezone the area of The Hills Golf Course as a new designation called The Hills Resort Zone.
- 75.2** The land in question is not currently within the Council water or wastewater schemes.
- 75.3** The relief sought will increase the density of development on this land over that allowed by the current rural zoning.

- 75.4** The submission includes an infrastructure assessment completed by Hadley Consultants Ltd, outlining the options and preferred solution for servicing the equivalent of 100 residential lots.
- 75.5** Hadley Consultants propose either connecting to the Arrowtown water supply scheme, or providing a stand-alone bore supply. They have identified the potential for buffer storage and booster pumps within the site, and also the need for development contributions to be paid, should connection to the Arrowtown Scheme be permitted. There are projects within the LTP to increase borefield, treatment and storage capacity for the Arrowtown Scheme, and subject to development contributions being made available to contribute to necessary upgrades, sufficient capacity is likely to be able to be made available from the Arrowtown Scheme. The alternative scenario proposed by Hadleys allows for the development to proceed without generating additional demand on the Arrowtown water scheme.
- 75.6** Similar to the water supply assessment, Hadley Consultants propose either connecting to the municipal wastewater scheme, or providing a stand-alone community system. They have similarly identified the need for development contributions to be paid for connection to be permitted. The current Wakatipu Basin wastewater network performance report notes no significant problems within the network to be fed by this proposed development, although there is an overflow for the 2028 future scenario. Assuming internal networks are a developer cost, and development contributions are made available to contribute to wider network and headworks upgrades, sufficient capacity is likely to be able to be made available for this development. The alternative scenario proposed by Hadleys allows for the development to proceed without generating additional demand on the Wakatipu wastewater network.
- 75.7** Consequently, because there are options that do not impact on the council water and wastewater networks, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**76. M DOYLE (#2030)**

- 76.1** Murray Doyle has sought for the flats bordering Speargrass Road/ Hogan Gully Road/ Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road notified as Precinct be rezoned Amenity Zone and the area encompassing The Hills Golf Course should be zoned Precinct.
- 76.2** The land in question is not connected to a Council water and wastewater supply.
- 76.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**LCU 23 MILLBROOK**

**77. MILLBROOK COUNTRY CLUB (#2295 and #2605)**

- 77.1** Millbrook Country Club seeks for zoning of land adjacent to Millbrook to be modified to reflect landscape protection zones and delineations.
- 77.2** The relief sought is varied, but can generally be described as maintaining or reducing the extent of development on this land from the PDP provisions.
- 77.3** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 77.4** The relief sought will either retain or decrease the current proposed density of development on this land from that intended under the PDP.
- 77.5** The zoning requested does not imply connection of the sites in question to the Council water and wastewater schemes, and it is inferred that servicing of any development on these lots would be via private onsite schemes.
- 77.6** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**78. JE GRIFFIN (#2580), PH ARCHIBALD (#2501), J EGERTON & COOK ALLAN GIBSON TRUSTEE COMPANY LIMITED (#2419), M AND K CAMPBELL (#2413), BOUNDARY TRUST (#2444), SPRUCE GROVE TRUST (#2512)**

- 78.1** The applicants seek that land surrounding Millbrook be rezoned to Millbrook Resort Zone, or as an alternative, that the land be zoned as Precinct.
- 78.2** The sites are currently outside of the water and wastewater scheme boundaries and are not serviced by council water or wastewater schemes.
- 78.3** The Millbrook Resort Zone sits within the water and wastewater scheme boundaries. The resort is supplied by the Arrowtown Water Scheme, and connects to the Wakatipu Wastewater Scheme on Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road.
- 78.4** Infrastructure within the resort is privately owned and maintained, receiving a bulk supply from the Arrowtown water scheme, and discharging to the wastewater network via a private wastewater pumping station.
- 78.5** From conversations with Stuart Pile of QLDC, I understand that development within the Millbrook Resort Zone has been subject to a historic agreement.
- 78.6** Additional development within the zone, or the extension of the zone, has the potential to increase the development potential outside of that which was anticipated at the time the original development agreement was put in place. This would place additional demands on the Council infrastructure.
- 78.7** There are upgrades planned to the Arrowtown Water Supply and the broader Wakatipu Wastewater scheme which should be able to support further development in this area. It is anticipated that developments requiring these upgrades would contribute to the cost, via development contributions or similar.

