



**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLAN CHANGE HEARING COMMITTEE**

REPORT FOR PLAN CHANGE 30: URBAN BOUNDARY FRAMEWORK

FOR HEARING COMMENCING: 15 APRIL 2010

REPORT DATED: 22 MARCH 2010

SUBMITTED BY: Mark Rushworth
Senior Policy Analyst, Queenstown Lakes District Council

FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

PURPOSE OF REPORT 3

BACKGROUND TO PLAN CHANGE 30 3

SCOPE OF PLAN CHANGE 30..... 3

CONSULTATION AND NOTIFICATION 5

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLAN CHANGES..... 5

SUBMISSIONS – OVERVIEW..... 5

REPORT FORMAT 7

SUBMISSION ISSUES ANALYSIS..... 8

 A. SECTION 32 8

 B. OBJECTIVES & POLICIES..... 13

 C. EXPLANATION AND PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR ADOPTION 39

 D. ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS ANTICIPATED..... 45

 E. DEFINITIONS 46

 F. ASSESSMENT MATTERS 50

 G. GENERAL ISSUES 54

APPENDICES

1. Copies of Plan Change 30 Public Notices.
2. Schedule of individual submissions, recommendations and reasons.
3. Growth Distribution in the Queenstown Lakes District.
4. Recommended changes to PC 30.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Plan Change 30

Plan Change 30 (PC 30) makes provision for establishing an Urban Boundary Framework within the Queenstown Lakes District Plan. It seeks to introduce a mechanism that provides a strategic approach to the sustainable management of urban growth.

Process

PC 30 has been prepared and notified in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). This report addresses the submissions received on PC 30.

Submissions

A total of 120 submissions and 5 further submissions were duly received on PC 30. The submissions cover most aspects of the Plan Change. A substantial number seek that PC 30 be withdrawn/rejected in its entirety. However, most go on to identify specific areas of concern and suggest some possible amendments. Twenty three submitters support the Plan Change in principle. Again there are some suggestions as to how the provisions could be amended. This report considers the issues raised in the submissions, and provides a recommended response to the relief sought.

Resource Management Act

The RMA is the primary legislation relating to District Plans. Part 2 of the RMA sets out the purpose and principles of the Act. The purpose is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Part 5 of the Act sets out details on the purpose, preparation and content of District Plans. PC 30 is considered to be consistent with the provisions of the RMA.

Conclusions

It is considered that there is merit in the proposed Plan Change. Some of the issues identified in submissions and relief sought have identified opportunities for the Plan Change to be amended to enhance its ability to promote the purpose of the RMA. It is recommended that the Plan Change be amended as set out in Appendix 4.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 42A of the RMA. It considers and makes recommendations on submissions made on Plan Change 30 – Urban Boundary Framework (PC 30), to the Queenstown Lakes District Plan.

Although this report is intended as a stand-alone document, a more in-depth understanding of the Plan Change, the process undertaken, and the issues and options considered may be gained by reading the Section 32 report and associated documentation. A copy of the Section 32 report (and the associated background documents) is available on the Council's website: www.qldc.govt.nz.

BACKGROUND TO PLAN CHANGE 30

Queenstown Lakes District is one of the fastest growing Districts in the country and experiences considerable pressure for new development. Statistics NZ growth projections indicate that the District's normally resident population will increase between 30% (low series) and 70% (high series) between 2006 and 2026. This compares to a range of -3% to 20% for the Otago Region, and 12% to 24% nationally. The Council's growth projections closely match the Statistics NZ high series.

Whilst the overall scale of the normally resident population is still relatively small (22, 959 in 2006), it is subject to significant seasonal variations due to the effects of tourism with the peak season population rising to approximately 77,500 (QLDC Growth Projections 2008).

The District's settlement pattern consists of a range of small to medium size townships spread across a large rural area. The settlement pattern and distribution of infrastructure is significantly affected by the District's topography.

Over the last decade Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) has been developing the strategic planning capabilities of the District. This has included a number of Community Plans, a Growth Management Strategy for the District (2007) and Long Term Council Community Plans (LTCCPs). These documents have identified the need for a more strategic and integrated approach to land use and development in order to achieve Community Outcomes and the sustainable management of resources and development. PC 30 is part of the response to this and has been prepared by QLDC in accordance with Schedule 1 of the RMA.

Plan Change 30 was notified on 19 August 2009, prior to the Resource Management (Simplifying and Streamlining) Amendment Act 2009 [RMAA 2009] coming into effect on 1 October 2009. Therefore, under the provisions of Section 161 (2) of the RMAA 2009 the proposed plan change must be determined as if the amendments made by the Act had not been made.

The District Plan became fully operative on 10 December 2009.

SCOPE OF PLAN CHANGE 30

The Section 32 report states that the scope of PC 30 is:

PLAN CHANGE 30: URBAN BOUNDARY FRAMEWORK

... to establish the broad strategic framework for Urban Boundaries within the District Plan. This will define their purpose and principles, including the establishment of a settlement hierarchy. It will also provide the context for their administration and the introduction of boundaries for specific settlements.

It notes that:

It will not, however, define specific boundaries, as these will be addressed through other Plan Changes. Nor does this Plan Change include any provision for rezoning land, either within or outside of any prospective Urban Boundary. In order to achieve effective integration with other relevant plans and strategies it will utilise a time horizon of approximately 20 years.

The plan change seeks to introduce:

- a new Objective that promotes the sustainable management of development.
- 11 new Policies that:
 - Establish a Settlement Hierarchy
 - Provide a process for maintaining a long term land supply for urban growth
 - Prioritises urban development within Urban Boundaries
 - Promote effective urban design and integration of new urban growth areas
 - Establish criteria for defining Urban Boundaries
 - Provides a Definition of Urban Growth and Urban Zones
- new Rules that provide Assessment Criteria for urban development in rural areas (Rural General Zone, Gibbston Character Zone, Rural Living Areas)

The plan change affects the following parts of the District Plan:

Section	Provision	Summary of Change
4.9 Urban Growth	4.9.3 Objectives & Policies	Insert new Objective after 6 and add new Policies, Implementation Methods, Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption
	4.9.4 Environmental Results Anticipated	Insert new Environmental Results Anticipated at the end of the section.
Definitions	New Definitions	Insert new definitions for: <u>Urban Growth</u> <u>Urban Zone</u>
5.4 Rural Areas – Rural General	5.4.2.3 Assessment Matters General	Insert new Assessment Matter <u>Urban Growth outside Urban Boundaries</u> at the end of the section.
5.8 Rural Areas – Gibbston Character Zone	5.8.2 Assessment Matters	Insert new Assessment Matter <u>Urban Growth outside Urban Boundaries</u> at the end of the section.

<p>8.2 Rural Living Areas</p>	<p>8.3.2 Assessment Matters</p>	<p>Insert new Assessment Matter <u>Urban Growth outside Urban Boundaries</u> at the end of the section.</p>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

CONSULTATION AND NOTIFICATION

Consultation on a proposed Plan Change to consider introducing Urban Boundaries took place during August & September 2008. Statutory consultees as identified in Schedule 1 of the RMA were included in this process. All of the District’s Community Associations were provided with a copy of the Discussion Document. Two public drop in sessions were held – Queenstown Memorial Hall on 5 August 2008 and Lake Wanaka Centre on 6 August 2008. In total of 445 responses to the Discussion Document were received.

PC 30 was publicly notified on 19 August 2009. All rate payers in the District were sent notice of the plan change. A summary of the decisions sought in the submissions on PC 30 was notified on 16 December 2009, and all original submitters were written to by the Council advising them of the availability of the summary and the opportunity to make further submissions. Copies of the public notices are set out in Appendix 1.

During the consultation and notification stages information has been available on the Council’s web site and circulated in *Scuttlebutt* the Council’s newsletter which is widely available within the District. There has also been media coverage of this issue.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLAN CHANGES

PC 29 Arrowtown Boundary – This Plan Change was notified alongside PC 30, and is the first Plan Change to introduce a formal urban boundary for one of the District’s settlements. Together with defining the alignment of the boundary it seeks to introduce policies that will guide development within the boundary and give effect to non statutory planning documents such as the Arrowtown Design Guidelines.

PC 39 Arrowtown South – This is a private Plan Change which seeks to rezone land at Arrowtown to enable residential subdivision and development. This was lodged with Council after PCs 29 & 30 were notified and proposes growth beyond the Urban Boundary.

PCs 20 & 21 – These Plan Changes are currently being prepared. They seek to introduce Urban Boundaries for Wanaka and Queenstown/Wakatipu Basin settlements respectively. PC 20 seeks to give effect to the principles contained in the non statutory Wanaka Structure Plan.

SUBMISSIONS – OVERVIEW

A total of 120 original submissions were received, of which 23 support or partly support the Plan Change.

The main points to which submissions refer are:

- A. Section 32
- B. Objectives & Policies
- C. Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption

- D. Environmental Results Anticipated
- E. Definitions
- F. Assessment Matters
- G. General Issues

Five Further Submissions were duly received.

Late submissions & amendments

Fourteen submissions were received after the date specified in the public notice for the close of submissions.

Eleven of the late submissions were received prior to the summary of decisions sought being completed and notified. These were reported to the Council's Chief Executive on 1 December 2009. The submissions were considered in relation to Section 37A of the RMA, and a waiver under Section 37 (1) of the RMA was granted for the failure to comply with the requirements of the Act. Details of these late submissions are set out below:

Name of Submitter	Date Received	Consultant
Boxer Hill Trust	9 November	Lane Neave
KJ & EF Horrell	29 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Otago Regional Council	12 October	N/A
Northridge Investments Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
FII Holdings Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Reavers (NZ) Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Steve Rout Contracting Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Parkins Bay Preserve Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Faulks Enterprise Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Queenstown Gravel Supplies Ltd	14 October	John Edmonds & Associates
Peter Eric Newbold	21 November	N/A

The submitters were advised of the decision on 15 December 2009. These late submissions were included in the summary of decisions sought that was notified on 16 December 2009 and are addressed in this report.

The three additional late submissions from Ken Hardman, Selwyn Steedman and Judith & Don Mahon were received on 11 & 16 December 2009, and 11 January 2010 respectively. This was too late for them to be included within the summary of submissions. It is noted that the nature of these submissions was similar to others that were received on time, and that there was opportunity to make a Further Submission. The Mahon's have made a further submission. These three late submissions are not therefore addressed in this report.

On 18 January, Lane Neave the solicitors for the Boxer Hill Trust advised that there were clerical errors in their submission lodged with Council. A revised submission was provided. Lane Neave were advised that as this was received after the summary of decision sought had been notified it would not be possible to formally include this in the Further Submission stage. However, it would be addressed in the planners report.

REPORT FORMAT

In order to get a more complete understanding of the issues raised, the main body of this report groups and considers the submission points by issue.

For each issue the report is structured as follows:

- Submission Points – summary of the main points raised and relief sought in the submissions.
- Discussion – the reporting planner’s consideration of the submission points for this issue.
- Recommendation – the recommended approach to responding to the issue, indicating whether to Accept, Accept in part, or Reject the submission.
- Reasons – the reason why the recommended approach is considered appropriate in relation to the RMA.

Many of the submissions were made in a pro-forma format. This means that for many of the issues there are many similar points raised by multiple submitters. For ease of reading, the main body of this report does not generally identify the individual submitters. An individual response to the relief sought by each submitter is given in Appendix 2.

A consolidated version of PC 30 setting out all the recommended changes is set out in Appendix 4. Wording recommended for deletion is ~~struck through~~, whilst any new wording is shown underlined.

SUBMISSION ISSUES ANALYSIS

A. SECTION 32

Submission Points

A number of submitters question the adequacy of the evaluation for the proposed Plan Change and compliance with the requirements of Section 32 of the RMA. The main concerns being that the Section 32 report is flawed and contains numerous deficiencies:

A1 Process:

- Compliance with Section 32 of the RMA, including weighing social and economic costs, effectiveness of the current plan, overstating risks and failure to address the framework of objectives, policies and methods in a comprehensive way. Not adequately examining the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Insufficient regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the new provisions.

A2 Identification of issues:

- Relies on generic statements regarding alleged problems with existing pattern of development and assumptions about growth patterns that are unsubstantiated.
- Contains many generic statements asserting problems with the zone based approach without providing examples or evidence of any problems.
- Zone boundaries act as urban growth boundaries. Statements that they are not working or are inadequate are unsubstantiated.
- There is no evidence of urban style subdivisions being approved in the Rural General zone, or that the existing zone based approach is failing. This makes the entire plan change unnecessary.
- Rural General zone already has a very stringent regime for development control established through the Environment Court process.
- Lack of sufficient justification of the need for change.
- Fails to establish a link between monitoring effectiveness of the District Plan or state of the environment that has brought about the need for additional controls.

A3 Analysis:

- Misleading analysis in sections 3.2-3.4 (Local Government Act, Transportation & Heritage).
- There is a failure to properly analyse the extent to which existing District Plan provisions already achieve what PC 30 seeks. The assessment of existing policy (Section B – Option 1) contains little detail or analysis and reaches incorrect conclusions.
- Insufficient thought and analysis of how the policies would be effectively implemented and monitored.
- A number of broad statements are not justified by any analysis. Numerous statement of fact or circumstance which lack any identified factual basis.
- Inappropriate reliance on non statutory documents which have not been properly tested and are not tested through PC 30 process, including Council's Growth Management Strategy and target of 85% of growth within Queenstown & Wanaka. This has resulted in the flawed concept of a hierarchy of settlements (section 4.2).
- Failure to recognise the extent to which PC 30 contradicts existing District Plan provisions and other non statutory Council strategies and policies.
- Flawed analysis of different options, including Local Government Act controls. Assessment of 'broad options' (section 8) contains generalised statements and

conclusions not supported by analysis. The cost of options are not properly assessed or disclosed.

A4 Scope:

- Proposed Plan Change goes well beyond the stated purpose (Section 7).
- Numerous internal inconsistencies between what is stated to be achieved and what is implemented.

A5 Timeframes:

- There is no justification or analysis that provides a rationale basis for the 20 year timeframe.

A6 Metropolitan Concept:

- Does not highlight differences between Queenstown Lakes District and larger centres that have initiated urban boundaries (section 5.2).
- It is not appropriate to translate large metropolitan methodology into the small town setting. Elsewhere metropolitan limits have been imposed by regional authorities where integration and co-ordination of growth is necessary across individual territorial authorities.

A 7 Costs:

- Fails to adequately identify the cost that could flow from PC 30.
- Reflects a lack of understanding of market influences on the development of land. The change would constrain urban development opportunities, leading to further speculation in land valuation for no positive economic outcome. In particular the economic housing of people who support the core economic sectors of the District. Provisions have the potential to suppress economic growth. And inflate land values.

Discussion

Process:

PC 30 was accompanied by a Section 32 report. As required by Section 32 (5) of the RMA the report is a summary of the consideration of alternatives, benefits, and costs undertaken during the preparation of PC 30. The evaluation report addresses those matters identified in Section 32 of the Act. The supporting documents provide more detail on specific aspects of the research and evaluation undertaken. It is considered that the Section 32 report complies with the requirements of the Act.

Issues & Analysis:

It is unclear from the submissions which 'facts' in the Section 32 report are allegedly incorrect.

Data on land supply and demand is provided in Council's Dwelling Capacity model, Growth Projections and Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Study. These provide a clear and reliable basis for assessing growth issues. The Council's Growth Projections closely match the Statistics NZ high series, and are used to support the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) which is subject to external audit. This provides confidence that the data is accurate.

Monitoring of the Rural General and Rural Living zones has identified a number of concerns regarding the scale and distribution of development in the District's rural areas. It is clear that in a number of instances development of an urban character is leaking out beyond current urban zones into adjacent rural areas. This is particularly the case with Rural Living zones

on the fringe of settlements. Details of these monitoring reports are available on the Council's web site. www.qldc.govt.nz.

The Rural Living Zones Monitoring Report (January 2010) notes that by 2008 some 403 dwellings have been built on sections below the minimum lot size for the Rural Living zones (261 dwellings in the Rural Residential zone and 142 dwellings in the Rural Lifestyle zone). The distribution of these dwelling indicates that this is an issue throughout the District (Wakatipu 62%, Wanaka 27%, Hawea 11%). Notably within the Wakatipu area more Rural Residential dwellings (55%) have been built on undersized 'non complying' sections than on sections that meet the District Plan minimum lot standard of 4,000m². The report also notes that difficulties have arisen in trying to defend the alignment of zone boundaries. This has resulted in a number of consents being allowed to extend the urban area, indicating that zones are not working effectively as urban boundaries.

