



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO,
SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED PLAN CHANGE,
VARIATION OR PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT



Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name of submitter [full name] Glenpanel Development Limited (Submitter #73)



FURTHER SUBMISSION // In support of (or opposition to) a submission on the following:

Please see attached letter

I AM [state whether you are]

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

[in this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category]

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or

[in this case, also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category]
Own land in or adjoining Variation, and am a original Submitter

The local authority for the relevant area.



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

[Include: name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available]
See attached



THE PARTICULAR PARTS // Of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]
See attached

**THE REASONS** // For my support (or opposition) are:

[give reasons]

See attached

**I SEEK** // That the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):

[give precise details]

See Attached

I wish / do not wish*

to be heard in support of my further submission.

I will / will not*

consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.

* Select one.

SIGNATURE

**Signature

[or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter]

Date 03/08/2023

** A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

**YOUR DETAILS** // Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email**

Electronic address for service of submitter [email]wmurray@propertygroup.co.nz

Telephone [work]0274456845

[home]

[mobile]

Postal Address

[or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act]

C/- The Property Group
PO Box 2130,
Queenstown

Post code

9371

Contact person [name and designation, if applicable]Werner Murray

**NOTE** // To person making further submission**A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- > it is frivolous or vexatious:
- > it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- > it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- > it contains offensive language:
- > it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.



Submission	Further Submission on Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Variation – Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan, Under Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991
Submitter	Glenpanel Development Limited (Submitter #73)
Prepared by (agent)	Joanne Skuse – Planner at The Property Group Werner Murray – Planner at The Property Group
Agent contact details	Phone: 027 498 1745; 027 445 6845 Email: jskuse@propertygroup.co.nz ; wmurray@propertygroup.co.nz

1. Glenpanel Development Limited (the ‘**Further Submitter**’) made a submission on the proposed Variation to Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile (‘**Variation**’) which seeks to make changes to the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (the ‘**Plan**’). The Further Submitter has an interest in the Variation that is greater than the interest that the general public.
2. While the Further Submitter has an interest in the entire Variation, it is particularly interested in issues of proposed density, transport outcomes, servicing of development, and roading layout. The Submitter also has a particular interest in the land described as Lot 2 DP 463532, Lot 1 DP 20162, Lot 1 DP 463532, and Section 1 SO 24954.
3. This is a **Further Submission** by the Submitter on the Variation.
4. The specific Original Submission points and Original Submitters in respect of which this Further Submission is made, including more specific reasons for the Further Submission are set out in Appendix A.
5. In addition to the specific reasons set out in Appendix 1, the relief sought (which includes all consequential or other relief to address the concerns raised) in each case is also advanced on the basis that the relief will:
 - a. achieve the sustainable management purpose of the RMA and otherwise meet the requirements of Part 2;

- b. better meet the requirements for a Variation under the RMA, including that the relief is “most appropriate” for achieving the purpose of the Act, the objective, or the objectives and policies (as relevant);
- c. better meet the Minister’s statement of expectations in respect of the Variation; and
- d. better achieve the outcomes sought in the Further Submitter’s original submission.

6. The Submitter wishes to be heard in support of its Further Submission.

If others make similar Further Submissions, or have made similar Original Submissions to those made by the Further Submitter, the Further Submitter will consider presenting a joint case at any hearing.

DATED

3 August 2023

Electronic address for service of submitter: wmurray@propertygroup.co.nz, and jskuse@propertygroup.co.nz

Telephone: 027 445 6845

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act):

C/- The Property Group

PO Box 2130,

Queenstown 9371

For: Werner Murray; or Joanne Skuse

Original Submission Point	Original Submitter Name	Decision Requested by Original Submitter	Further Submitter: Support or Oppose	Reason	Decision Sought by Further Submitter
OS5	Richard Jonathan Pettit	The submitter states that there are no redeeming features of the plan change, and would like to protect the rural landscape and Gateway to Queenstown	Oppose	Ladies Mile is part of the Queenstown Lakes Urban Environment in accordance with Chapter 4.1.2 of the PDP and also meets the definition of Urban Environment under the NPS-UD	Decline the relief
OS20.1	Samuel Belk	Among other things the submitter states That there be further emphasis on high density housing in central Queenstown and transport infrastructure.	Oppose	Granting the relief sought by refusing the Variation will impact further on the housing crisis	Decline the relief
OS23.1	Nadia Lisitsina	The submitter states that the proposal should be rejected or substantially amended so development is aligned with current infrastructure capacity, commuter behaviour, and the rural character and current zoning.	Oppose	Ladies Mile is part of the Queenstown Lakes Urban Environment in accordance with Chapter 4.1.2 of the PDP. In addition infrastructure capacity can be increased and commuter behaviour changed over time.	Decline the relief
OS23.2	Nadia Lisitsina	That QLDC present a plan for future wastewater infrastructure.	Oppose	Multiple business cases have been done – QLDC are required by the NPS-UD to ensure infrastructure is available	Decline the relief
OS32.1	Lois Martin	That the Ladies Mile Zone should be rejected.	Oppose	Ladies Mile is part of the Queenstown Lakes Urban Environment in accordance with Chapter 4.1.2 of the PDP and also meets the definition of Urban Environment under the NPS-UD	Decline the relief
OS32.3	Lois Martin	That the QLDC await the 2023 census figures before considering what areas to further develop, how much housing is planned, how many are built for investment, the resident	Oppose	QLDC is required by the NPS-UD to continually update these numbers in the Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.	Decline the relief