- 78.8** Consequently, I do not oppose the rezoning requested to incorporate these lots within the Millbrook Special Zone from an infrastructure perspective, on the condition that development contributions are made to contribute to the headworks upgrades required to support the zone extension, or a revised development agreement provides similar relief.
- 78.9** The alternative request to rezone the land in question to WBLP as opposed to Millbrook Special Zone would result in the land remaining outside of the water and wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 78.10** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the alternative relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**79. G WILLS & T BURDON (#2320)**

- 79.1** I am not providing comment on this application due to a conflict of interest, as part of the land in question appears to include a small part of previous proposals presented by Waterfall Park Developments Ltd.

**80. A FEELEY, E BORRIE & LP TRUSTEES LTD (#2397)**

- 80.1** The applicants seek that land between McDonnell and Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road is rezoned Low Density Residential and included within the Arrowtown UGB.
- 80.2** The land in question is currently outside of the Council wastewater scheme, but within the water supply scheme. The demand on the water supply scheme is assessed based on the current rural zoning.
- 80.3** The land has previously been proposed for development, including via SHA processes.
- 80.4** The LDR rezoning requested is at odds with the structure plan submitted, which indicates a higher density along McDonnell Road, with a lower density in the interior of the site and a setback from Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road. The land has an area of 6.1715

hectares, with a theoretical yield of 93 lots. The structure plan appears to show 35 lots.

- 80.5** The submission does not provide information regarding how the infrastructure will support the development, other than noting that there is surrounding infrastructure.
- 80.6** The water supply network should have adequate levels of service from the perspective of flows and pressures, assuming development contributions are paid to offset the headworks upgrades required in terms of borefields, treatment and reservoir storage.
- 80.7** The rezoning sought would create a significant additional load on the wastewater network in this area. There is an existing 150 mm sewer main within McDonnell Road. This main already supports approximately 20 hectares of residential development. Based on the potential development of this area to the maximum allowed under the LDR zone to 1 lot per 450 m<sup>2</sup>, the contributing catchment could feasibly include over 300 lots. The downstream portion of this catchment is relatively flat, and it is assumed the pipe is close to minimum grade. In accordance with NZS4404:2010, a 150 mm sewer laid at minimum grade can support up to 250 lots. The existing catchment exceeds this, and therefore there is no theoretical capacity for the rezoning requested by this submission.
- 80.8** The proposed development is at the upstream end of the catchment, and upgrading the reticulation to support the development would require significant lengths of pipework, and likely sewage pumping station upgrades.
- 80.9** There may be options to mitigate the infrastructure effects via a separate sewer connection, or onsite pressure sewer connections designed to pump during periods of low flow. This has not been proposed within the application.
- 80.10** Based on the significant increase in sewer demand and insufficient capacity within the network, I oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

## **LCU 24 SOUTH ARROWTOWN**

### **81. ARROW IRRIGATION COMPANY (#852)**

- 81.1** Arrow Irrigation Company seeks to rezone a small portion of land to take into account the existing industrial landuse of the site.
- 81.2** The land in question is outside of the scheme boundaries for the Arrowtown water scheme and the Wakatipu Wastewater scheme. It lies on the edge of the Butel Park area of Arrowtown, and at the end of Bush Creek Road.
- 81.3** This area has been identified in the Arrowtown Water Model as being subject to pressures below 30m head (Bush Creek Road) and having firefighting and security of supply issues (Butel Park).
- 81.4** Based on the current shortfalls in the water supply network in this area, I oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