The Rural General Monitoring Report (April 2009) recorded 1,119 dwellings within the Rural General zone and that 485 vacant building platforms exist. The report concludes:

there are some concerns raised as to the number of dwellings that have been consented under the regime and the cumulative effect this may be having on the landscape. Perhaps more notably, whether the amount of development consented is providing for a sustainable settlement pattern is a matter of serious consideration.

The Section 32 report draws attention to a range of other statutes, strategies and policies. These are considered to be relevant to achieving an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district, which is one of the functions of territorial authorities under Section 31 (1)(a) of the RMA.

Section 74 (2) (b) (i) of the RMA requires territorial authorities to have regard to management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts, such as the Local Government Act, which includes the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP). Council and the Community have prepared a range of non statutory plans to guide policy development and strategic planning within the District. Documents such as the Queenstown Lakes District Growth Management Strategy 2007 and the Wanaka Structure Plan 2007 have been through extensive public consultation. These documents reflect the policy position of Council, and provide a means of enabling an integrated approach to the sustainable management and development of resources. These non statutory documents provided a starting point for the development of Plan Changes. Further research and testing has been undertaken as part of the Plan Change process and is documented in the Section 32 report. The Plan Change process provides the forum to test the approach in relation to the requirements of the RMA. Submissions are not specific about which Strategies or Policies the Section 32 evaluation is alleged to be contrary to.

The Section 32 report shows that consideration has been given to the merits of various options, including the overall strategic approach (Section 8) and the method of implementation (Section 10). It recognises that there is some capacity within the existing zones. However, it notes that this does not provide any strategic direction for future growth once that capacity is used, or if it is unavailable.

Under the operative District Plan urban growth proposals that extend beyond existing urban zones will normally be either discretionary or non complying activities. They may also be pursued through plan changes. These processes require consideration of appropriate objectives and policies. This provides the means to implement PC 30. The distribution of development can be monitored and assessed against the target in Policy 7.2.

Scope:

PC 30 is not considered to be outside the scope or purpose identified within the Section 32 report. In order to ensure that there is integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district as required by Section 31 (1)(a) of the RMA, it is necessary for the plan change to consider the potential implications and effects that could arise on either side (inside and outside) of the resultant urban boundaries, this includes rural areas.

Timeframe:

The 20 year timeframe around proposed urban boundaries is consistent with contemporary planning practice. It will help to ensure that there is an adequate supply of land identified to meet market demand. This will provide added certainty over the rezoning process. Certainty over supply can help to support the property and development market, and help to promote and sustain economic growth. Further commentary on the time horizons is provided in the response to submissions on Policy 7.4.

Metropolitan Concept:

Metropolitan Urban Limits are a tool used to manage growth. They are typically used in areas with significant growth pressures. Whilst this is often in large urban centres where there may be cross boundary issues, the concept can equally apply to smaller provincial locations. The relevance of growth management tools is not necessarily related to the size of the settlement, but the rate of growth.

Whilst the Section 32 report may not point out the differences between Queenstown Lakes and larger centres, it does illustrate that there are significant growth pressures which puts the District into the category of one of the fastest growing areas in the country along with a number of larger centres. Statistics NZ project that the District's normally resident population will increase between 30% (low series) and 70% (high series) between 2006 and 2026. This compares to a range of -3% to 20% for the Otago Region, and 12% to 24% nationally. The Council's growth projections closely match the Statistics NZ high series. This indicates that there is a need to consider growth management techniques, some of which are used in larger centres.

The need for growth management is often first identified at a local level, and then addressed in sub regional growth strategies, eg Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, SMART Growth (Tauranga/Western Bay of Plenty), Future Proof (Hamilton). Regional Councils and other agencies are usually involved to ensure that there is an integrated approach. The Queenstown Lakes District Growth Management Strategy identifies the relevant local issues. This has involved consultation with a range of stakeholders and there is community support for a more integrated approach to managing urban growth.

The Otago Regional Council has not yet incorporated the concept of urban boundaries within the Regional Policy Statement for Otago. However, in its submission on PC 30 it supports in principle the introduction of an Urban Boundary Framework within the Queenstown Lakes District. The New Zealand Transport Agency also supports this approach within the Queenstown Lakes District. This indicates that there is a need for an integrated approach to growth management with other key agencies.

Failure to effectively manage urban growth can result in significant adverse effects on the District's natural and physical resources. One of the main concerns for QLDC as a major infrastructure provider is the efficiency, effectiveness and cost of delivering infrastructure service to urban areas and new development. Details of this are set out in Appendix 3.

Costs:

The Section 32 takes into account the main aspects of cost that are likely to be affected by the plan change. These are considered at different levels and relate to both financial and other types of cost. A range of alternatives are considered, including non District Plan based approaches.

If urban boundaries unnecessarily constrain growth and development opportunities this could have an impact on land values. It could also have implications for the type of development that occurs within the proposed boundaries, with a likely pressure to increase densities. The Section 32 report recognises that urban boundaries can assist in maintaining a land supply to enable growth needs to be met. The intention of Policy 7.4 is to ensure that there is always a reasonable supply of land available to meet projected growth needs. It should be noted that the District Plan is only one of a range of factors that can influence land availability and cost – other matters include land ownership and taxation.

Another significant cost issue relates to the delivery of public infrastructure. Council has a range of existing assets and a programme of works to provide new infrastructure to address future growth in accordance with the District's Growth Projections and the Growth Management Strategy (See Appendix 3). Section 74 of the RMA requires due regard to be given to management strategies and plans prepared under other legislation, this includes the LTCCP. Urban Boundaries provide a means of ensuring effective co-ordination between growth and infrastructure provision that will contribute to achieving the sustainable management of significant resources. Failure to achieve such co-ordination could result in very significant costs to Council and the District's rate payers.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Queenstown Lakes District is one of the fastest growing communities in the country and experiences considerable ongoing pressure for development and urban growth.

The report assessing the alternatives, benefits, and costs of PC 30 is considered to be consistent with the provisions of Section 32 of the RMA.

B. OBJECTIVES & POLICIES

A number of submitters raised issues in respect of the Objective and Policies proposed in PC 30. Some of the issues were general in nature, whilst others focused on specific elements of the proposed provisions.

B1. Objectives & Policies – General

Submission Points

B1.1 Necessity:

- The existing District Plan Objectives and Policies in Part 4 are adequate for managing urban growth. PC 30's Objectives and Policies are superfluous and unnecessary and do not advance the Plan's function of giving effect to the RMA.
- The Objective and Policies are not necessary and the suggested reasons for inclusion are not substantiated.
- Managing release of land and alleged beneficial outcomes not justified or established.

B1.2 Approach:

- Proposed provisions are inappropriate and/or flawed for a number of reasons.
- Supporting Policies do not relate to overarching Objective
- Planning for the effects of urban growth should not lock down current urban boundaries.
- Growth management under the District Plan should occur in accordance with:
 - The need to provide a reasonable level of growth preferably alongside/adjacent existing settlements.
 - The ability of the landscape to absorb additional development without compromising landscape values.
 - The ability to connect to existing infrastructure that does not impose cost on the wider community.
 - The ensuing constraints are not imposed on residential development which artificially inflates the price of land and the provision of affordable housing.
- Proposed Objectives and Policies rely on subsequent plan changes that are undefined and their outcomes unknown, resulting in further uncertainty.
- Proposed Objectives and Policies will stifle creative and high quality development.

B1.3 Format:

- They are badly drafted and inappropriately confuse what should be Objectives, Policies and Rules.

Discussion

Necessity:

The concept of defining urban boundaries in addition to current zoning provisions is recognised in a range of planning documents for the Queenstown Lakes District – operative District Plan (Section 4.2.5 Policy 7 & 4.9.3 Implementation Methods), Growth Management Strategy (Principle 1 a) and various Community Plans (eg Arrowtown Plan).

Monitoring of the distribution of development and the effectiveness of rural zones has identified that the District Plan is not effectively achieving a consolidated form of development in accordance with the provisions of the District Wide section of the Plan and

the Growth Management Strategy for Queenstown Lakes. The scale of growth projected for the District is significant. Together these issues indicate that future urban growth could have significant adverse effects on the District's natural and physical resources. It is therefore appropriate for a Plan Change to consider how urban growth can be more effectively managed.

Approach:

PC 30 seeks to take a strategic approach to managing the issues and effects arising from the spatial aspects of urban growth. Objective 7 recognises that the pattern of development has implications for the sustainable management of resources. The proposed Policies expand on the spatial aspects of Objective 7 and promote a co-ordinated approach to growth management. They provide specific direction in respect of how the Objective should be achieved.

PC 30 does not advocate a 'lockdown' of current zones. Policy 7.4 recognises the need to provide for growth requirements over a 20 year period. Analysis of the supply and demand for development (see Appendix 3) indicates that there is adequate supply within the current zones to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of the community. It should be noted that the District Plan does not currently contain urban boundaries.

The matters that should be considered when defining urban boundaries are set out in Policy 7.11. This includes the growth needs of the community, location aspects in relation to existing urban areas, landscape matters and utilisation of infrastructure. This is further explained in the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption.

PC 30 provides an integrated approach that is not dependant on future Plan Changes. However, it is anticipated that it may be appropriate for more detailed work to be undertaken to define individual settlement boundaries and provide policy direction for growth areas as and when needs dictate. Policy 7.5 makes provision for such an approach. Future Plan Changes will go through a formal notification process to provide opportunity for localised issues to be considered in full.

PC 30 takes an holistic approach to urban growth. Policy 7.7 promotes effective urban design to help deliver high quality sustainable outcomes. There is no evidence that this approach will stifle creative and high quality development. On the contrary it will promote efficient use of resources that can have a range of positive benefits for the community.

Format:

The Ministry for the Environment's Quality Planning web site provides guidance on writing District Plan provisions. In summary Objectives provide a statement of what should be achieved, Policies provide the course of action to be pursued to achieve or implement the Objective. PC 30 is considered consistent with this approach. No alternative approach is suggested in terms of how PC 30 could better distinguish between Objectives, Policies and Rules.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The operative District Plan is failing to fully achieve the provisions relating to urban growth.

The pressure for further growth indicates that there is a need to introduce provisions to ensure that sustainable management of resources is achieved.

The introduction of Urban Boundaries is supported by Council's non statutory Plans and Strategies prepared under the LGA, to which due regard has been given in accordance with Section 74 of the RMA.

The structure of PC 30 is considered to be generally consistent with best practice advice.

PC 30 is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA (Section 5), the matters referred to in Section 7 (b, c & f) of the Act and Section 31(1 a) concerning an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

B2. Objectives

Submission Points

Objective 7 is very general and effectively repeats section 5 of the RMA. It is not possible to monitor achievement of the objective.

Discussion

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Section 5 of the Act identifies the principal issues involved in sustainable management. Objective 7 expands on this by providing a strategic context for managing the spatial aspects of urban growth within Queenstown Lakes District. It recognises that the pattern of development is a relevant consideration in achieving the purpose of the Act, and focuses the District Plan on the effects of the scale and distribution of development.

In accordance with Section 74 of the RMA, PC 30 has regard to the Otago Regional Policy Statement (RPS). Objective 9.4 of the RPS acknowledges that sustainability of the built environment is affected by the pattern of urban development and settlement.

Section 35 of the RMA sets out details of the duty to gather information, monitor, and keep records. Clause b) requires Policies, Rules or other methods of Plans to be monitored, but not Objectives. Objective 7 provides the platform upon which more detailed Policies can be developed to manage the District's settlement pattern. Therefore while monitoring of Objective 7 is not required under the RMA, its general effectiveness can be measured by monitoring the Policies by which it will be achieved. In particular Policy 7.2 provides a performance indicator against which the distribution of growth can be monitored.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to this issue.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Objective 7 provides a local context and mechanism for achieving the purpose of the RMA (as set out in Section 5 of the Act). It is also consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the Otago Regional Policy Statement.

There is no requirement to monitor Objectives under the RMA.

B3. Policies

B3.1 Policy 7.1

Submission Points

Settlement Hierarchy:

- A settlement hierarchy not necessary as it is already established elsewhere in the Plan and by fact.

Third Tier:

- That with the exception of Arrowtown, the settlements currently listed under the heading 'Local Centre' be re-listed under a third level category.

Mount Cardrona Station:

- That the Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone be added to the list of Local Centres and for provision to be made to allow minor adjustments of the structure plan boundaries.

Discussion

Settlement Hierarchy:

There is no formal settlement hierarchy within the operative District Plan.

Settlement hierarchies are a recognised planning method used to assist achieving a strategic approach to growth management. The absence of a strategic overview creates uncertainty as to what function different settlements are expected to perform.

The Growth Management Strategy recognises that Queenstown and Wanaka are the District's major centres, and that they should be the focal point for urban growth. This differentiates their role from smaller lower order settlements.

The settlement hierarchy in Policy 7.1 is based on the functional role of settlements. This involves consideration of their size, the level of service available, their catchment area and accessibility. Consideration is also given to growth projections. This provides a basis on which to determine the broad extent and location of urban growth required to provide for the foreseeable needs of the community whilst ensuring sustainable management of resources.

Third Tier:

It is recognised that Arrowtown is currently the largest of the townships identified as Local Centres. Principle 1d of the Growth Management Strategy indicates that the 'secondary' settlements should be allowed to grow to approximately the same size as Arrowtown, in order to support local services. This is supported by the District Plan's Township zones. It is not clear what function a third tier within the settlement hierarchy would perform. Without a clear purpose an additional level within the hierarchy would create confusion and difficulty in administration of the District Plan.

Mount Cardrona Station:

Cardrona is identified as Local Centre in Policy 7.1. The definition of urban zone includes Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone and Cardrona Rural Visitor Zone. This will form the basis for a Plan Change to define an urban boundary for Cardrona.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The settlement hierarchy will help to promote the purpose of the RMA and assist in achieving consistent administration of the Plan.

Cardrona is already included as a Local Centre in Policy 7.1 and includes Cardrona Village and Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone.

B3.2 Policy 7.2

A number of submitters questioned the appropriateness of having a growth target within Policy 7.2. The main points of the submission are:

Submission Points

Growth Target:

- The rationale has not been explain, tested or justified.
- Concern that there is no justification for the 85%-15% split between Area and Local Centres.
- 15% growth outside Area Centres is insufficient – more growth can be absorbed without adverse environmental effects.
- The proposed split is unworkable, not appropriate and does not reflect current zoning and the impact of recent plan changes on residential capacity.
- The figures are arbitrary and not based on effects or resource management principles.
- Significant implications and costs.
- Fails to differentiate between Local Centres.
- Reword to achieve approximately two thirds of the District's urban growth within the defined Area Centres.

Implications for current zones & consent:

- No justification for how policy 7.2 applies to existing consented or zoned development.

Delete Policy 7.2.

Discussion

Growth Target:

Managing the effects of urban growth is directly related to the purpose of the RMA. In particular, it will help to ensure that the reasonably foreseeable needs of the community are met in a sustainable manner that makes efficient use of existing urban resources, reduces the need to travel to access services and facilities and avoids sporadic/ad hoc development that would be less efficient to service and could lead to fragmentation of rural resources. It also helps to avoid adverse effects of development on the landscape and rural character of the District.

Growth targets are a recognised planning tool. The Auckland Regional Policy Statement anticipates 70% of the Region's growth will be within the Metropolitan Urban Limits. This indicates that RMA mechanisms can be used to concentrate relatively high proportions of growth on the main urban centres.

An assessment of the potential to manage growth distribution and some of the effects associated with this is set out in Appendix 3 – Growth Distribution paper. This concludes that it is possible to achieve the 85% – 15% split within the District. However, it notes that there are risks associated with achieving either too much or too little development in the main urban centres. It also recognises that there are some uncertainties over the ability to achieve the targets in practice.

The proportional split in urban growth is derived from the Queenstown Lakes District Growth Management Strategy 2007. This is one of Council's strategies to which Plan Changes are

required to have regard under Section 74 of the RMA. It was subject to public consultation during its preparation. Further opportunity to test the assumptions and targets is now being provided through this Plan Change process.