		population, and how the proportion of the population who are construction workers who will move on.			
OS32.4	Lois Martin	That the existing 100 kmph speed limit be amended to 60 kmph now.	Support	The Masterplan did propose this but it will need to be subject to a separate process	Support the intent
OS32.5	Lois Martin	That an assessment of the impact of the existing development at Shotover country, the country club, the commercial/health precinct. and Kawarau Heights on the infrastructure, traffic, environmental change, and residents' quality of life be undertaken before contemplating the Ladies Mile proposal.	Oppose	The QLDC Spatial plan sets out the Council's "Grow Well" agenda and targets, the QLDC has undertaken a multiple master planning processes including the Ladies Mile and Frankton Masterplans; the area is already considered part of the Urban Environment; and the district can't be static/wait for every process that could possibly completed.	Decline the relief
OS32.6	Lois Martin	That a second bridge is needed.	Oppose	The Bridge is not at capacity, at least not at most times. Further investigation into what is meant by "capacity" is needed. To the extent that the Bridge is, at times, at capacity, that may be a necessary factor in encouraging mode shift.	Decline the relief

OS33.1	Justin Crane	<p>The submitter states that the variation is opposed on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there will be adverse effects on the Threepwood owners/ residents and the wider community from the increase in stormwater flows through Threepwood and into Lake Hayes, causing physical damage and further deterioration to the Lake Hayes water quality and the wetland. 	Oppose	<p>The Stormwater along Ladies Mile does not all drain towards Threepwood, including sites that are located more to the east, and appropriate stormwater management can be achieved for those sites.</p>	Decline the relief
OS33.5	Justin Crane	<p>The submitter also states that, whilst opposed to the Variation in its current form, the submitter recognises the need for additional housing and amenities within the masterplan area and is open to working with the QLDC to achieve a workable solution for wastewater and stormwater management, and an active travel link.</p>	Support	<p>The Submitters support and seek to be involved in any future process involving solutions for stormwater management, active travel, and wastewater.</p>	Support the intent
OS34.1	Don Andrew	<p>The submitter states that the proposal appears to be replicating the dreadful strip developments found in the USA that proceed the town itself .This for years under previous councils was actually protected as the scenic entrance to</p>	Oppose.	<p>Development Along the Ladies Mile needs to occur in accordance with the NPS-UD. This deals with well-functioning urban environments. Further the Ladies Mile is considered to be an urban environment.</p>	Decline the relief

		the district and you now propose it become some ghastly strip development for the benefit of the developers along that road			
OS39.1	Richard Bowman	The submitter among other things states that the proposal is opposed in its current form, citing concerns that untreated stormwater runoff will enter Lake Hayes.	Oppose	The Stormwater along Ladies Mile does not all drain towards Lake Hayes, including sites that are located more to the east, and appropriate stormwater management can be achieved for those sites.	Decline the relief
OS39.2	Richard Bowman	The submitter also states that, to achieve Policy 24.2.4.2 (avoidance of adverse impacts on, and improvements to water quality in the Lake Hayes catchment, along with any development changes), the QLDC and/or the developers need to embrace a commensurate scale project to assist in the overall remediation of Lake Hayes. This could include the construction and regular maintenance of large sediment traps, restoration of the significant wetland at the south end of Lake Hayes, or improving the current poorly performing stormwater outflow system at the Lake Whakatipu rowing club.	Oppose	The Stormwater along Ladies Mile does not all drain towards Lake Hayes, including sites that are located more to the east, and appropriate stormwater management can be achieved for those sites.	Decline the relief
OS41.1	Shane Pratley	The submitter states that the maximum building height be amended to 12 m or 3 storeys in the high density residential and medium density residential areas.	Oppose	Part of the Ladies Mile Variation is to enable modal shift and thus increasing density and building heights have been a focus as an integral part of the plan variation.	Decline the relief