### **82. SHAPING OUR FUTURE (#2511), QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST (#2299)**

- 82.1** The applicants seek that land on the southern side of Jopp Street not be rezoned to WBRA, and that the Arrowtown Urban Growth Boundary is extended to include this site.
- 82.2** The land in question is currently outside of the Council water or wastewater schemes, as it sits outside the UGB.
- 82.3** The land has previously been considered for development, and has been included in the Arrowtown Water Model. The previous development considered in this area had a yield of 67 lots. At the LDR density currently requested, the potential yield for the site would be 102 lots.
- 82.4** The relief sought would result in the site becoming part of the catchment for the Norfolk Street wastewater pumping station. This

wastewater pumping station has known constraints from an emergency storage point of view, and I have been advised by Mr Ulrich Glasner that there are upgrades planned within the 2018-2028 LTP to address the shortfall and allow for future capacity. I have been informed that the Jopp Street site has been included in the capacity calculations to inform these upgrades. The yield considered for this upgrade was not stated, but based on previous modelling undertaken for the site, the 67 lot yield is likely to have been used. The additional 35 lots has the potential to increase the peak wastewater flows by approximately 1.5 l/s. Given the pumping station upgrade is not yet underway, and has not been fully designed, the additional 1.5 l/s will be able to be accommodated without significant extra cost.

- 82.5** The wastewater gravity network would require extension to service the Jopp Street site, and potentially require a new wastewater pumping station internal to the site. The receiving reticulation network appears to have sufficient capacity for the development at either 67 or 102 lots.
- 82.6** The water network will also require extension, and installation of new hydrants to support the site. From the point of view of the water network, the fire-fighting demands generally govern in a domestic demand situation, and therefore the increase by 35 lots will potentially increase the size of the local reticulation network to supply the site, but not require significant upgrade to the wider reticulation network.
- 82.7** These upgrades will not benefit the community as a whole; they are only required to service the site in question.
- 82.8** The relief sought will increase the density from the current situation, however, this is in a way that has been anticipated when considering upgrades due in the LTP.
- 82.9** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective, as long as the required extensions to the water and wastewater network are borne by the developer and are not offset against development contributions.



# ARROWTOWN, LAKE HAYES, LADIES MILE - STAGE 1 SUBMISSION ORDER

## REQUESTS FOR REZONINGS ONLY

### 83. SLOPE HILL

#### **Justin Crane & Kirsty Mactaggart - #688**

**83.1** Crane and MacTaggart have sought that approximately 20ha of land be rezoned from Rural to Rural Residential. Based on the current property boundaries the rezoning would allow potential for approximately 15 new residential dwellings.

**83.2** The land is located to the north of Ladies Mile between Marshall Avenue and Lake Hayes.

**83.3** The land is within Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries. Water supply is provided from the Lake Hayes Scheme and there are existing wastewater mains within the area of the proposed rezoning. There is sufficient capacity within these services to accommodate an increase to the servicing requirements on this site.

**83.4** I do not oppose the rezoning to Rural Residential as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective, because it is expected that these areas will be connected in to existing infrastructure within Council scheme boundaries without any increase required to the infrastructure capacity.

#### **Wayne Evans, GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry – #534; Cassidy Trust - #631**

**83.5** This group of submissions are very similar in wording with only the lots in question varying, so have been assessed as a group.

**83.6** Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust and Mike Henry have sought to have approximately 41ha of land rezoned from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle. The land is located to the east of Lower Shotover Road.

- 83.7** The Cassidy Trust has sought that approximately 23ha of land be rezoned from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle Zone. They have further sought that the minimum lot size under the Rural Lifestyle Zone be reduced from 2ha to 1ha. The land is located between Lower Shotover Road and the existing Outstanding Natural Landscape boundary.
- 83.8** The land is not within Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 83.9** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Rural Lifestyle, from an infrastructure perspective, because it is expected these areas will be privately serviced on.