The Growth Management Strategy reflects the communities desire to have a structured approach to growth management. It implies a two tier settlement hierarchy. Principle 1b identifies Queenstown and Wanaka as the main settlements that will accommodate the majority (85% target) of the District's growth. Principle 1d supports modest growth in 'secondary settlements', in order that they can become more self sufficient by supporting waste water treatment facilities and local services. The purpose of the settlement hierarchy is set out in the Explanation and Principal Reasons for PC 30. There appears to be no rationale for making a further distinction between the Local Centres.

Analysis of growth distribution issues (Appendix 3) indicates that a slight reduction in the target for Area Centres to 75% is appropriate. This recognises the capacity of current zoning provisions and the status of existing resource consents. It also takes account of the availability of infrastructure and the need to facilitate modest growth within the Local Centres.

Implications for current zones & consent:

Plan Change 30 does not seek to change the purpose of zones. Existing resource consents are not intended to be affected by this policy, and have their-own legal status.

The proposed assessment criteria for the Rural General (5.4.2.3), Rural Living (5.8.2) and Gibbston Character (8.3.2) zones will have an impact on the scale and distribution of urban growth in those areas. This is necessary for the urban boundary approach to have teeth. It will therefore have an effect on future applications for resource consent.

Appendix 3 provides an assessment of the current supply situation arising from zoning and resource consents. It concludes that it is possible to achieve 85% of urban growth within the Area Centres. However, it recognises that due to the current supply of developable land that the proposed distribution of urban growth may not be achieved. It is considered that the figure in Policy 7.2 could be reduced to 75% in recognition of the current zoning and consents situation. This will provide a more realistic distribution of where urban growth is likely to occur over the next 20 years.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

That policy 7.2 be amended to achieve 75% of the District's urban growth within the defined Area Centres.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.2 will help to achieve the sustainable management of the District's natural and physical resources in accordance with Part 2, Section 5 of the RMA. In particular it will enable the identified social and economic needs of the community to be met and promote efficient use of zoned land and infrastructure networks.

Revising the Area Centres growth figure to 75% will achieve a sustainable pattern of development that is in general conformity with the provisions of the Growth Management Strategy.

B3.3 Policy 7.3

Submission Points

- Reword: To enable local economic and social needs of rural communities to be met.
- Delete Policy 7.3.

Discussion

Policy 7.3 sets out the purpose for the Local Centres defined in Policy 7.1. It seeks to ensure that the foreseeable needs of the District's small communities can be provided for locally. It is necessary to ensure consistent administration of the District Plan.

The townships and small communities of the District already provide a network of local hubs within the wider rural areas. Policy 7.3 will help to sustain the role of these centres by providing a focus for future urban growth. This can assist in promoting more sustainable communities, in accordance with Principle 1d of the Growth Management Strategy, by promoting self sufficiency as opposed to the role as a satellite/dormitory settlement. This will improve the ability of these communities to meet their day to day needs locally.

This approach will help to provide for the social, economic and cultural well being of the District, and in particular its small communities which serve the rural areas. It will also support a sustainable pattern of development that provides convenient access to services and facilities thereby reducing the need to travel.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.3 promotes a sustainable pattern of development that will assist the rural communities of the District meeting their needs locally.

It will enable consistent administration of the District Plan.

B3.4 Policy 7.4

Submission Points

Timeframes:

- There is confusion and tension between meeting identified needs over a 20 year time horizon and ensuring that a 5 year land supply is maintained.
- There is no justification or analysis of why there is a 20 year timeframe.
- PC30 may be focused on an inappropriately short period.
- A new long term approach be taken to identify future growth areas up to 50 years ahead.

Constraints

- Will constrain further availability of land for residential purposes, which is likely to result in increased land values and undermine the ability to achieve self sustainable communities.

- Delete Policy 7.4

Discussion

Timeframes:

Policy 7.4 indicates that there are two time horizons of relevance to urban boundaries. The first seeks to identify the period over which the boundary has been designed to operate. This is 20 years. The second is intended to ensure that adequate provision is made for maintaining an ongoing supply of land for urban growth. This indicates a minimum of 5 years supply should be maintained within the boundaries.

Part of the purpose of the RMA (Section 5a) is to sustain the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

Whilst the normal timeframe for District Plans is 10 years, strategic growth planning typically utilises longer term timeframes. The 20 year time horizon in Policy 7.4 is consistent with timeframes used for Queenstown Lakes District Growth Management Strategy 2007. Elsewhere growth strategy timeframes extend out over 50 years (Auckland Regional Growth Strategy, SMART Growth – Tauranga, Future Proof – Hamilton). The Auckland Regional Policy Statement (Method 2.6.6) requires development capacity within the Metropolitan Urban Limits to be managed over a 20 year period.

Longer term timeframes enable more effective integration with infrastructure planning and provision. This recognises the long lead in times that can be required for major infrastructure projects.

A 20 year time frame also provides longer term certainty for landowners, developers and the community. This is particularly important within an area of rapid growth where there can be significant change.

Whilst there are advantages to longer term planning, it should be recognised that the accuracy of growth projections will be reduced over longer periods. There is a need to balance the desire to have a long term strategic vision with the level of certainty that can be achieved. There is a risk that in trying to plan over an extremely long period (50 years) that this could result in the over supply of land, particularly in the short term. This would conflict

with sound resource management principles, as outlined in the Environment Court's decision on the Peninsula Bay Special Zone (C010/2005 – Infinity Group and Dennis Norman Thorn vs Queenstown Lakes District Council), which recognised that care is required to ensure that planned land release is not excessive. If there is an unreasonable over supply of land this can have adverse effects on sustainable management eg leading to inefficient use of land, either for development or other purposes, and putting pressure on infrastructure networks. A major concern for Council would be the pressure to service the future growth areas. This could impose a high level of cost on the community and developers, both through the provision of capital works and the servicing of debt needed to fund infrastructure.

One of the principles of sustainability is to enable future generations to be able to make their own choices. This will enable them to address the actual circumstances at that exist at the time. A 20 year time frame is considered to strike a reasonable balance in terms of planning for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the community.

It is recognised that development rates will vary over time. It is possible that the land identified for urban growth may be used up more rapidly that originally envisaged. In order to ensure that a continuous supply of land is available to address urban growth needs a minimum reserve of 5 years has been identified. When land supplies drop to this level, this will act as an indicator that the urban boundary may need to be reviewed.

Maintaining a minimum 5 year land supply ensures that the needs of the community will be able to be met and provides flexibility to respond to changes in the development/take up rate. Maintaining a buffer is recognised as good practice.

The UK Government's national Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing provides guidance on maintaining a strategic land supply. It states:

the supply of land should be managed in a way that ensures that a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites is maintained.

The 10 yearly review period for the District Plan, set out in Section 79 of the RMA, provides an opportunity for the timeframes associated with urban boundaries to be reconsidered if monitoring indicates that there are any capacity issues or unexpected effects associated with a 20 year timeframe.

Constraints:

Analysis of land supply and demand (see Appendix 3) indicates that there is a significant amount of residential land resource available. This can more than meet the projected needs of the District over the next 20 years. The de-facto boundaries introduced in Policy 7.5 will not result in a shortage or tightening of supply in the short to medium term (approx 20 years). The value of land is affected by a wide range of factors outside the District Plan, for instance the availability of infrastructure. PC 30 seeks to ensure that adequate provision is made to address the land supply needs of the community in accordance with the strategic directions for growth established in the Growth Management Strategy and the LTCCP.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.4 will enable the people and communities of the District to provide for their current and future social, economic, and cultural well-being. It therefore contributes to achieving sustainable management of resources in a way that is consistent with the purpose of the RMA.

B3.5 Policy 7.5

Submission Points

Zone Boundaries:

- Zone boundaries already act as urban growth boundaries. PC 30 is therefore unnecessary.
- Policy 7.5 is in direct contradiction to assertions in the Section 32 assessment.

Delineation of Boundaries:

- PC 30 fails to provide sufficient information by not including maps to define urban boundaries.
- That any consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary Plan Changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.
- Creates uncertainty about rules that could flow from the development of the proposed framework.
- Uncertainty with regard to actual effect on settlements where future plan changes relating to urban growth have not been prepared.
- Demonstrates a lack of integration which is a fundamental role of the local authority under the RMA.
- Suspend the processing of Plan Change 30 so that the approach to identification of urban boundaries for any urban or local centre can be integrated with and considered in association with the urban boundary framework provisions.
- Put PC 30 on hold until PCs 20 & 21 are ready for Hearing, and hear them together (possibly with PC 29).
- Amend policy 7.5 to enable the de-facto boundary to include a rural lifestyle buffer zone between the urban and rural areas as envisaged within the Kingston 2020 Community document, or define a separate Urban Boundary for Kingston.
- The de-facto boundaries should not have effect until such time as urban growth boundaries have become operative through the Plan Change process.
- Reword: To use Urban Boundaries to define the spatial parameters of urban growth and indicate this on the Planning Maps. Where detailed Urban Boundaries have not been defined for those settlements in the settlement hierarchy, to use the outer extremity of the settlement's existing urban or rural residential zones as the de-facto boundary.

Education:

- Exemption of education from Policy 7.5 so that development of schools is not restricted to the urban area of Frankton until an Urban Growth Boundary has been established.
- Delete Policy 7.5

Discussion

Zone Boundaries:

There are no formal urban boundaries within the operative District Plan.

Zones provide the basis for determining the appropriate use and management of land and other natural and physical resources. They provide a framework within which the resource consent process can operate. They are essentially a tool to enable the management of

effects. Whilst zones may provide capacity for development they do not provide a long term strategic direction for growth.

The Rural Living Zones monitoring report (January 2010) notes that difficulties have arisen in trying to defend the alignment of zone boundaries. This has resulted in a number of consents being allowed to extend the urban area, indicating that zones are not working effectively as urban boundaries.

Proposals to rezone land for urban purposes have been received by Council. These range from significant intensive developments such as Frankton Flats (PC 19) to the expansion of smaller townships eg: Kingston (PC 25). These are currently guided by the non statutory Growth Management Strategy. The Wanaka Structure Plan provides further evidence that the current zoning provisions are not sufficient to meet future growth needs and that there is a need to have strategic direction as to the scale, location and nature of future growth.

Growth projections indicate that there will continue to be strong demand for urban development within the District. Urban boundaries will provide strategic direction for urban growth. This will contribute to achieving the purpose of the RMA by sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

As PC 30 does not seek to define individual urban boundaries it is necessary to put a mechanism in place to ensure that the policy framework can operate in the period until individual boundaries are defined. Policy 7.5 therefore ensures that there is an integrated approach to the administration of the Plan. Utilising the outer edge of the urban zones is considered an appropriate method as it can be readily defined and there is generally sufficient capacity available within these areas to accommodate the District's urban growth needs in the interim.

The operative District Plan (Section 4.2.5 Policy 7 & 4.9.3 Implementation Methods), Growth Management Strategy (Principle 1 a) and various Community Plans (eg Arrowtown Plan) support the definition of urban boundaries in addition to current zoning provisions.

Plan Changes are being prepared to define individual boundaries. PC 29 – Arrowtown Boundary was been notified alongside PC 30. Consultation has been undertaken on the Wanaka and Queenstown/Wakatipu boundaries, and plan changes for these settlements are currently being prepared.

Delineation of Boundaries:

Policy 7.5 provides an integrated approach to the introduction of PC 30 and the Urban Boundary Framework. It establishes de-facto boundaries for all settlements in the hierarchy based on the outer edge of 'urban' zones.

Monitoring of land supply and demand (see Appendix 3) indicates that overall the de-facto boundaries will not result in a shortage or tightening of supply in the short to medium term (approx 20 years). However, it is anticipated that it may be appropriate for more detailed work to be undertaken to define individual settlement boundaries and provide policy direction for growth areas as and when needs dictate. Priority is currently being afforded to those locations experiencing significant growth pressures, this includes: PC 29 – Arrowtown Boundary, which was notified alongside PC 30; PC 20 – Wanaka, incorporating provisions from the Wanaka Structure Plan and PC 21 – Queenstown/Wakatipu.

Future Plan Changes to introduce urban boundaries for specific settlements will be guided by the provisions of Policy 7.11. This will provide a degree of certainty as to the overall

expectations and ensure a consistent approach, which will result in an integrated Plan. The Plan Change process for individual urban boundaries will enable the potential effects and implications of the proposed boundaries to be identified and fully considered.

Development and growth is unlikely to occur uniformly across the District. The need to define and review individual urban boundaries will therefore vary depending on local circumstance. The District's supply and demand data (Dwelling Capacity model and Growth Projections), the provisions of PC 30 and the Growth Management Strategy enable a localised approach to defining urban boundaries, whilst ensuring that a co-ordinated strategic overview is maintained.

Rural Living zones have been specifically excluded from the definition of Urban Zone, as they have a different purpose, including softening the edge of urban areas and assisting the transition to the wider rural areas beyond. The area identified in the Kingston 2020 plan has been identified as an area of some sensitivity in an urban design review of the Community Plan. It is not therefore considered appropriate to include this area within the de-facto boundary. Furthermore, provision has been made for further urban growth at Kingston through PC 25 – Kingston Village Special Zone, which is included within the definition of Urban Zone. It is not considered necessary to make further provisions for growth at this stage. PC 30 anticipates that there will be Plan Changes to define specific boundaries for settlements. That would be the appropriate mechanism to consider localised alignment issues for Kingston. It is outside the scope of PC 30 to define specific boundaries.

Once individual urban boundaries have been established through a Plan Change process, the de-facto boundaries for that settlement will become irrelevant.

Education:

The nature of education facilities are such that they are generally going to be classified as urban growth and development. As such, there is no justification for exempting them from the provisions of Policy 7.5. This could establish an undesirable precedent that could undermine the purpose and intent of PC 30. The definition of Urban Zones includes Frankton Flats Special Zone which includes provision for educational facilities. Work is underway on Plan Change 21 – Queenstown/Wakatipu Urban Boundary. The work programme indicates that the proposed Plan Change will be reported to Council during 2010. No significant delay is therefore anticipated in defining the boundary for the Area Centre and adjacent settlements in the Wakatipu Basin.

In light of the above it is not considered necessary for urban boundaries to be more comprehensively defined at this stage.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.5 provides an integrated approach that supports consistent, efficient and effective administration of the District Plan.

PLAN CHANGE 30: URBAN BOUNDARY FRAMEWORK

The proposed policy framework provides for an integrated approach to the management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district as required by Section 31 of the RMA.

Urban Boundaries will help to achieve the purpose of the RMA as set out in Section 5 of the Act.

The scope of PC 30 does not include defining specific urban boundaries.

B3.6 Policy 7.6

Submission Points

- **Policy 7.6.1** cannot be achieved as part of a sequential approach as Council cannot require that appropriately zoned and consented development be given effect to.
- **Policy 7.6.3** restricts urban growth to situations where there is an identified need rather than considering the environmental effects arising from urban growth.
- **Reword 7.6.3:** Where there is an identified within higher order settlements land will be released beyond the identified boundary.
- **Policy 7.6.4** is unclear in its meaning and intention. There is no appropriate basis for such an approach.
- **Policy 7.6.5** fails to recognise that settlements may not have defined boundaries. Council cannot require appropriately zoned and consented development be given effect to. This would prevent land release if one person is land banking a large area.
- **Policy 7.6.6** imposes a large cost on applicants. It does not promote an efficient use of land resource as it attempts to control market demand and influences, particularly factors relating to the saleability of previously developed land. The reference to 'previously developed land' is unclear. The policy needs to be balanced by recognising that the existence of appropriate zoning or previous development does not lead to certainty that land will be more intensively developed.
- Delete **Policy 7.6**

Discussion

Policy 7.6 sets out details relating to the sequential release of land for development. This provides a mechanism against which urban growth proposals can be tested. There are two main elements to this. Firstly, it promotes the efficient use of natural and physical resources by initially focussing on existing commitments (zoned & consented land). This provides an integrated approach with available and planned infrastructure services. Secondly, it provides a mechanism that enables necessary growth to be achieved in an orderly and sustainable manner when there is no suitable committed land available.

The sequential approach provides flexibility for the market to respond to meeting reasonably foreseeable needs, whilst ensuring that there is a coherent and 'staged' approach to urban growth.

This approach is consistent with Section 7 (b) of the RMA which requires regard to be given to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. It also contributes to promoting the purpose of the Act by enabling the foreseeable social and economic needs of the community to be met.