OS44.1-44.7		<p>That the proposed Variation is not approved unless or until there is adequate offsetting and/ or compensation for the loss of bird habitat, and provision for a consolidated stormwater management approach.</p> <p>That the Structure Plan be amended to include consolidated stormwater management.</p> <p>That the Variation is not approved unless or until off-site monitoring and effects management measures have been developed and confirmed in relation to native bird species. These could include stand-alone measures, and/or collaboration with, or support for, existing community initiatives.</p> <p>That information be added in the Variation to alert plan readers to the likely presence of McCann's skinks and the requirements of the Wildlife Act 1953.</p> <p>"That an additional matter of discretion be inserted into Rule 27.7.8.1 as follows, or wording to like effect: "x. ecological and natural values""</p>	Oppose	<p>This is an onerous requirement for an Urban Environment, and has been addressed by QLDC through the master planning process, and there are options available to address these concerns.</p> <p>The Further Submitter opposes any modifications to the Stormwater provisions that would result in consolidated stormwater management approach that required centralised stormwater solutions.</p>	Decline relief
-------------	--	--	--------	---	----------------

		<p>"That an additional assessment matter be added to 29.9.8.1 as follows, or wording to like effect: "x. the extent to which the subdivision protects, maintains or enhances indigenous biodiversity, including through offsetting or compensation measures."</p> <p>Note: While the submission refers to 29.9.3.1, the submitter has since confirmed in writing that this is an error and should be amended to read '29.9.8.1', as above.</p> <p>That Assessment matters 49.7.1(f) be retained, as notified.</p>			
OS45.1	Caithness Developments Ltd	<p>The Submitter states that an active travel link through the submitter's site at 12 Stalker Road (located on the corner of Stalker Road and SH6 and legally described as Lot 4 DP 325561, Section 4-5 SO 485598) within the 25m BRA is within the control of the landowner, and this could be provided at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>This requirement is accepted.</p>	Support	The Submitter supports better active travel on both sides of the highway.	Accept the relief
OS45.7	Caithness Developments Ltd	<p>The submitter also seeks to amend Rule 49.4.38 to change the status of Service Stations from prohibited to discretionary.</p>	Support	It is inappropriate to prohibit service stations in an urban environment.	Accept the relief

OS76.1	Maree Wheeler	The submitter requests that the Variation be declined until the traffic issues, housing affordability, and a commitment to the provision of community and commercial facilities are resolved and triggers and controls are in place to ensure the masterplan will be implemented.	Oppose	Ladies Mile is part of the Queenstown Lakes Urban Environment in accordance with Chapter 4.1.2 of the PDP and also meets the definition of Urban Environment under the NPS-UD.	Decline the relief
OS77.1	Ladies Mile Property Syndicate	The submitter is generally positive about the Variation, and supports removing minimum density, the removal of 20m setback, and subdivision without land use. The submitter further supports removal of transport triggers, and is opposed to the location of the east west road	Support	The Submitter supports the general direction and amendments sought by the Submitters.	Support the intent
OS93.1	Sanderson Group	The Submitter opposes proposed density, because it will increase the cost of construction, The submitter wants larger commercial area, and is opposed to the building heights proposed. The submitter also opposes the proposed setbacks to SH6. The submitter is opposed to specified transport infrastructure triggers, oppose east wet road location, and opposes community park.	Support	The Submitter supports the general direction and amendments sought by the Submitters.	Support the intent
OS101.2	David Finlin	Some concerns about road east west and parks	Support	The Submitter supports the intent and submits that there should be more thought into the location of a future road and how it relates to the existing road reserve (paper road).	Support the relief

OS102.2	Alexander Reid	The submitter raises some general concerns but is supportive of the ONL line being moved further up Slope Hill. The submitter also opposes the proposed height transition between medium density and high density.	Support	This is a good outcome for an urban environment. The current ONF line is arbitrary and does not reflect what is truly outstanding on the feature.	Support the relief
OS104.1	Rodney Albertyn	Waka Kotahi	Support and oppose	Aspects of the submission are sensible while other aspects may provide an undue barrier to development along Ladies Mile.	Support in part and oppose in part
OS119.1	Jane Hamilton	This is a wide ranging submission that talks about Zoned land and refers to the Market Economics Housing and Business Capacity Study	Oppose	The submission identifies a range of reasons why the Variation should not proceed which are not considered to have any merit.	Decline the relief
OS121.1	Daniel Foggo	This submission talks about keeping development in Urban Areas, and states: the Council prioritises the development of new residences on non-rural land, in existing town areas	Oppose	Ladies Mile is part of the Queenstown Lakes Urban Environment in accordance with Chapter 4.1.2 of the PDP and also meets the definition of Urban Environment under the NPS-UD. Ladies Mile is not ad hoc and complies with the Policies and objectives in both Chapters 3, and 4 of the PDP.	Decline the relief