**GW Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin - #535, Sam Strain - #351, Alexander Reid - #277**

- 83.10** This group of submissions are very similar in wording, with only the lots in question varying, so have been addressed as a group.
- 83.11** The G W Stalker Trust has sought that approximately 107ha of land be rezoned from Rural to Rural Lifestyle Zone. They have further sought that the minimum lot size under the Rural Lifestyle Zone be reduced from 2ha to 1ha. The land is located to the north of Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes.
- 83.12** Sam Strain has sought that approximately 12ha of land be rezoned from Rural to Rural Lifestyle Zone. He has further sought that the minimum lot size under the Rural Lifestyle Zone be reduced from 2ha to 1ha. The land is located to the north of Ladies Mile in the vicinity of Strains Road.
- 83.13** Alexander Reid has sought that parts of the northern side of Ladies Mile should be rezoned to a mixture of Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle.
- 83.14** Some of these sites are within Council water and wastewater boundaries but the majority are not. Specifically, the land relating to the

Threepwood development, and David Finlin's land at 25 Mcdowell Drive lies within water and wastewater scheme boundaries.

- 83.15** All sites outside the Council scheme boundaries would continue to be serviced privately on site.
- 83.16** Water supply to areas within the scheme boundary is considered possible with the properties being fed from the Lake Hayes Scheme. No upgrade to existing services is required.
- 83.17** Wastewater connection to areas within the scheme boundary is considered possible but will likely require an upgrade to existing infrastructure. The extent of this upgrade would be dependent upon other development being undertaken in the area and would need to be further assessed.
- 83.18** There may be opportunity to connect other areas in to the Council infrastructure. However, this would require an extension to the scheme boundaries that would be addressed by a separate application and therefore this has not been considered further in this evidence.
- 83.19** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 -5.3 I do not oppose the rezoning to either Rural Lifestyle or Rural Residential Zone as outlined in the above submissions, from an infrastructure perspective. Areas within Council scheme boundaries can be serviced without any significant effects on the current infrastructure capacity.

#### **84. LAKE HAYES ESTATE MARGINS**

##### **Scott Crawford - #842**

- 84.1** Scott Crawford has sought to have Lot 403 DP379403 rezoned from Rural General to Medium Density Residential. It is estimated that the rezoning would allow potential for approximately 40 new residential dwellings.
- 84.2** The land is located to the south of Lake Hayes Estate off Onslow Road and is 1.16ha in size. The surrounding property is zoned Rural General and Rural Residential.

- 84.3** The property is within the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries. The property is serviced by the Shotover Country Scheme for water supply and connects in to the Lake Hayes Estate wastewater reticulation.
- 84.4** The water supply capacity for this property has previously been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that based on the programmed upgrades to the Shotover Country Scheme there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.
- 84.5** The wastewater servicing capacity for this property has also been reported on with regard to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.
- 84.6** I do not oppose the rezoning to Medium Density Residential as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective, because previous reporting has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the surrounding water and wastewater networks to service this site.

**85. MORVEN HILL**

**Lindsay Topp - #121**

- 85.1** Lindsay Topp has sought to have Lots 1 and 2 DP 476278 included in the designation of Rural Lifestyle that has been extended over adjacent properties. The site is located to the east of Alec Robins Road and encompasses approximately 11ha of land. The current zoning of the site is Rural General.
- 85.2** Some of the property is within the Council water scheme boundary. None of the property is within the Council wastewater scheme boundary.

**85.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Rural Lifestyle as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective.

**86. LCU 10 LADIES MILE**

**Don Moffatt and Brian Dodds - #239**

**86.1** Don Moffat and Brian Dodds have sought that 13.6 ha of land be rezoned from Rural to Rural Lifestyle Zone. It is also sought that the minimum property size for Rural Lifestyle be reduced from 2ha to 1ha.

**86.2** The site is located between Ladies Mile and Shotover Country and is legally titled as Lot 500 DP 470412.

**86.3** Council GIS (and in **Attachment 1**) records show the site as being outside the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries. However, as this area covers the land previously subject to an approved SHA application, the scheme boundaries have been extended to cover the site and this is considered a GIS anomaly.

**86.4** The water supply capacity for this property has previously been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that based on the programmed upgrades to the Shotover Country Scheme there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.

**86.5** The wastewater servicing capacity for this property has also been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.