Further comment on 'land release' issues is set out in the response to submissions on the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption. It should be noted that if land owners are unwilling to make zoned land available for development anticipated by the zone, it may be appropriate to review the zoning rather than changing the Plan's broader policies.

In light of the current land supply situation (see Appendix 3), Policy 7.6.3 seeks to manage any further urban growth to ensure that this meets the purpose of the RMA, in particular Section 5a which seeks to sustain the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. An important aspect of this is enabling future generations to be able to make their own decisions on how

urban growth should be achieved in order to meet their needs at the time. This approach also ensures that current or potential interim uses are not precluded from land due to speculative consents or rezoning for urban activities. Further comment on 'exceptional circumstance' is given in response to submissions on Assessment Matters.

Even where the land supply within urban boundaries is limited, this does not automatically make urban growth outside the boundary appropriate. Consideration will need to be given to whether development beyond the boundary will contribute to the sustainable management of resources.

The Environment Court has recognised in *Infinity Group and Dennis Norman Thorn vs Queenstown Lakes District Council* (C010/2005 – Peninsula Bay Special Zone) that care is required to ensure that planned land release is not excessive. If there is an unreasonable over supply of land this can have adverse effects on sustainable management eg leading to inefficient use of land, either for development or other purposes, and putting pressure on infrastructure networks.

Should urban growth be required outside urban boundaries Policy 7.6.4 indicates that the preference is for peripheral growth to occur on the fringe of existing settlements. This recognises that there is efficiency in focusing growth on established settlements. This can provide for more effective infrastructure services, help reduce the need to travel and provide good access to existing services and facilities. It also avoids sporadic development within rural areas that could have a range of adverse effects including loss of high quality soils, impacts on the landscape and rural character of the area.

Policy 7.6.5 seeks to promote the efficient use of land already committed for development either through zoning or resource consents within urban boundaries. Policy 7.5 provides the mechanism through which to apply this policy prior to urban boundaries being formally established for all settlements. It is accepted that Council has little power to influence the release of land onto the market. The Explanation and Principal Reasons recognises that not all land will necessarily be available to the market. This fact could be more specifically recognised within the policy as it is not the intention to unduly restrict necessary development.

It is possible to test the availability of land, eg through Real Estate enquiries and analysis of published property reports. This approach will help to promote the efficient use of natural and physical resources, including zoned land and infrastructure.

Previously developed land is often referred to as 'brownfield' land. This includes derelict land and redundant or underutilised buildings. The UK Government defines previously developed land as:

Previously developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.

It is widely acknowledged that there is a range of sustainability benefits associated with re using developed land rather than relying on greenfield resources to cater for growth. These include using existing infrastructure, clearing up contamination, enhancing amenity values and safeguarding natural resources.

The nature of the Queenstown Lakes District means that there is likely to be relatively little previously developed land outside urban boundaries. This will reduce the number of any potential assessments that may be required. Furthermore, the policy states that the

evaluation measures should be reasonable. This will again restrict the extent and cost of any evaluation. Failure to reuse previously developed land can give rise to costs for the community in terms of adverse effects on amenity and the environment, which in the case of this District could impact on tourism and therefore the wider economy.

Any planning measures will have a degree of impact on market forces (some positive, others negative). Policy 7.6.6 is not considered to be a significant factor in this instance as it is unlikely that there will be a significant number of potential suitable previously developed sites available that could have a marked impact on the market.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Insert 'available' after 'land' in Policy 7.6.5.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.6 has regard to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources, in accordance with Section 7 (b) of the RMA.

The proposed amendment will provide greater clarity as to the circumstances where it may be appropriate to consider urban growth outside urban boundaries.

Policy 7.6 will help to achieve the purpose of the RMA as set out in Section 5 of the Act.

B3.7 Policy 7.8

Submission Points

- Policy 7.8 contains unnecessary reference to piecemeal development.
- Amend Policy 7.8 by deleting: within defined urban boundaries

Discussion

Policy 7.8 seeks to achieve a logical and co-ordinated approach to growth within urban boundaries. In order to achieve sustainable land use it is necessary to manage the supply of developable land to cater for growth. This is particularly important in situations where new greenfield areas are identified for expansion of settlements as strategic infrastructure is likely to be required to service the wider growth area.

Due to the nature of the timeframes associated with urban boundaries it is recognised that growth may not happen at a single point in time or uniformly across the area. Some interim land use may also take place on rural land situated within the urban boundary prior to it being rezoned for urban growth. Development will need to contribute to achieving strategic urban growth. Piecemeal and ad hoc development that could compromise efficient, cohesive and sustainable urban growth should be avoided.

Structure Plans are identified as one of the 'other methods' to assist implementation of this policy. This is a tool that is often used to achieve co-ordinated development within strategic growth areas. Examples include the Wanaka Structure Plan and Frankton Flats (PC 19).

Policy 7.6 focuses urban growth in urban boundaries. Where development occurs outside such areas Policies 7.7, 7.10, 7.11 and the assessment criteria for the Rural General, Rural Living and Gibbston Character zones will apply. These will help to ensure that there is an integrated approach to avoiding piecemeal development.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.8 contributes to achieving Objective 7. It has regard to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources as required by Section 7 (b) of the RMA, and will promote the purpose of the Act as set out in Section 5.

Alternative provisions exist to addresses the situation outside urban boundaries.

B3.8 Policy 7.10

Submission Points

Delete Policy 7.10

Discussion

Sporadic and ad hoc urban development in rural areas can have a range of adverse effects.

Monitoring of the Rural General and Rural Living zones has identified that there are concerns about the effectiveness of the District Plan's provisions. The consequence of this has been that development has had unintended impacts on the character and amenity of these areas.

There are broader strategic issues related to a dispersed pattern of development. These include impacts on the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure networks, increased travel generation (use of fossil fuels and emissions) and accessibility to services and facilities.

One of the main concerns for QLDC as a major infrastructure provider is the cost of delivering infrastructure service. Details of this are set out in Appendix 3.

Urban sprawl can also erode opportunities for rural activities to occur in the future due to fragmentation of rural land and reverse sensitivities generated from more intensive occupation of land.

In light of the issues identified through monitoring of development and the effectiveness of current zoning provisions, it is appropriate for the District Plan to include further policy guidance as to how to manage the adverse effects that can arise from sporadic and ad hoc urban development in rural areas.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to this issue.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.10 contributes to achieving Objective 7. It has regard to the matters set out in Section 7 (b, c & f) of the RMA, and will promote the purpose of the Act as set out in Section 5.

B3.9 Policy 7.11

Submission Points

- The matters listed are already taken into account by the zone based approach.
- Does not give recognition to the 10+ year process of preparing the partially operative District Plan.
- Growth Boundaries should consider the natural/greenbelt boundaries that are in place.
- Identify more clearly the criteria for defining urban boundaries and formulate them with regard to appropriate objectives and policies.
- Explicit inclusion of provision for education in policy 7.11.
- Add: 7.11.12 The need to provide for sustainable rural communities.
- Add a) Natural hazards and b) Land contamination
- Amend as follows: To take account of the following matters when defining urban boundaries: ...
The location of existing and future (known) transmission line corridors.
- Delete Policy 7.11

Discussion

If urban boundaries are to be used, a logical process is required to ensure that they are defined in such a way that they promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This approach applies at a strategic level and is intended to be in harmony with other aspects of the District Plan.

Policy 7.11 provides an holistic approach to defining urban boundaries. It establishes a clear and transparent process that identifies relevant issues that will enable the environmental effects of urban growth to be considered. It is considered that this is an efficient way to promote consistent administration of the District Plan.

Policy 7.11.7 identifies the need to safeguard sensitive resources. This will require an evaluation of the natural qualities of the environment. Whilst there are no formal greenbelts, the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption indicates that landscapes, ecological habitats and reserves will form part of the evaluation.

Whilst recognising that the District Plan has had a long gestation through Hearings and various appeals, monitoring now indicates that there are issues related to urban growth and development arising in some of the rural areas that, if left unchecked, could result in significant adverse environmental effects and a failure to achieve sustainable management of the Districts natural and physical resources.

As education is primarily an urban activity it is agreed that provision should be made for schools etc within urban boundaries. Policy 7.11 identifies the main criteria that should be considered when defining urban boundaries. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all the types of activity and development that should be provided for within boundaries as this would be impractical. However, education facilities would be considered under Policy 7.11.2 as part of the community's needs. The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption indicates that urban boundaries will provide for the full range of activities needed to support the urban population. It refers to meeting social needs, and specifically refers to education as a community facility that should be provided in the Area Centres. The Environmental Results Anticipated identifies the provision of sufficient land for education, amongst other things.

PC 30 is intended to focus on urban growth management. It is not intended to address all aspects of growth. Policy 7.3 indicates that Local Centres are the appropriate locations for urban growth that is necessary to support small communities and their rural catchment. Policy 7.11.2 ensures that the identified needs of communities are considered when defining urban boundaries. Other provisions within the Plan, particularly within Section 5 – Rural Areas address rural sustainability.

The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption indicates that mitigating the effects of urban growth includes avoidance of natural hazards. This matter could be more clearly identified within the Policy. It is unclear from the ORC submission how Policy 7.11 should address contamination. Policy 7.6 promotes opportunities to redevelop previously developed land, which could include areas of contamination. Contamination of land does not necessarily preclude it from future use. Redevelopment can contribute to the clean up of contaminated sites.

There is one electricity transmission line of significance within the Queenstown Lakes District (Cromwell – Frankton A). An additional criteria related to transmission corridors will ensure that the Plan Change gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Insert additional criteria:

The need to avoid areas affected by natural hazards.

The location of existing and future (known) transmission line corridors.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

Policy 7.11 is consistent with Objective 7 and the purpose of the RMA, as set out in Section 5 of the Act.

It is not necessary or appropriate to add further matters related to sustainable rural communities as part of this Plan Change.

Adequate provision already exists for education.

To enhance the clarity in respect of natural hazards.

To give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission.

B3.10 Additional Policies

Submission Points

- Include a policy under Objective 1 (District Wide Issues): *To provide for growth predominantly in or adjoining existing urban settlements avoiding areas of high landscape or ecological value.*
- Insert a policy or policies requiring structure planning of new areas that are to be incorporated into urban boundaries.

Discussion

Proposed Policy 7.6 already sets out a sequential approach to urban growth. This prioritises growth within urban boundaries of existing settlements, before moving to adjoining or more peripheral areas. Consideration of sensitive landscape and ecological resources is already included within Policy 7.11 and the proposed assessment criteria (5.4.2.3, 5.8.2 and 8.3.2). Whilst it is accepted that urban growth should avoid adverse effects on areas of high landscape or ecological value, it is considered inappropriate to just highlight these issues as there are a number of other significant factors that need to be taken into account in respect of urban growth. Furthermore the District Plan already has specific provisions to address landscape and ecological values.

Structure Plans are identified as an Other Method in PC 30. This recognises that they can be of value in achieving a co-ordinated approach to larger or more complex growth areas. However, as PC 30 does not define specific growth areas, it is unclear whether a structure plan would be necessary in all cases. This is an issue that would best be left to the individual Plan Change that defines for the boundary for a specific settlement.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

This issue is already addressed by the provisions of PC 30.

B4. Methods

B4.1 Implementation Methods and Other Methods

Submission Points

- QLDC cannot force landowners to develop the most suitable land and therefore does not have the power to implement the sequential approach to land release.
- Delete Method i c) – sequential approach.
- Method d) – assessment criteria for growth proposals in the Rural General zone are already set out in huge detail in the District Plan.
- Add method f) rural growth strategy – to provide for sustainable rural growth.
- Include a method under Objective 1 (District Wide Issues) – *Apply urban boundaries to the District's settlements to discourage growth that would adversely affect the District's natural environment and landscape values.*

Discussion

The sequential approach is a process that promotes the use of the most sustainable locations for urban growth. Policy 7.6 provides a logical means to test the availability of land, and provides a mechanism to progress to other options when land is not available. It is recognised that Council has limited powers to ensure land is developed. Further comment on this issue is provided in the response to submissions on Policy 7.6 (Sequential approach) and Explanation and Principal Reasons (Land release).

The operative District Plan's assessment criteria for the Rural General zone do not address the full range of matters identified in PC30. Evidence from monitoring of the zone indicates that the current criteria are failing to achieve some of the Plan's objectives in relation to consolidation of urban development, and protecting the character of the rural areas. The assessment criteria set out an holistic approach to managing urban growth outside urban boundaries. This complements the existing plan provisions which are more focused on rural attributes.

The Implementation Methods for PC 30 already refer to Other Matters, including a) Growth Management Strategies. These can cover both urban and rural issues. Growth Management Strategies, such as that for the Queenstown Lakes District prepared in 2007, are a method that sits outside the District Plan. It is unnecessary and inappropriate to make reference to a rural growth strategy under Method i of the District Plan. There is no indication as to who would prepare a rural growth strategy.

PC 30 already identifies the use of Urban Boundaries as a District Plan method, an additional reference under Objective 1 is considered unnecessary. PC 30 also includes other methods (sequential approach to land release and assessment criteria) that address the natural environment and landscape values.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The sequential approach and assessment criteria will help to achieve the purpose of the RMA by promote sustainable management of the District's natural and physical resources.

The proposed Other Methods are considered an appropriate way to address identified issues.

PC 30 already makes provision for urban boundaries to be used as a District Plan method.

C. EXPLANATION AND PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR ADOPTION

Submission Points

C1 Justification:

- The Explanation & Principal Reasons are unnecessarily detailed, containing matters that are already included elsewhere in the plan.
- The Explanation & Principal Reasons do not provide appropriate justification for changes proposed.
- Fails to identify adverse effects or significant resource management issues that require regulatory intervention.
- Fails to establish a link between monitoring effectiveness of the District Plan or state of the environment that has brought about a need to impose additional controls.
- Fails to address adequacy of existing controls.

C2 Metropolitan Concept:

- The circumstances of the other centres are very different. Queenstown and Wanaka are very small towns and there is no comparison to NZ major urban cities that have imposed Metropolitan Urban Limits.
- There is a fundamental lack of evidence about the applicability of this approach within Queenstown Lakes District.

C3 Dwelling Capacity Model:

- Council's Dwelling Capacity Model is not reliable and inaccurate and should not be relied upon to determine when and where land is released for development or rezoning.

C4 Terminology:

- Introduction of terms such as 'social capital' and 'town cramming' are inappropriate and the justifications are inconsistent with the Act, or are not relevant considerations.
- Provide a clearer definition of town cramming.
- 'Release of land' is not properly explained, is uncertain and could not be implemented in practice.
- The explanation identifies inner and outer growth rings around undetermined settlements, this is a complex and unnecessary layer that is not appropriate and will not achieve the objective of the change.

C5 Resort Zones:

- Omits growth anticipated within Resort Zones.

C6 Jack's Point:

- The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption should be amended to remove any reference to Jacks Point as a Resort Zone and to include the following:

The Jacks Point Zone is located within the Coneburn Downs catchment, in between the Remarkables and the Lake, covering approximately 1,320 hectares of flat to gently rolling land. Although currently within a Resort zoning, the value of this land is recognised as an urban settlement area that can accommodate up to 6,000 residents, while also providing a range of employment, education and recreation opportunities. It is therefore important to recognise the role that Jacks Point will play within the settlement hierarchy of the Queenstown Lakes District in the future. Jacks Point will eventually become a small town, with all of the essential services

necessary to support that population. Jacks Point and Arrowtown therefore serve a Local Centre function.

C7 Urban Communities:

- Reword:
 - i) ... enable urban communities.
 - ii) ... Reducing the need to travel by enabling urban communities.
 - And make a positive contribution to the sustainability of urban communities and the environment.
- Deleted: Local Centres ... needs of the local community.

C8 Protection purpose:

- Give more emphasis to the value of urban boundaries in retaining rural areas with associated landscape, recreational and amenity value.
- Note that land within urban boundaries may also be retained for protection purposes.
- Retain paragraph vii without modification.

Discussion

Justification:

Section 75 of the RMA provides discretion as to whether the principal reasons for adopting policies are included in the District Plan. The primary role of the explanation provided in PC 30 is to set out the overall rationale for Urban Boundaries in order to assist future implementation. This puts the strategic and spatial issues of urban growth in context and provides a holistic approach that is not fully addressed elsewhere in the Plan. The explanation is relevant and directly concerned with achieving the purpose of the RMA.

The justification for the Plan Change is found in the Section 32 report and the supporting documents. Monitoring of the District Plan's rural zones also provides information that indicates the current provisions are not totally effective in achieving the anticipated environmental results for the zones, or the approach to consolidate urban growth. This supports the introduction of the provisions of PC 30.

Metropolitan Concept:

It is acknowledged that Queenstown and Wanaka are smaller than those settlements within the Auckland Region where Metropolitan Urban Limits (MUL) are currently applied. The relevance of growth management tools is not necessarily related to the size of the settlement, but to the rate of growth and sensitivity of the environment. There is evidence that Queenstown Lakes District experiences growth rates and pressures that are similar to larger urban centres (eg Statistics NZ growth projections).

Further commentary on this issue is provided in the response to submissions on the Section 32 evaluation.

Dwelling Capacity Model:

The explanation for PC 30 states that the Council's Dwelling Capacity model will be an indicator of land supply. It is a regularly updated public resource that is available to assist administration of PC 30. However, it is not compulsory to use it, and other methods are not precluded. Council utilises the Dwelling Capacity model for its major strategic planning projects, including the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) – which is subject to external audit. This indicates that the data is robust and reliable. Use of the Dwelling Capacity model will assist in achieving consistent administration of the District Plan.

Terminology:

The terms 'social capital' and 'town cramming' are recognised planning terminology. Town cramming acknowledges that inappropriately intensive development can potentially generate adverse effects. This can include diminish amenity, heritage and ecological values, and overloading social and utility infrastructure. This is described in the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adopting PC 30. The Auckland Urban Design Framework uses this term. The concept of social capital recognises that social networks have value to the community. Social networks can utilise physical resources such as buildings, reserves and transport infrastructure to provide a means to support interaction and social development. Statistics New Zealand has produced a paper entitled: *Framework for the Measurement of Social Capital in New Zealand*. These issues draw attention to the social well being aspects of sustainable management, in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA. They are consistent with the definition of environment set out in Section 2 of the RMA. They are therefore both relevant and appropriate terms and concepts in relation to this Plan Change.

In this instance 'land release' refers to land being made available for development through the planning system, this would apply to zoning or resource consent.

The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption recognises that land banking may occur. This is a normal, if not necessarily desirable part of the development process. It is recognised that Council has little power to influence the release of land onto the market.

The mechanisms available to Council to facilitate land release include expansion of urban boundaries, rezoning land and granting resource consent. Fiscal measures can be used such as rating of zoned land. In some instances provision also exists under the Public Works Act to enable compulsory purchase of land – although this is an infrequently used option, and is essentially a last resort.

It is important that land release issues are considered. The release of land for development and urban growth will help to stimulate the market and provide greater choice. This can ensure that sufficient land is available at the right time and in the right location. This can also assist in managing the cost of land, contributing to the affordability of development.

The Environment Court has recognised in *Infinity Group and Dennis Norman Thorn vs Queenstown Lakes District Council* (C010/2005 – Peninsula Bay Special Zone) that care is also required to ensure that planned land release is not excessive. If there is an unreasonable over supply of land this can have adverse effects on sustainable management eg leading to inefficient use of land, either for development or other purposes, and putting pressure on infrastructure networks.

It should also be noted that 'over' zoning (zoning more land than is required), or the granting of consents does not guarantee that land will be made available for development.

The concept of Inner and Outer boundaries originated in the Wanaka 2020 Community Plan, and was further developed through the Wanaka Structure Plan (2004 & 2007). It reflects the community's desire to define and stage growth over the long term.

This approach helps to provide more clarity and certainty as to where longer term growth options exist, and assists in achieving a more coherent approach to urban growth, including the provision of infrastructure. It will also provide more flexibility to respond to high growth rates should the capacity of the Inner boundary prove to be inadequate at any stage. This will help to ensure that the reasonably foreseeable need of the community can be met.

This approach recognises that some communities are able to provide longer term direction to growth issues, based on the characteristics of the local environment.

Inner and outer boundaries enable a staged approach to land release in communities that are anticipating significant growth. This can help to achieve coherent development and ensure integration with other strategic planning initiatives, such as infrastructure delivery. This approach can also help to ensure effective management of interim development and activities in growth areas, in order to ensure that they do not compromise the ability to ultimately achieve urban development within that area.

However, it is accepted that this approach is not necessary or appropriate for all settlements, particularly those that are not anticipating significant growth, or where it may be more appropriate to defer longer term decisions to enable future generations to address the competing or potentially conflicting local interests.

Resort Zones:

The Explanation and Principal Reasons considers the role of Resort zones in relation to the settlement hierarchy.

Resort zones relate to Millbrook, Waterfall Park & Jack's Point. These zones contribute to supporting tourism and economic development within the district (including the provision of holiday homes) and rely on high quality rural locations and settings.

Jack's Point is identified as an urban Special Zone, the others being rural Special Zones. Each Resort Zone has a Structure Plan to guide land use and development. The Structure Plans make provision for substantial amounts of residential development Millbrook (450), Waterfall Park (100) & Jack's Point (1,594).

Development in accordance with the Structure Plans is generally a Controlled Activity and would not therefore be directly affected by the Objectives and Policies in PC 30. There has been no change to the zoning provisions for Resort zones. The assessment criteria remain the same. This recognises their existing status and reflects the fact that Resort zones provide for a particular form of development that differs from conventional settlements and urban growth.

Residential units within Waterfall Park are Discretionary. However, the definition of urban growth allows for some residential activity and requires consideration to be given to whether the development would be consistent with the rural character – in this case the character being that of a rural resort.

If new or expanded resort zones are proposed the provisions of PC 30 would apply. This will enable consideration to be given to the effects and appropriateness of potentially urban forms of development in the future. This approach would allow the proposal to be considered in the wider context of the District as well as in relation to the localised effects that it may have.

Where Resort zones are located near to townships, or if the nature of a resort zone has changed consideration could be given to including them within urban boundaries, either as discrete settlements or extensions to nearby townships.

Jack's Point:

Jack's Point is included within the District Plan's Special Zones. Objective 3 – Jack's Point Resort Zone, states:

To enable development of an integrated community, incorporating residential activities, visitor accommodation, small scale commercial activities and outdoor recreation – with appropriate regard for landscape and visual amenity values, servicing and public access issues.

The Dwelling Capacity model records Jack's Point as an urban Special Zone, and indicates that there is capacity for 1,594 dwellings. This could support a population of approximately 3,985 based on the average household size for the District (2.5 people per household – Statistics NZ 2006 Census). The scale and nature of growth planned for Jack's Point is commensurate with townships included as Local Centres in the settlement hierarchy in Policy 7.1.

PC 30 will not change current zoning provisions, so it is not appropriate to refer to Jack's Point as anything but a Resort Zone. However, it is considered that Jack's Point is different in character to other Resort Zones and that it can function as a discrete settlement.

Urban Communities:

Whilst PC 30 seeks to manage urban growth it has strategic implications that will extend beyond urban areas. It recognises that a sustainable pattern of urban growth can help to support rural communities by improving access to a range of services and facilities. Focusing urban growth onto the defined Local Centres will help to sustain these settlements and their surrounding rural areas. It would be incorrect to imply that a sustainable development pattern is only relevant to urban communities.

Further comment on the role of Local Centres and their relationship with rural communities is provided in the response to submissions on Policy 7.3.

Protection purpose:

The Explanation and Principal Reasons focuses on the growth aspects of urban boundaries. Further comment would help to clarify that urban boundaries can assist in retaining the rural values of areas outside the boundaries. Whilst the Explanation addresses the risk of 'town cramming', further references to the need to protect areas from development will help to clarify that not all land within urban boundaries is suitable for development.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Include Jack's Point as a Local Centre in Policy 7.1.

Delete reference to Jack's Point in the Explanation: '*The Resort Zones of Millbrook, ~~Jack's Point~~ and Waterfall Creek cater for specific types of development*'.

Insert the following at the end of the paragraph 'Although land may be zoned': In relation to Policy 7.6 land release refers to zoning and resource consents.

Insert the following paragraph into the Explanation and Principal Reasons after the paragraph 'Below this level':

Urban Boundaries provide the context for managing the growth of individual settlements. They are intended to promote a sustainable pattern of development. This can have a positive effect on the social, economic and cultural well being of the community and can avoid or mitigate adverse environmental effects associated with urban sprawl and inappropriate urban growth in rural areas. Urban boundaries will help to protect the setting of settlements and the character and amenity values of the rural environment. Not all land

within urban boundaries will be suitable for development. Some areas will need to be retained as open space for their recreational and amenity value. Open areas may also be required to support low impact infrastructure design solutions.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The Explanation and Principle Reasons for Adoption provides clarity as to the purpose of the of PC 30s provisions. This will support consistent administration of the District Plan and promote the purpose of the RMA.

Jack's Point has potential for to act as a Local Centre.

To clarify the meaning of 'land release' in the context of Policy 7.6.

To provide clarity that urban boundaries will help to protect rural and open space values.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS ANTICIPATED

Submission Points

- Delete: xiv incremental release of land for development.
- Include: Protection of the visual and open space amenity values of rural areas of the District.
- Add: Avoidance of encroachment and adverse effects on the existing high-voltage transmission network.

Discussion

Section 5 of the RMA indicates that sustainable management includes managing the rate of development. The Environment Court has recognised in *Infinity Group and Dennis Norman Thorn vs Queenstown Lakes District Council* (C010/2005 – Peninsula Bay Special Zone) that care is required to ensure that planned land release is not excessive. Given the current level of land resource that is committed for development (ie zoned or consented) it is considered appropriate that the rate of any further land release for development is sustainably managed.

Urban boundaries can contribute to the protection of the visual and open space values of rural areas. However, urban growth is not the only factor that will have an effect of these qualities of rural areas. The proposed environmental outcome is therefore considered to be too broad to be appropriate for the provisions of PC 30.

Section 75 (3) (a) of the RMA requires District Plans to give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission. In doing so it is expected that the environmental outcome should be that transmission corridors are protected from any adverse associated with urban growth.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Add the following anticipated environmental result to 4.9.4:
xx Avoidance of encroachment and adverse effects on the existing high-voltage transmission network.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The Environmental Results Anticipated are in line with the provisions of PC 30.

To give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission.

E. DEFINITIONS

A number of submissions raise concerns that the proposed Definitions are ambiguous and too restrictive. They are considered to be an inappropriate attempt to undermine earlier Environment Court decisions.

Submission Points

E1 Urban Growth:

- The two new definitions are not supported by the proposed change.
- New definitions are not necessary and overly restrictive. They are inconsistent with, and contrary to the policy direction established by the Environment Court in decisions on rural parts of the District Plan, where the Court sought clustering of development within rural parts of the District.
- The definition of Urban Growth is so broad as to capture almost every activity as an intentional 'catch all'. It contains subjective criteria. The meaning of 'not consistent with rural character' and 'focus' is question. Reference to 100 vehicle trips per day does not take into account the access situation. Is inconsistent with Council's support for types of development with common access/servicing and clusters within the Rural General Zone. As a result it is uncertain and inappropriate.
- Rework definition to control actual urban development in the Rural General zone as opposed to capturing a range of appropriate non-urban activities.
- Amend the definition of urban growth so as to ensure that only land use activities captured by this definition can reasonably be considered as urban land use activities.
- That the Plan Change be amended so that tourism, commercial recreation and similar activities are excluded from the scope of the change.
- Rework: A density of development – 5 dwellings or sections per hectare (sections of less than 2,000m²)
- Delete Urban Growth includes clusters of built development within a more extensive landscaped/open area.
- Delete or otherwise amend to exclude community related activities and projects including any buildings, parking and access that might be captured by the new definition.

E2 Urban Zone:

- The definition of urban zones is unnecessary.
- Retain the Definition of urban zones as notified in regard to exclusion of rural residential and lifestyle areas. Clarify whether this would enable Council to turn down applications for activities (such as a school) which would be defined as urban growth.
- Reference to special zones should be supplemented by adding reference to Arrowtown South Special Zone.

E3 Other:

- Does not define 'Urban Boundary'.
- Delete the definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones.

Discussion

E1 Urban Growth:

The focus of PC 30 is around managing the effects of urban growth. It is not intended to restrict legitimate rural activities. There is no change to the activity status for development within the Rural General zone. Essentially the definition of Urban Growth is about providing

more clarity around when the scale, intensity and character of development goes past the point of being rural and is recognised as urban in nature. This provides an indication that other factors, beyond those concerned with rural development such as landscape, need to be considered in promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Policy 7.11 provides the methodology for defining urban boundaries, and this indicates the range of factors that need to be considered when assessing urban growth. This includes the ability to utilise existing infrastructure and reduce the need to travel to access a range of services and facilities.

The proposed definition is generally consistent with the provisions of Section 76 (4B) of the RMA. This provides defines the urban environment as:

an allotment no greater than 4000 m²—
(a) that is connected to a reticulated water supply system and a reticulated sewerage system; and
(b) on which is a building used for industrial or commercial purposes, or a dwellinghouse.

The minimum lot size within the District Plan for the Rural Residential zone is 4,000m². This indicates that sections under this size will create densities that cease to be rural in nature, ie they become urban or suburban in character.

The Auckland Regional Policy Statement defines Urban Development as:

Development which is not of a rural nature. Urban development is differentiated from rural development by its scale, density, visual character, and the dominance of built structures. Urban development may also be characterised by a reliance on reticulated services (such as water supply and drainage) by its generation of traffic and includes activities (such as manufacturing), which are usually provided for in urban areas.

Whilst it may be helpful for a definition to be absolute, such an approach is difficult in terms of urban growth as the nature and effects of development proposals are so variable. A definitive definition can also cause problems, for example multiple adjacent schemes being prepared deliberately with the intention of each falling below the defined threshold, but with the cumulative effect being urban growth. The District Plan's approach to defining landscape categories, which was established through the Environment Court, establishes a precedent for a definition to rely on a degree of assessment and interpretation.

The proposed definition of Urban Growth is not considered unduly restrictive as it allows some flexibility, enabling proposals to be assessed on their merits in relation to the individual circumstances of the site, its surroundings and the nature of the development.

It is recognised that the current planning regime for the rural areas of the District has a long history and that the Environment Court spent considerable time addressing the approach to development in such areas. However, this approach was based around the premise that Rural General zoning is different in nature to more urban forms of zoning, and the type and range of activities that one could expect to find would therefore also be different. Assessment Matters xi & xii for Other Rural Landscapes (Rule 5.4.2.2 – 4) recognise that even in the rural areas of least landscape significance development should not introduce densities which reflect the characteristics of urban areas, and that the rural amenities should be maintained. Another aspect of the District Plan recognises the need to contain development and more clearly define urban edges (Section 4.2.5 Policy 7 & 4.9.3 Implementation Methods). It is considered that it would be inappropriate and a misinterpretation of the Plan to assume that simply because there is no minimum lot size for

subdivision that anything goes in the Rural zone, so long as it can be absorbed within the landscape. PC 30 helps to provide more clarity on this issue.

The proposed definition of Urban Growth does not seek to undermine the approach to clustering rural development to help mitigate effects. It is more concerned at addressing the appropriateness and effects arising from urban forms of development occurring in rural locations, and seeks to clarify the tipping point beyond which development becomes urban in its character and effects, even if the development is compact and visually screened.

Utilising trip generation as an indicative threshold within the definition of Urban Growth is considered an appropriate measure to ensure the transportation effects of more intensive urban forms of development are taken into account. The level of 100 vehicle trips per day is equivalent to the level of traffic generated from 10 dwellings. The Wakatipu and Wanaka Transportation Strategies recognise travel demand management (TDM) is an important aspect of managing the effects on the transportation network. This includes consideration of the location of development, and is a much more holistic and integrated approach than traffic impact assessments, which are more narrowly focused on the capacity of the roading network and access points.

The exclusion of certain activities from the definition of Urban Growth could generate significant adverse effects on the rural area. Some activities by their nature will require a rural location, however, one cannot assume that all tourism, commercial recreation and similar activities are appropriate in rural settings. Large scale facilities will give rise to significant trip generation, and a scattered pattern of development could have major impacts on the transportation network and dilute the ability of established settlements to utilise their infrastructure networks efficiently or provide for their own social and economic needs locally.

The provisions of PC 30 are intended to promote a sustainable pattern of urban growth. Should development conflict with these provisions it would be possible to decline discretionary and non complying activities.