## **R & R Jones - #850**

- 86.6** John Edmonds and Associates Limited and R & R Jones have sought to have approximately 40ha of land rezoned from Rural General to Low Density Residential.
- 86.7** The land is located between Lake Hayes Estate to the north and Shotover Country to the west and encompasses Sections 109, 110, 66 & 129 Blk III Shotover SD; Lot 2 DP 20797; and Lot 2 DP 475594.
- 86.8** The area is not within the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 86.9** The water supply capacity for this property has previously been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that based on the programmed upgrades to the Shotover Country Scheme there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.
- 86.10** The wastewater servicing capacity for this property has also been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club development. The findings of this report were that there was sufficient capacity to service the Queenstown Country Club development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.
- 86.11** Although the previous modelling has confirmed capacity for the Queenstown Country Club development, a low density zoning over the site has the potential to significantly increase the infrastructure demands above the flows and demands modelled.
- 86.12** I therefore oppose the rezoning to low density residential, from an infrastructure perspective, because although previous reporting has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the surrounding water and wastewater networks to service the QCC development as currently

described, the proposed rezoning does not provide enough clarity to understand the specific infrastructure demands.

#### **D Boyd - #838**

- 86.13** D Boyd has sought to have approximately 29ha of land rezoned from Rural General to Large Lot Residential. It is not specified whether this is to be Large Lot Residential A (4000m<sup>2</sup>) or Large Lot Residential B (2000m<sup>2</sup>). It is estimated that the rezoning would allow potential for between 50 – 100 new residential dwellings, depending whether the lot size was 2000m<sup>2</sup> or 4000m<sup>2</sup>.
- 86.14** The land is located around Max's Way, between Ladies Mile and Shotover Country. The surrounding property is zoned Rural General and Rural Residential.
- 86.15** The site is not within the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries.
- 86.16** On-site servicing can be achieved on a 2000m<sup>2</sup> or 4000m<sup>2</sup> property, as long as secondary onsite wastewater treatment is provided for the reasons set out in paragraph 5.7. There may be opportunity for some of the properties bordering on existing serviced areas to connect in to QLDC infrastructure. However, this would require an extension to the scheme boundary as a separate application and so it has not been considered in this evidence.
- 86.17** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Large Lot Residential as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective.

#### **Felzar Properties - #229**

- 86.18** Felzar Properties Limited has sought to have approximately 1.6ha of land rezoned from Rural General to Rural Residential. The land is located at the southern end of Lake Hayes and encompasses Part Sections 115 and 210R Blk III Shotover SD.

**86.19** The land is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**86.20** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Rural Residential as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective.

**Sanderson Group - #404**

**86.21** Sanderson Group has sought that 13.6ha of land be rezoned from Rural General to an Urban Zone that enables the construction of a Retirement Village as a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity.

**86.22** The site is located between Ladies Mile and Shotover Country and is legally titled as Lot 500 DP 470412.

**86.23** Council GIS records show the site as being outside the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries. However, as this area covers the land previously subject to an approved SHA application, the scheme boundaries have been extended to cover the site and this is considered a GIS anomaly.

**86.24** The water supply capacity for this property has previously been reported on with regards to the proposed Queenstown Country Club (QCC) development. The findings of this report were that based on the programmed upgrades to the Shotover Country Scheme there was sufficient capacity to service the property to the density currently permitted for the QCC development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.

**86.25** The wastewater servicing capacity for this property has also been reported on with regards to the proposed QCC development. The findings of this report were that there was sufficient capacity to service the property to the density currently permitted for the QCC development. Development contributions to assist with the servicing of the site would be likely.



**86.26** The proposed rezoning allows for multiple potential density outcomes for this land. This creates a large amount of uncertainty as to the infrastructure demands generated, and these need to be assessed across the entire Ladies Mile Area.

**86.27** I therefore oppose the rezoning to an Urban Zone that enables the construction of a Retirement Village as a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective, because although previous reporting has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the surrounding water and wastewater networks to service the QCC development as currently described, the proposed rezoning does not provide enough clarity to understand the specific infrastructure demands.

#### **Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust - #532**

**86.28** Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust has sought to have approximately 15ha of land rezoned from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle. The land is located between Ladies Mile and Lake Hayes Estate.

**86.29** The land is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**86.30** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Rural Lifestyle as outlined in the above submission, from an infrastructure perspective.