Education facilities are likely to be classified as urban activities as they generally do not require a rural location, the majority of staff and students are likely to live within urban areas and the scale and intensity of development and activity could be inconsistent with rural characteristics. Local Centres are likely to represent a more sustainable and therefore preferable location for rural schools. There may be some limited exceptions to this, eg outdoor education centres.

The definition of Urban Growth could be enhanced by distinguishing between those activities that require rural locations (eg: ski fields) and those that don't.

E2 Urban Zones:

The definition of Urban Zones is necessary as these areas are referred to in Policy 7.5. Without a definition it is unlikely that there would be consistent administration of the District Plan.

A private plan change, PC 39 – Arrowtown South, has been lodged with Council. However, it has not yet come into effect. There are a significant number of submissions to this proposed zone change, so its outcome is uncertain at this stage. It is therefore considered premature to include reference to it within PC 30. The promoters of PC 39 have submitted on PC 29 – Arrowtown Boundary. Once the boundary is established, this will take priority over Policy 7.5 which provides the cross reference to the definition of Urban Zones. Hence the definition will become less significant in relation to the Arrowtown Boundary. If PC 39 is successful, it would be possible to amend the definition of Urban Zone as a consequential amendment.

E3 Other:

Policy 7.5 indicates the purpose of urban boundaries. The full implications and meaning can be obtained through reading the provisions of PC 30. It is not considered necessary to have a more separate definition within the Plan.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Insert 'does not require a rural location' in the definition of Urban Growth after 'characteristics'.

Insert the following paragraph in the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption prior to '*In order to ensure that the needs of the community continue to be met*':

Some development and growth will be appropriate within rural areas. Typically this will need to utilise rural resources and will be smaller scale and less intensive than urban growth. However, it is noted that some activities that require a rural location will be more intensive than is normally the case for such areas. These activities can include ski fields, viticulture and factory farming.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

To improve the clarity of the definition, and continue to support appropriate rural development and activities.

The definitions contribute to achieving Objective 7 and the purpose of the RMA as set out in Section 5 of the Act.

F. ASSESSMENT MATTERS

Submission Points

- Introduction of assessment matters into Part 5 and Part 8 of the District Plan is inappropriate and flawed. They introduce a series of contradictory and inconsistent tests that are inappropriate and inconsistent with the existing plan provisions. They impose higher cost that has not been considered or assessed. They introduce a higher level of control on rural land than currently exists without justification.
- Guiding principles are not appropriate as assessment matters. Guiding principle A is a policy rather than an assessment matter.
- 'Exceptional circumstances' is too restrictive and does not provide the necessary flexibility for managing urban growth and development.
- Delete: A. Urban growth should only occur outside urban boundaries in exceptional circumstances. Add : iv) Enables sustainable rural communities. Provides for the sustainable growth of rural communities while managing the effects of urban growth.
- Reword B: iii Support a choice of urban travel modes. (e) the extent to which the proposal avoids, remedies or mitigates. (f) Delete all reference to preserve throughout 4 – replace with maintain. vi should be avoid conflict with amenity values of adjacent activities not safeguard.
- It is inappropriate for assessment matters to be based on a test of effects not being more than minor.
- Create a number of tests which will be difficult to achieve and apply and/or unrelated to the land subject to consideration and/or are so generic as to be almost meaningless and/or inherently contradictory with the desired District Plan outcomes.
- In respect of Part 8 create assessment matters for what would otherwise be non complying activities without justification for that unusual approach.
- Impose controls on the use of rural land which are essentially unrelated to the purpose and objective of PC 30.
- Undermine and to an extent contradict a rural general zone planning regime which is currently working well and does not need to be amended.
- A truly high level plan change would not need assessment matters for particular rural zones.
- The proposed changes to Part 5 and Part 8 of the District Plan be cancelled, withdrawn or deleted.
- Assessment Criteria 4 xxx (e) (i) be amended to read: (i) preserve or enhance natural resources (soil, minerals, air and water) landscapes, ecological habitats, historic heritage as defined in Section 2 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991, cultural features and reserves.
- Amend xxx a) to by adding: 'include where appropriate, the relevant Growth Management Strategy'.
- That a new matter be incorporated: The extent to which a proposal provides for, or will promote, mechanisms to manage demand to travel, or will utilise and/or capitalise on existing mechanisms to manage demand to travel. In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will: i) improve the ability to undertake multi-purpose trips to destination nodes ii) reduces the distances that need to be travelled in order to reach destination nodes iii) supports a choice of travel modes that prioritises walking, cycling, and public transport iv) capitalises on and/or establishes opportunities for destination nodes to provide access to a comprehensive mix of goods and services and activities.
- Assessment criteria ix) be amended to read: Avoid areas affected by natural hazards.

- Make the following amendments to Section 4 (xxx) (g):
In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:
..
(vi) avoid giving rise to reverse sensitivity issues (including any effects on regionally significant infrastructure).
..
(x) Identify and provide for appropriate Transmission Corridors.

Discussion

Monitoring of the rural zones indicates that the current District Plan provisions are not fully achieving the anticipated environmental results. This indicates that urban growth is happening in rural areas. For example Rural Living zones that were intended as transitional areas between settlements and the wider countryside have been consented and developed to low density residential standards and this form of development is now extending into the adjacent Rural General zone (eg Lake Hayes Estate), industrial development has also been consented in the Rural General zone at Frederick Street, Wanaka. It is therefore appropriate for PC 30 to consider how these aspects of urban growth should be managed. Further assessment matters will enable a more robust evaluation of proposals. This is necessary to ensure that development meets the purpose of the RMA and the strategic intentions of the District Plan.

It is not clear from the submissions which of the assessment criteria are supposedly contradictory or what aspects are inconsistent. The assessment criteria are well related to proposed Objective 7 and its policies and the general provisions of Section 4.9 of the District Plan. They will help to achieve an integrated and consistent approach to the administration of the District Plan.

Guiding Principles provide a context for the assessment criteria and relate back to Objective 7 and Policy 7.6.3. This approach is used elsewhere in the District Plan – Rural Areas 5.4.2.2 Assessment Matters, states:

These assessment matters should be read in the light of two further guiding principles. First that they are to be stringently applied to the effect that successful applications for resource consent will be exceptional cases. Secondly, existing vegetation whichshall not be considered nor shall removal of such vegetation be considered as a positive effect of any proposal.

The principle related to ‘exceptional circumstances’ recognises that the District Plan promotes sustainable urban growth in other ways than through development of rural resources. There is a significant supply of land already committed for urban development through urban zoning and resource consents. It also recognises that the rural areas of the District are a significantly important natural resource, both for their intrinsic value and the contribution they make to the local economy.

The travel modes referred to in criteria (b) (iii) are not exclusively urban. The proposed amendment appears to add no benefit to the interpretation of this criteria.

The proposed rewording of assessment criteria e) and f) appears to make little difference to the meaning of these criteria, and may reduce the clarity of their purpose.

Section 104D of the RMA recognises that in particular circumstances it may be appropriate to grant consent for non-complying activities. One of the tests for non-complying activities is

that the adverse effects of the activity will be minor. The assessment criteria are structured to assist the evaluation of proposed development in relation to this test.

Policy 7.3 identifies Local Centres as the location where sustainable urban growth should occur to service rural areas.

Further comment on the purpose of the Rural zones is given in response to the submissions on Definitions.

The focus of PC 30 is on managing urban growth. It is accepted that this can have implications for rural areas. The assessment criteria under (a) already enables the sustainability of rural communities to be taken into account. More specific reference to rural sustainability goes beyond the scope of PC 30 and would need to be addressed through a review of the provisions for rural areas.

The RMA provides a specific definition of historic heritage. The proposed cross reference will improve the clarity of the Plan and ensure consistency with the Act.

PC 30 identifies growth management strategies as another method. Including reference within the assessment criteria will improve the clarity as to how such strategies should be used to assist decision making.

Travel demand management is a recognised approach to promoting integration between land use and transportation. The proposed new transportation assessment criteria are consistent with the approach to travel demand management referred to in the Council's Transportation Strategies. They also reflect the concept of promoting a reduction in energy consumption set out in the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption of PC 30. However, there is some repetition of the assessment criteria (b).

The area of risk associated with natural hazards may be different to the feature that generates the risk. For example a flood plain will extend beyond the normal course of the river. The proposed rewording of criteria g) ix) more clearly addresses the risk associated with the hazard.

Section 75 (3) (a) of the RMA requires District Plans to give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission. In doing so it is expected that the environmental outcome should be that transmission corridors are protected from any adverse associated with urban growth.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Insert: historic heritage (as defined in Section 2 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991) into Assessment Criteria xxx (e) (i).

Insert: include where appropriate, the relevant Growth Management Strategy at the end of the first sentence of Assessment Criteria xxx a)

Incorporate travel demand management into Assessment Criteria xxx b) by inserting the following in the first sentence:

'(b) The extent to which the proposal provides for, or will promote, mechanisms to manage demand to travel, and reduces energy consumption.

Amend the wording of criteria g) ix) to: Avoid areas affected by natural hazards

Insert the following wording into criteria (xxx) (g) (vi): (including any effects on regionally significant infrastructure)

Add a new criteria: (x) Identify and provide for appropriate transmission corridors.

No other change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

To improve clarity and ensure consistency with the RMA.

This will provide a more integrated approach to land use and transportation planning and promote more sustainable travel.

To improve clarity with respect to the potential effects associated with natural hazards.

To give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission.

G. GENERAL ISSUES

G1 Withdraw/Decline Plan Change

Submission Points

A considerable number of submissions seek the withdrawal or rejection of the Plan Change in its entirety as their first relief. The specific reasons for this are addressed under the individual headings of this report.

Discussion

Over the last 10 years there have been significant advancements in strategic growth management planning within Queenstown Lakes District. This includes adoption of a Growth Management Strategy, Transportation Strategies, the production of Community Plans and the Long Term Council Community Plan. Council now needs to have regard to these in accordance with 74 of the RMA.

Monitoring of the District Plan has also identified that the anticipated environmental outcomes relating to achieving urban consolidation and maintaining the level of rural amenity, including spaciousness and outlook, are not being fully achieved.

There are significant ongoing growth pressures within the District.

These factors indicate that it is appropriate to consider amending the District Plan to ensure that it effectively promotes sustainable management of the District's natural and physical resources. Failure to do so would increase the risk of adverse effects occurring.

For further comment on the justification for the Plan Change, see responses to submissions on the Section 32 report in Section A above.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

Reasons

PC 30 is considered necessary to address issues identified through monitoring of the District Plan and growth projections in order to provide an holistic approach to growth management.

PC 30 will promote the purpose and principles of the RMA.

G2 RMA

Submission Points

Part 2 – Sustainable Management:

- PC 30 will not achieve the purpose or principles of the RMA.
- It does not promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources, in that it does not positively contribute to the District Plan's function of enabling people and communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well being.
- It does not have particular regard to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources and will not contribute to the quality of the environment.
- Imposes inappropriate and unnecessary restrictions on the use and development of land.
- Creates a regime of land use control which is not effects based and/or cannot be justified under the RMA.
- The location of development should be assessed on its own merits through an effects based approach.

Integrated Management:

- Contrary to the functions of Territorial Authorities under section 31 of the RMA.
- Will not achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources.

Discussion

Part 2 of the RMA sets out the purpose and principles of the Act. The purpose of the RMA is set out in Section 5 of the act. It states:

- (1) The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—*
- (a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;*
 - and*
 - (b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
 - (c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

PC 30 provides a strategic context for managing the spatial aspects of urban growth within Queenstown Lakes District. It recognises that the pattern of development is a relevant consideration in achieving the purpose of the Act, and focuses the District Plan on the effects of the scale and distribution of development.

PC 30 assists in directing urban growth away from areas of recognised national importance. This will help to ensure that sensitive areas are not adversely affected by urban growth. In this way PC 30 provides for those matters identified in Section 6 of the Act.

The Policy provisions of PC 30 seek to ensure that provision is made for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the community, whilst having regard to matters set out in Section 7 of the RMA. A strategic approach to managing the spatial effects of urban growth promotes the

purpose of the Act, particularly the efficient use of natural and physical resources such as zoned land and existing infrastructure networks.

Section 31 of the RMA sets out the functions of Territorial Authorities under the Act. This requires the establishment, implementation, and review of Objectives, Policies, and Methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district, and the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land. Effects can be positive or negative.

In response to high growth pressures and the need for integration between land use and infrastructure in the Auckland Region the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 has expanded on the RMA, by including the need to consider strategic growth issues. The purpose of this Act includes:

(b) to require Auckland local authorities to change the policy statement and plans prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991 to integrate the land transport and land use provisions and make those provisions consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy.

This demonstrates that integrated strategic growth management is a critical aspect of the sustainable management of resources.

One of the UK Governments key principles for delivering sustainable development (set out in Planning Policy Statement 1) states:

A spatial planning approach should be at the heart of planning for sustainable development

This recognises that the distribution of development and urban growth can have an effect on sustainability. Objective 7 incorporates this approach in order to further promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

There are a wide range of effects related to the spatial aspects of urban growth. These are recognised in the Explanation and Principle Reasons for Adoption of PC 30. The proposed provisions of PC 30 build on concepts already identified in the District Plan and promote a more holistic approach to managing the effects of urban growth and achieving sustainable management of resources. This is consistent with Part 2 and Section 31 of the RMA.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 is consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA and is effects based.

G3 Repetition

Submission Points

Unnecessarily replicates existing District Plan provisions

Discussion

PC 30 expands, and is complementary to, the District Plan's current urban growth provisions. It provides a strategic approach to managing the spatial aspects of urban growth. This is necessary to address deficiencies that have been identified through monitoring of the performance of rural zones and analysis of the distribution of growth. It will also enable the Plan to take account of the provisions of the District's Growth Management Strategy, which has been prepared since the Plan was notified.

It is appropriate for the District Wide section of the District Plan to provide an holistic overview as to the management of urban growth. Certain aspects of this may also be relevant in other sections of the Plan. It is not necessarily superfluous to have more than one reference to certain issues.

The submissions do not specifically identify which existing provisions are thought to be duplicated.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 provides additional provisions to address identified issues of concern. It is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA (Section 5), the matters referred to in Section 7 (b, c & f) of the Act and Section 31(1 a) concerning an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

G4 Consistency of the Plan

Submission Points

- PC 30 is seeking to elevate the status of urban growth above all other issues, affecting a paradigm shift in District Plan policy.
- Implications of proposed Plan Change – fundamental change to underlying principles of the District Plan resulting in:
 - A disjointed plan with contradictory objectives.
 - Confusion as to the intentions of the plan.
 - Inconsistent administration of the plan.
 - Additional layer of unnecessary control.
- PC 30 is not consistent with the District Plan and will not enable consistent administration of the Plan. It is inherently contradictory of existing District Plan provisions
- Proposed objectives and policies either contradict or paraphrase the Plan's existing unchanged urban growth objectives and policies, and will not achieve the purpose of the Act.
- PC documentation demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the legal history of the Rural General zone, the discretionary regime, the landscape categories and consented development.

Discussion

Section 4.9 of the District Plan (Urban Growth) promotes the concept of urban consolidation and a structured approach to growth. However, monitoring has shown that the existing District Plan provisions are not totally effective in achieving the anticipated environmental results for urban growth and rural areas. In particular there is concern that the pattern of development is not achieving urban consolidation and maintaining the level of rural amenity, including spaciousness and outlook.

Since the District Plan was first prepared understanding of the range of effects associated with urban growth has improved. This is illustrated at the national level with initiatives such as the Urban Design Protocol and the local level with the Growth Management Strategy for the Queenstown Lakes District.

PC 30 provides a strategic approach that is complementary to the existing District Plan.

PC 30 does not change the underlying approach to rural development and does not represent a fundamental change in the intentions of the District Plan. It does, however, provide greater clarity as to the distinction between urban growth and other forms of development. This will help to ensure that the effects of such growth can be more readily identified and effectively managed. This will improve the ability to achieve consistent and effective administration of the plan.

Further comment on the purpose of the Rural zones is given in response to the submissions on Definitions.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 provides a mechanism to address identified adverse effects.

It is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA (Section 5), the matters referred to in Section 7 (b, c & f) of the Act and Section 31(a) concerning an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

It will provide greater clarity in respect of urban growth that will enable consistent administration of the District Plan.