#### **87. LCU 15 HOGANS GULLY AND LCU 17 MORVEN FERRY**

##### **Hogans Gully Farm Limited - #2313**

**87.1** I am not providing comment on this application due to a conflict of interest.

**88. LCU 18 MORVEN EASTERN FOOTHILLS**

**Morven Ferry Limited - #2449, D MacColl (#2350), Philip Bunn - #2355, Steven Bunn - #2356, Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited and DE, ME Bunn & LA Green - #2509**

**88.1** All of the above submitters have sought that the land located on either side of Morven Ferry Road be rezoned to Rural Residential and Rural Visitor Zoning, or Precinct – Morven Derry Sub zone and Morven Ferry Rural Visitor Zones A & B.

**88.2** The land is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**88.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning requested as outlined in the above submissions, from an infrastructure perspective.

**89. LCU 24 SOUTH ARROWTOWN**

**All submissions that seek extension of the UGB rather than MDR (155,180,199,154,221,244,265,276,317,341,423,569,597,646,648,814,831)**

**89.1** A number of submissions have been made relating to the Arrowtown area. The submissions include a number opposing the proposed MDR zone, a number requesting the proposed MDR zone does not go ahead and instead the Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**) for Arrowtown is extended, one request for an extension of the Industrial B zone, a request for a removal of the heritage overlay, and two site specific rezoning requests.

**89.2** Overall, as per the May 2015 Memorandum, I support the Arrowtown Medium Density Residential (**MDR**) zone in central Arrowtown. This area is within the scheme boundaries for both water supply and wastewater servicing, and the intensity of development can be supported either by the existing infrastructure, or via Council's planned programme of renewals combined with upgrades and extensions to

services identified within the current Long Term Plan (refer to Infrastructure Capacity Arrowtown, referenced above).

**89.3** I oppose the submissions requesting the MDR zone is rescinded and the UGB is extended, where this is a general comment and not in reference to a specific parcel of land. In my view, extending the water and wastewater schemes to service new parcels of land is a less efficient use of infrastructure, and will have adverse effects in terms of the cost to establish and maintain the infrastructure.

**90. SHAPING OUR FUTURE (#2511), QUEENSTOWN LAKES COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST (#2299)**

**90.1** The applicants seek that land on the southern side of Jopp Street not be rezoned to Amentiy Zone as notified, and that the Arrowtown Urban Growth Boundary is extended to include this site.

**90.2** The land in question is not within the Council water or wastewater Scheme Boundaries, although it is adjacent to both.

**90.3** The land has previously been considered for development, and has been included in the Arrowtown Water Model.

**90.4** The relief sought would result in the site becoming part of the catchment for the Norfolk Street wastewater pumping station. This wastewater pumping station has known constraints from an emergency storage point of view, and there are upgrades planned within the LTP to address the shortfall and allow for future capacity. I have been informed that the Jopp Street site has been included in the capacity calculations to inform these upgrades.

**90.5** The wastewater gravity network would require extension to service the Jopp Street site, and potentially require a new wastewater pumping station internal to the site. The receiving network appears to have sufficient capacity for the development.

**90.6** The water network will also require extension, and installation of new hydrants to support the site.

- 90.7** These upgrades will not benefit the community as a whole; they are only required to service the site in question.
- 90.8** The relief sought will increase the density from the current situation, however, this is in a way that has been anticipated when considering upgrades due in the LTP.
- 90.9** Consequently, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective, as long as the required extensions to the water and wastewater network are borne by the developer and are not offset against development contributions.

**91. LCU 25 SHOTOVER COUNTRY MARGINS**

**Shotover Country Limited - # 528**

- 91.1** Shotover Country Limited has sought that 6ha of land be rezoned from Rural to Shotover Country Special Zone or Low Density Residential Zone and that the Urban Growth Boundary be moved to encompass this area. It has been estimated that this could potentially yield 90 additional residential lots.
- 91.2** The area is located between the Shotover River and the existing Shotover Country development.
- 91.3** Council GIS records show the site as being outside the Council water and wastewater scheme boundaries. However, as this area covers the land previously subject to an approved SHA application, the scheme boundaries have been extended to cover the site and this is considered a GIS anomaly.
- 91.4** An assessment of the infrastructure for the broader Ladies Mile area was undertaken in 2016, and this area was specifically considered as part of the SHA application.
- 91.5** The water supply for the site would be provided from the Shotover Country Scheme and it is considered that there is likely to be sufficient

capacity to service the proposed rezoning without requiring significant upgrades to the existing infrastructure beyond those already planned.

**91.6** The two connection points in to the Shotover Country wastewater reticulation are both via 150mm mains. These would require upgrading to service the proposed area. Additionally, an upgrade to the Shotover Country wastewater pumpstation would also be required.

**91.7** I therefore do not oppose the rezoning to Low Density Residential or Shotover Country Special Zone as outlined in the above submissions, from an infrastructure perspective, because the infrastructure was assessed at the time of the SHA application and found to be sufficient, subject to planned upgrades. Alternative relief including Rural Residential or Rural Lifestyle zoning has also been considered. As this is a lower density than the Low Density Residential zoning discussed above, I do not oppose this alternative relief from an infrastructure perspective.

**92. MCGUINNESS (2292)**

**92.1** McGuinness Pa Limited have sought that 66 Dalefield Road and other properties in the area are rezoned to Precinct, subject to various modifications, rather than the notified Amenity Zone.

**92.2** The site is located approximately 8 km from Arrowtown and 4 km from Arthurs Point. The area is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**92.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the rezoning to Precinct, from an infrastructure perspective.

**LCU 2 FITZPATRICK BASIN**

**93. THE CROWN INVESTMENT TRUST (2307)**

**93.1** The Crown Investment Trust have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning, with a number of items of relief sought in landscape and visitor accommodation categories.

**93.2** The site is located south of Fitzpatrick Road and north of the Shotover River. The area is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**93.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.

**94. ROBERT FFISKE AND WEBB FARRY TRUSTEES 2012 LTD (2338)**

**94.1** Robert Ffiske and Webb Farry Trustees 2012 Ltd have submitted generally in support of the PDP, and in particular the Precinct zoning, with relief sought in a number of categories relating to location and type of buildings to be constructed, and average lot size calculation methodology.

**94.2** The site is located north of Fitzpatrick Road and south of Littles Road. The area is not within the Council water or wastewater scheme boundaries.

**94.3** For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.1 – 5.3, I do not oppose the relief sought, from an infrastructure perspective.



**ANDREA THERESE JARVIS**

**28 May 2018**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Water and Wastewater Scheme Boundary Maps**




**Holmes** PROJECT: Wakatipu Basin Rezoning Submissions  
 JOB NO: 136380.00 DATE: 24/05/2018  
 CSK: 01-01 REV: 1

Legend

- Water supply scheme - - - - -
- Wastewater scheme - - - - -

Legend

- Parcel/Road Boundary
- Landscape Feature
- State Highway
- Unformed Roads
- Water (zoned Rural unless otherwise shown)
- Zones excluded from Stages 1 and 2 of the District Plan Review
- New Road Parcels
- Community Purpose - Campground
- Community Purpose - Cemetery
- Community Purpose - Golf Course
- Active Sports and Recreation
- Civic Spaces
- Community Purposes
- Informal Recreation
- Nature Conservation
- Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone
- Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct
- Rural



All Stage 1 and Stage 2 land is subject to the District Wide Earthworks Chapter 25, Transport Chapter 29 and Signs Chapter 31.

The District Wide Annotations notified in Stage 1 remain applicable to all Stage 1 and Stage 2 land. Refer to the Proposed District Plan Maps for the location of the District Wide annotations. Specifically the Open Space and Recreation Zoned land that was not notified in Stage 1 is subject to the District Wide annotations and submissions can be made on a District Wide annotation that affects this land.

The Council has identified where the proposed Visitor Accommodation Sub Zones are to be located. Any person may make a submission on the location and extent of Visitor Accommodation Sub Zones as it relates to Stage 1 and Stage 2 land.

15a 13d