G5 Financial impacts

Submission Points

- Discourage investment in the District.
- Increased cost to ratepayers with no appreciable benefit.

Discussion

Urban Boundaries will help to focus future growth and infrastructure provision on recognised centres. The timeframes set out in Policy 7.4 will ensure that an adequate supply of land is identified to meet growth needs. Urban Boundaries will provide more certainty over the future use of land contained within them. This will ease the rezoning and consenting process, thus helping to overcome potential constraints that may otherwise exist when current zoning capacity is used up or new growth is sought. These measures are expected to encourage investment in identified growth areas. The Wanaka Structure Plan demonstrates that signalling long term growth opportunities can encourage investment, as witnessed by the Three Parks Plan Change (PC 16) which has been prepared in partnership with the land owner.

Urban Boundaries are not intended to restrict appropriate rural development and activities, therefore this should not discouragement investment in rural areas.

Urban Boundaries will help to achieve a more integrated approach to growth management. They will assist infrastructure, utility and other service providers in planning for the delivery of facilities. Co-ordinating development and infrastructure roll out can help to reduce costs. Furthermore, focusing growth on areas where there has already been significant investment in infrastructure will help to ensure that resources are used efficiently, thus improving the cost-benefit equation for the community. Where urban growth requires new capital works to expand or upgrade infrastructure networks, the Council uses Development Contributions (through the Local Government Act 2002) to ensure that the wider community does incur any additional financial burden. Further comment on the costs associated with PC 30 is provided in Section A above in response to submissions on the Section 32 report.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 will provide more certainty for investment in the District and help to reduce unnecessary and inappropriate costs to rate payers.

G6 Rural impact

Submission Points

- Effectively a change to rural parts of the plan.
- The introduction of assessment matters to Parts 5 & 8 of the Plan demonstrate that this change is actually to the Rural and Rural Living parts of the plan.
- Impose controls on the use of rural land which are essentially unrelated to the purpose and objective of PC 30.
- A truly high level plan change would not need assessment matters for particular rural zones.
- That the Change be amended such that it does not apply in any respect to the Rural Residential Zones.
- If adopted the plan change should be limited in scope to urban areas only, and any reference to rural development/activity/subdivision be deleted.
- Protect rural landscapes.
- Manage the scale and location of growth and prevent urban sprawl over the whole (Wakatipu) basin.
- The plan change should be better articulated so that it is not open to interpretation, ensuring that rural areas are not in a vulnerable position with regard to the District Plan.

Discussion

The focus of PC 30 is on achieving a sustainable pattern of development and managing the effects of urban growth. This requires a broad consideration of the distribution, needs and pressures for development throughout the District. It forms part of the overarching District Wide section of the District Plan in recognition that it is a strategic approach to growth management, rather than being based on particular zones.

In order to ensure that there is integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district as required by Section 31 (1)(a) of the RMA, it is necessary for the plan change to consider the potential implications and effects that could arise on either side (inside and outside) of urban boundaries, this includes rural areas.

The public notice for PC 30 (see Appendix 1) clearly acknowledged that it will have an impact on rural areas of the District as well as the overall urban growth section of the District Plan. The proposed assessment criteria for the rural areas of the District provide certainty in terms of the methods of evaluating urban growth proposals. This enhances the current District Plan provisions.

Monitoring of the Districts Rural areas has identified concerns about where urban forms of development are occurring. This includes the Rural Residential zone. This is currently resulting in a more dispersed pattern of development rather than the consolidated form promoted by the District Plan. Rural areas are a significant resource in their own right. Rural Living areas contribute to the provision of a range of living environments within the District. It is therefore appropriate that these areas are managed in such a way that their distinctive character and attributes are maintained, and that they remain distinct from the urban environment. As such, it would be inappropriate to exclude the Rural Residential zones from the provisions of PC 30.

Further comment on rural issues is provided in the response to submissions on the Section 32 report in Section A above.

The response to submissions on the proposed Definitions indicates that it would be appropriate to clarify that some development and growth will continue to be appropriate within rural areas. It is beyond the scope of this Plan Change to specifically address the protection of rural landscapes. However, in response to submissions on the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption of PC 30 it is accepted that it is appropriate to clarify that urban boundaries will help to protect aspects of the District's rural areas.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 seeks to reinforce the provisions of the District Plan to address issues identified through monitoring and research.

It is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA (Section 5), the matters referred to in Section 7 (b, c & f) of the Act and Section 31(1) (a) concerning an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

G7 Existing Consents and Zoning

Submission Points

- PC 30 seeks to restrict the ability for people to exercise resource consents and/or private plan changes in a manner which is inappropriate.
- Ensure Urban Boundaries do not stifle development elsewhere in the District.
- Amend the proposed new objectives, policies and assessment criteria to recognise existing entitlements and existing consented land use.
- Amend the proposed new objectives, policies and assessment criteria to provide for modifications to existing consents or new consents which do not increase the envelope of effects beyond that already contemplated by existing consent entitlements.
- Make all necessary changes to address concerns over existing consented and reasonably contemplated land use activities to ensure that they are not unduly hindered by urban boundaries.
- Clarify how the proposed Plan Change affects current zoning.
- Oppose any change to current boundaries.

Discussion

Monitoring and analysis indicate that the current District Plan provisions are not fully achieving the anticipated environmental outcomes. In addition to this the District continues to face significant growth pressures. It is therefore reasonable and necessary to look at introducing other means of delivering these outcomes. The response to submissions on the Section 32 report and Policies and Objectives9 (Sections A & B above) provides further comment on the need for and appropriateness of the proposed approach.

PC 30 seeks to achieve a sustainable pattern of urban development. It puts in place a mechanism by which the effects of urban growth can be tested to ensure that they promote sustainable management of resources. There is no intention of stifling development necessary to meet the foreseeable needs of the community. PC 30 will assist development proposals by enabling growth within urban boundaries (or exceptionally in other locations) when this is consistent with the provisions of the Plan Change.

PC 30 does not change the purpose or activity status of any zone. However, where appropriate, future applications for resource consent or private plan changes that promote urban growth will be subject to the provisions of PC 30. New assessment criteria will help to ensure that applications within rural areas achieve the environmental results anticipated by the District Plan. The response to submissions on the proposed Definitions indicates there is scope to clarify that some development and growth will continue to be appropriate within rural areas.

Existing resource consents have their-own legal status and will not be directly affected by PC 30 or the introduction of urban boundaries. Valid, but unimplemented consents form part of the existing environment and are considered part of the permitted baseline. This will mean that they are already able to be taken into account if any modifications to the scheme are proposed.

There are no formal urban boundaries within the operative District Plan. Policy 7.5 provides for the outer edge of urban zones to act as de-facto urban boundaries. This will effectively maintain the status quo for the time being. However, PC 30 makes provision for new boundaries to be defined, should circumstances require it. This will ensure that a sustainable

pattern of urban growth is achieved. Plan Changes are already being prepared for specific settlements eg PC 29 – Arrowtown Boundary. This will enable the individual circumstances of each settlement to be considered as the boundaries are defined. In the instance of PC 29 this has resulted in a tight boundary that will limit growth beyond current zones.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 will promote the purpose and principles of the RMA, and address identified deficiencies in the current District Plan provisions.

Existing resource consents will remain valid and form part of the permitted baseline.

G8 Gibbston

Submission Points

That the Change be amended so that it has no effect upon land or activities within the Gibbston Character Zone.

Discussion

The Gibbston Valley Character Zone is recognised for its concentration of viticultural activities and heritage values. These provide a 'sense of place' that distinguishes it from the wider Rural General zone. The District Plan objectives for the zone (5.6) include protecting the character and landscape values, retention of the life supporting capacity of soils, safeguarding the life supporting capacity of water and encouraging land management practices that recognise the environmental sensitivity and amenity values.

The Gibbston Character Zone is clearly a rural area. Although the nature of activities within the Gibbston valley may be more intensive than other rural parts of the District, they are nevertheless still related to rural resources.

The productive nature of the soils and the micro climate that exists within the Gibbston valley create a unique set of characteristics. This is a limited and finite resource base within the District.

PC 30 focuses on managing urban growth to ensure that it occurs in appropriate locations that maximise the potential to efficiently use urban resources, meets the foreseeable needs of communities and avoids adverse effects on rural resources and amenity values.

Given the range of important natural and physical resources within the Gibbston Character Zone it is considered appropriate to apply the provisions of PC 30 to this area in order to achieve sustainable management of the identified rural resources.

The definition of Urban Growth will enable appropriate rural activities to continue within this area. This includes development associated with viticulture.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to this issue.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The application of PC 30 to the Gibbston Character Zone PC 30 is consistent with achieving the purpose of the RMA (Section 5), the matters referred to in Section 7 (particularly b, c, f and g) of the Act and Section 31(1 a) concerning an integrated approach to management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

G9 Proposed Urban Boundaries

Submission Points

Ladies Mile Partnership Land

- Include Ladies Mile Partnership land within the Urban Growth Boundary as an extension of Lake Hayes Estate as shown on the plan provided.
- Making provision for future growth adjacent to Lake Hayes Estate is appropriate. The LMP site is an ideal area to accommodate future residential growth as it is alongside established resources. Topographical attributes have the capacity to provide for and absorb development. Direct access of State Highway 6 via Stalker Drive as well as the ability to connect to the established road (Howards Drive). Access to the established sewer main and high volume water bore. Connecting to existing infrastructure is considered a more sustainable approach that stand alone facilities. The rapid take up of land at Lake Hayes Estate demonstrates a ready market for this type of residential development. LMP has signalled intention to proceed with rezoning land south of Ladies Mile and this has been supported by others.

Waterfall Creek, Wanaka

- The western outer growth boundary for Wanaka should revert to include Waterfall Creek as part of the original 2020 three rivers urban boundary. The urban growth boundary is defined by Lake Wanaka, Clutha River, Cardrona River, Alpha face and Waterfall Creek.
- Concern at the arbitrary line drawn around western boundary for Wanaka.

Arrowtown

- Include provision that would enable future urban growth and development on the Boxer Hill Trust land, between McDonnell Road and Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Rd.

Discussion

The scope of PC 30 does not include delineating Urban Boundaries. However, Policy 7.1 identifies Wanaka as an Area Centre and Arrowtown and Lake Hayes Estate as Local Centres. De-facto Urban Boundaries are established for these settlements through Policy 7.5. Currently these exclude the areas identified in these submissions.

Section 32 reports that analyse the effects of boundary changes for these areas have not been provided with the submissions. The implications of defining a boundary for the Ladies Mile Partnership land, Boxer Hill Trust land and at Waterfall Creek cannot therefore be fully assessed.

Based on the assessment of land supply and demand (Appendix 3) there is no identified need for the inclusion of a significant new growth area in the parts of the Wakatipu basin identified in these submissions.

A Private Plan Change has been lodged with Council to rezone the Ladies Mile area, primarily for residential purposes. However, this has yet to be assessed.

Plan Change 29 – Arrowtown Boundary has been notified. Council is preparing Plan Changes 20 & 21 which are intended to define urban boundaries for Wanaka and Queenstown including the adjacent settlements of the Wakatipu Basin. These are more appropriate mechanisms for considering the areas identified in these submissions.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The delineation of Urban Boundaries is outside of the scope for this Plan Change.

G 10 Subdivision Requirements

Submission Points

Limit and tighten subdivision requirements.

Discussion

The scope of PC 30 does not include amendments to the subdivision provisions of the District Plan.

More intensive forms of urban subdivision within rural areas are already at least Discretionary activities. The provisions of PC 30 will apply to subdivision where this is a Discretionary or a Non-Complying activity. This will promote a more sustainable pattern of development without the need to specifically amend subdivisions provisions. This will enable more control through the subdivision process as sought by the submission.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to this issue.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

The provisions of PC 30 will have an effect on most subdivision within rural areas.

G11 Industrial and Non Residential Activities

Submission Points

- Provision be made for dirty, dusty, noisy industrial activities that no one wants as neighbours.
- Define the urban boundaries with proper regard to the need for all land use, rather than predominantly residential.
- Identify in the plan change areas of existing and future industrial use and identify objectives, policies and methods to protect these from reverse sensitivity.

Discussion

It is accepted that industrial growth is an urban activity that should be anticipated by and addressed through the District Plan. The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption of PC 30 recognises that a sustainable pattern of development includes meeting the economic needs of the community. It notes that urban boundaries will provide for the full range of activities needed to support the urban population of the District, and that Area Centres should have a mix of land use activities, including employment. Monitoring of growth needs is identified as one of the criteria to ensure that the plan is kept up to date. PC 30 has drawn upon a Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Study, which considers the need for a range of industrial activities within the District, including heavier yard based facilities. This approach will feed into future boundary Plan Changes in order to ensure that adequate provision is made for such activities. PC 30 also addresses the need to mitigate the effects of urban growth, in order to ensure that activities can be appropriately incorporated into the environment. This will help to ensure that the adverse effects from heavy industry are taken into account when planning for growth.

Analysis of growth needs (see Appendix 3) indicates that 90% of future land requirements will be for residential activities. However, it is recognised that it is important to achieve a mix of activities to achieve sustainable communities that provide for social, economic and cultural well being of those living in and visiting the District. Policies 7.2 and 7.3 provide for a mix of land uses.

The District Plan maps identify the areas where industrial activity is supported. There are also a number of established industrial sites in addition to this. It is beyond the scope of PC 30 to identify all industrial sites and potential opportunities. This is a matter that would need to be considered as part of a review of the Business and Industrial areas. However, Policy 7.7 addresses the need to achieve successful integration of growth areas with existing settlement. The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption of PC 30 identify reverse sensitivity is an issue to be considered in mitigating the effects of urban growth. Assessment Criteria xxx (g) (vi) also identifies the need for urban growth outside urban boundaries to avoid giving rise to reverse sensitivity issues. Reference to reverse sensitivity could be further enhanced by including it within Policy 7.7.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

Insert the following at the end of Policy 7.7: and to avoid potential adverse effects from reverse sensitivity.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 includes provision for the full range of urban activities needed to achieve sustainable urban growth.

Identification of industrial land resources is beyond the scope of PC 30.

To improve clarity regarding the need for urban growth to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.

G12 Consultation

Submission Points

- Give the plan change more consideration and a public forum so that questions can be answered.
- There be improved and efficient person to person dialogue with landowners and the ongoing support of landowners in maintaining existing and/or heritage land values.

Discussion

Consultation on the concept of Urban Growth Boundaries took place in August and September 2008. There has been media coverage of this issue and this has facilitated public discussion. The issues raised have been considered by a Council Working Party and were reported to the Strategy Committee and full Council. There is opportunity for matters to be raised with Council directly through the public forum sessions. The notification process provided a formal opportunity for public comment. The Hearings process provides another forum for submitters to air their views and for these to be considered.

Further consultation will be undertaken with land owners and the community as individual urban boundary Plan Changes are prepared. This has already occurred in Arrowtown, Wanaka and Queenstown.

The Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adopting PC 30 identifies heritage values as part of the consideration in achieving a sustainable pattern of development. This provides opportunity for these issues to be explored as part of the process of defining urban boundary.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

No change in relation to these issues.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

A number of opportunities have been provided for public engagement in the development of this Plan Change. Further opportunities will be available when urban boundaries are prepared for individual settlements.

G13 Deferred Zoning

Submission Points

Council assess the merits of and make provision to the policy framework for incorporation of a phased or deferred zone technique to provide clear direction for phased growth outside of the proposed urban growth boundaries.

Discussion

It is accepted that a logical approach is required to manage the roll out of future urban growth and development.

Policy 7.4 sets out that urban boundaries should make provision for the development needs of the community over a 20 year period. Analysis of current supply and demand (Appendix 3) indicates that overall there is adequate provision available to meet the identified growth needs of the community over this period. It is not therefore necessary or appropriate to make specific provision through deferred zoning for additional urban growth outside the boundaries. Zoning provisions are outside the scope of PC 30. However, recognising that circumstances may change over time, Policy 7.6 sets out the approach to considering land release beyond urban boundaries should this be required due to exceptional circumstances.

Policy 7.6 sets out a sequential approach to land release, which provides a phased approach to urban growth. It also includes provision for the use of inner and outer urban boundaries that provide guidance on the staging of growth. This technique has been used within the Wanaka Structure Plan.

Policy 7.8 seeks to ensure that the future development potential of land identified for growth within the urban boundaries is not compromised by any interim activities and development.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

No change in relation to this issue.

For individual responses to the decisions sought in submissions refer to Appendix 2.

Reasons

PC 30 makes adequate provision for a phased approach to urban growth.

G14 NPS – Electricity

Submission Points

Amend the plan change to ensure that the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission is given effect to:

- The sustainable management of the National Grid as a physical resource;
- Appropriate provision for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the network including ensuring that lines can be accessed;
- That the existing network can be upgraded in order to meet growth in energy demand;
- The protection of the existing network from issues of reverse sensitivity and the effects of others' activities

Discussion

Section 75 (3) (a) states that District Plans must give effect to National Policy Statements (NPS). The NPS on Electricity Transmission was gazetted on 13 March 2008 and came into effect 28 days later. It is therefore necessary to ensure that, where appropriate, PC 30 gives effect to the NPS. Other submissions from Transpower indicate the changes considered necessary. These are addressed under the relevant sections of this report.

Recommendation

Accept.

No change in relation to this issue.

Reasons

To ensure compliance with Section 75 (3) (a) of the RMA.

G15 Crown Range/Cardrona Community Projects

Submission Points

Eastburn Station has been working alongside Council to implement two community related projects by the Crown Range Rd and Cardrona Valley Rd. Concerned that PC 30 will be a significant obstacle for the implementation of these projects.

Discussion

The nature of the proposed projects relates to rural resources and heritage features.

The focus of PC 30 is around managing the effects of urban growth. It is not intended to restrict legitimate rural activities. There is no change to the activity status for development within the Rural General zone.

Amendments have been proposed to the Definition of Urban Growth and the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption. This will help to further clarify that not all activities will be classified as urban growth, specifically those activities that require a rural location. For further comment, see the response to submissions on Definitions.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

No change in relation to this issue.

Reasons

Proposed changes to the Definition of urban Growth will address the identified concerns.

G16 Greenbelts and Private Land

Submission Points

- Do not support the use of Greenbelts as an urban growth boundary technique, unless created by the use of publicly owned land.
- It is essential that the methods adopted do not have the effect of appropriating private land for public benefit, unless it can be established that such methods represent the only sustainable use of that land. None of the land east of Waterfall Creek (Wanaka) falls into this category.

Discussion

The Discussion Document on Urban Growth Boundaries (2008) identified Greenbelts as a potential option for managing urban growth. However, this method was not widely supported, and has not been incorporated into PC 30.

Greenbelts do not necessarily prevent all activities from occurring, or beneficial private use of land. In the UK, where Greenbelts are a recognised planning tool, there is no requirement for public ownership of the land.

Issues regarding land at Wanaka are best addressed through proposed PC 20 – Wanaka Urban Boundary.

Recommendation

Reject.

No change in relation to this issue.

Reasons

PC 30 does not propose to introduce Greenbelts.

G17 Adopt Plan Change

Submission Points

Four submitters support PC 30 in its entirety and want it to be adopted.

The Arrowtown Promotion and Business Association note the relevance of urban boundaries to managing urban growth in and around Arrowtown and the relationship with PC 29. Their primary issue is to retain the heritage 'village' character of Arrowtown.

Discussion

A number of other submissions have highlighted opportunities to refine the provisions of PC 30. It is considered that some amendments will help to improve the clarity and effectiveness of the Plan Change, without changing the overall purpose or intent.

PC 30 provides a strategic approach that will enable individual settlement boundaries to be developed throughout the District. PC 29 has been prepared in conjunction with PC 30. This will ensure that the approach for Arrowtown is consistent with the strategic district wide approach whilst responding to local circumstances.

Recommendation

Accept in part.

PC 30 be retained with amendments to address issues identified elsewhere in this report.

Reasons

PC 30 will help to promote a strategic approach to the sustainable management of urban growth.

The proposed amendments arising from submissions will enhance the provisions of PC 30.

G18 Neutral Submission

Submission Points

The Arrowtown Village Association (AVA) lodged a neutral submission to enable them to participate within the process.

Discussion

This submission enables the AVA to participate in the plan change process.

Recommendation

Accept.

No change in response to this submission.

Reasons

The submission was lodged in accordance with the requirements of the RMA.

Resource Management Act 1991 Public Notice of proposed District Plan Changes:

Queenstown Lakes District Council gives public notice as of **19 August 2009** that it has prepared the following Plan Changes to the Partially Operative District Plan:

Plan Change 27A: Updating Noise Measurement and Assessment Standards

Plan Change 29: Arrowtown Boundary

Plan Change 30: Urban Boundary Framework.

The purpose of the proposed Plan Changes are summarised as follows:

PC 27A – To revise references to acoustic standards.

PC 29 – To establish an urban boundary for Arrowtown.

PC 30 – To establish a strategic framework for managing the scale and location of urban growth within the District.

What is proposed?

PC 27A Updating Noise Measurement and Assessment Standards:

Clarify, replace or update references to acoustic standards incorporated by reference in the District Plan and revise provisions relating to noise to ensure they are consistent and clear, and reflect industry best practice.

PC 29 Arrowtown Boundary introduces:

- An Urban Boundary for Arrowtown into the District Plan (Planning Maps 26, 27 & 28)
- New Policies that:
 - Limit the growth of Arrowtown
 - Promote urban design outcomes for future growth in accordance with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines and the Arrowtown Plan

PC 30 Urban Boundary Framework:

- Introduces a new Objective that promotes the sustainable management of development.
- Introduces 11 new Policies that:
 - Establish a Settlement Hierarchy
 - Provide a process for maintaining a long term land supply for urban growth
 - Prioritises urban development within Urban Boundaries
 - Promote effective urban design and integration of new urban growth areas
 - Establish criteria for defining Urban Boundaries
 - Provides a Definition of Urban Growth and Urban Zones
- Introduces new Rules that provide Assessment Criteria for urban development in rural areas (Rural General Zone, Gibbston Character Zone, Rural Living Areas)

Where can I get a copy?

A full copy of the Plan Changes and associated Section 32 Reports can be inspected at the following locations:

- Queenstown Lakes District Council offices during normal office hours at 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown and 47 Ardmore Street, Wanaka;
- Queenstown Public Library, 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown;
- Wanaka Public Library, Dunmore Street, Wanaka;
- Arrowtown Library, 58 Buckingham Street, Arrowtown;
- Glenorchy Library, 13 Islay Street, Glenorchy;
- Hawea Library, Myra Street, Lake Hawea;
- Kingston Library, 48 Kent Street, Kingston;
- Makarora Library, Makarora School, Rata Road, Makarora;

- Lakes Environmental, Shotover Street, Queenstown and 33-35 Reece Crescent, Wanaka.
- On the QLDC website- www.qldc.govt.nz.

Make a Submission

Any person may make a submission to the proposed Plan Changes. Submission forms are available from the above locations.

The closing date for submissions on PC 27A is **18 September 2009**.

The closing date for submissions on PCs 29 & 30 is **9 October 2009**.

Submissions must be in writing and sent to:

Ruth Joiner
Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072
QUEENSTOWN 9348

E mail: services@qldc.govt.nz

Fax: 03 450 2223

What happens next?

Following the receipt of public submissions, a summary of the submissions lodged will be prepared. This will be publicly notified and **any person** may lodge a further submission in support or opposition to any original submission.

The Council will appoint a Hearing Panel to assess the Plan Change and the submissions lodged to it, including further submissions. The Panel will hold a public hearing to enable submitters to present their submissions.

Following deliberation, a decision will be issued by the Council to withdraw, retain or modify the Plan Change. Any person who was a submitter, or lodged a further submission, and who is not satisfied with the decision reached, may appeal that decision to the Environment Court.

Want more info?

For further information regarding these Plan Changes or the process outlined above, please call the Policy and Planning Team at the Queenstown Lakes District Council on (03) 441 0499.

This notice is pursuant to Clause 5 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Queenstown Lakes District Plan – Summary of Decisions Requested
Plan Change 29: Arrowtown Boundary & Plan Change 30: Urban Boundary Framework**

As of 16 December 2009, a summary of decisions requested is available for inspection for the following plan changes:

- Plan Change 29: Arrowtown Boundary; and
- Plan Change 30: Urban Boundary Framework.

Where can I get a copy?

A full copy of the summary of decisions requested and further submission forms are available at the following locations:

- Queenstown Lakes District Council offices during normal office hours at 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown and 47 Ardmore Street, Wanaka;
- Queenstown Public Library, 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown;
- Wanaka Public Library, Dunmore Street, Wanaka;
- Arrowtown Library, 58 Buckingham Street, Arrowtown;
- Lakes Environmental, Shotover Street, Queenstown and 33-35 Reece Crescent, Wanaka
- Council website: www.qldc.govt.nz – under District Plan Changes Underway.

A copy of the original submissions can be viewed at the Queenstown council office and at the Arrowtown Library.

Make a Further Submission

Any person may lodge a further submission in support or opposition to any original submission.

Further submissions must be sent in writing to:

Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072
QUEENSTOWN
Attention: Ruth Joiner

Fax: 03 450 2223
Email: services@qldc.govt.nz

by **5 February 2010**.

If you make a further submission, you must, within 5 working days of lodging that further submission to the Council, serve a copy of the further submission on the person who made the original submission.

What happens next?

Following collation of all further submissions received, the Council will appoint a Hearings Panel to assess the Plan Change and the submissions lodged to it, including further submissions. The Panel will hold a public hearing to enable any submitters to present their submissions in person.

Following deliberation, a decision will be issued by the Hearings Panel to withdraw, retain or modify the Plan Change. Any person who was a submitter, or lodged a further submission, and who is not satisfied with the decision reached, may appeal that decision to the Environment Court.

Want more info?

For further information regarding these Plan Changes or the process outlined above, please call Mark Rushworth at Queenstown Lakes District Council on (03) 441 0499.

This notice is pursuant to Clause 7 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991.

PC 30 Urban Boundary Framework

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/1/1	Branches Station Limited	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/1/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/1/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/1/2	Branches Station Limited	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/1/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/1/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/2/1	Cardrona Developments Ltd	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/2/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/2/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

Appendix 2

ProformaBP 30/2/2 Cardrona Developments Ltd Oppose Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter’s concerns A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4 Partly Accept

	30/2/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/2/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

Proforma Sub. No. Submitter Position Decision Requested Issue/Category Recommendation

ProformaBP 30/3/1 Cardrona Landcare Inc Oppose That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn G1 Reject

	30/3/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/3/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP 30/3/2 Cardrona Landcare Inc Oppose Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter’s concerns A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4 Partly Accept

	30/3/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/3/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/4/1	Cardrona Valley Residents and Ratepayers Society Inc	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/4/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/4/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/4/2	Cardrona Valley Residents and Ratepayers Society Inc	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/4/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/4/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/5/1	Cattle Flat Station Limited	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/5/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/5/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/5/2	Cattle Flat Station Limited	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept

	30/5/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/5/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/6/1	Criffel Deer Farm Limited	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/6/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/6/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/6/2	Criffel Deer Farm Limited	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/6/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/6/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/7/1	Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/7/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/7/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/7/2	Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/7/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/7/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/8/1	Hazeel Downs Partnership	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/8/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/8/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/8/2	Hazeel Downs Partnership	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/8/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/8/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/9/1	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited, trading as Criffell Station	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/9/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/9/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/9/2	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited, trading as Criffell Station	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/9/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/9/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/10/1	Lake Landcare Inc.	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/10/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/10/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/10/2	Lake Landcare Inc.	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/10/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/10/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/11/1	Little Bo Peep Sheep Company	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/11/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/11/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/11/2	Little Bo Peep Sheep Company	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/11/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/11/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/12/1	Mt Creighton Joint Venture	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/12/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/12/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/12/2	Mt Creighton Joint Venture	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/12/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/12/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/13/1	P D Gordon Family Trust	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/13/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/13/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/13/2	P D Gordon Family Trust	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/13/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/13/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/14/1	Pezaro Childrens Trust	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/14/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/14/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/14/2	Pezaro Childrens Trust	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/14/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/14/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/15/1	Signature Investments Ltd	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/15/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/15/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
ProformaBP	30/15/2	Signature Investments Ltd	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/15/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/15/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/16/1	Spotburn Station	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/16/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/16/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/16/2	Spotburn Station	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/16/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/16/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaBP	30/17/1	T M & C M Scurr Limited	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/17/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/17/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

ProformaBP	30/17/2	T M & C M Scurr Limited	Oppose	Alternatively any such alternate or consequential relief that addresses the Submitter's concerns	A2 A3 A7 B1.1 B2 B3.2 B3.5 B3.6 B3.9 B4.1 C1 C2 E1 F G2 G3 G4	Partly Accept
	30/17/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/17/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaCFMA	30/18/1	JP & BM Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn and/or rejected in its entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/18/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/18/2	JP & BM Holdings Limited	Oppose	Delete policies 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.10 and 7.11	B3.2 B3.3 B3.4 B3.5 B3.6 B3.8 B3.9	Reject
	30/18/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/18/3	JP & BM Holdings Limited	Oppose	Amend policy 7.8 by deleting the words: within defined Urban Boundaries.	B3.7	Reject
	30/18/3/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/3/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/18/4	JP & BM Holdings Limited	Oppose	Delete the Definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones,	E1 E2	Reject
	30/18/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/18/5 JP & BM Holdings Limited Oppose Delete the new assessment criteria introduced to Parts 5 and 8 of the District Plan. F Reject

	30/18/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/18/6 JP & BM Holdings Limited Oppose Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as are considered necessary to address the issues and concerns raised in this submission A1 A2 A3 B3.5 C1 G2 G4 Reject

	30/18/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/18/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaCFMA	30/19/1	Platinum Estates Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn and/or rejected in its entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/19/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/19/2	Platinum Estates Limited	Oppose	Delete policies 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.10 and 7.11	B3.2 B3.3 B3.4 B3.5 B3.6 B3.8 B3.9	Reject
	30/19/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/19/3	Platinum Estates Limited	Oppose	Amend policy 7.8 by deleting the words: within defined Urban Boundaries.	B3.7	Reject
	30/19/3/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/3/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/19/4	Platinum Estates Limited	Oppose	Delete the Definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones,	E1 E2	Reject
	30/19/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/19/5 Platinum Estates Limited Oppose Delete the new assessment criteria introduced to Parts 5 and 8 of the District Plan. F Reject

	30/19/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/19/6 Platinum Estates Limited Oppose Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as are considered necessary to address the issues and concerns raised in this submission A1 A2 A3 B3.5 C1 G2 G4 Reject

	30/19/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/19/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaCFMA	30/20/1	Shotover Design Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn and/or rejected in its entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/20/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/20/2	Shotover Design Limited	Oppose	Delete policies 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.10 and 7.11	B3.2 B3.3 B3.4 B3.5 B3.6 B3.8 B3.9	Reject
	30/20/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/20/3	Shotover Design Limited	Oppose	Amend policy 7.8 by deleting the words: within defined Urban Boundaries.	B3.7	Reject
	30/20/3/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/3/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/20/4	Shotover Design Limited	Oppose	Delete the Definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones,	E1 E2	Reject
	30/20/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/20/5 Shotover Design Oppose **Delete the new assessment criteria introduced to Parts 5 and 8 of the District Plan.** **F** **Reject**
Limited

	30/20/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/20/6 Shotover Oppose **Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as are considered necessary to address the issues and concerns raised in this submission** **A1 A2 A3 B3.5 C1 G2 G4** **Reject**
Design Limited

	30/20/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/20/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaCFMA	30/21/1	The Station at Waitiri Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn and/or rejected in its entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/21/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/21/2	The Station at Waitiri Limited	Oppose	Delete policies 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.10 and 7.11	B3.2 B3.3 B3.4 B3.5 B3.6 B3.8 B3.9	Reject
	30/21/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/21/3	The Station at Waitiri Limited	Oppose	Amend policy 7.8 by deleting the words: within defined Urban Boundaries.	B3.7	Reject
	30/21/3/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/3/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaCFMA	30/21/4	The Station at Waitiri Limited	Oppose	Delete the Definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones,	E1 E2	Reject
	30/21/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/21/5 The Station at Waitiri Limited Oppose Delete the new assessment criteria introduced to Parts 5 and 8 of the District Plan. F Reject

	30/21/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaCFMA 30/21/6 The Station at Waitiri Limited Oppose Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as are considered necessary to address the issues and concerns raised in this submission A1 A2 A3 B3.5 C1 G2 G4 Reject

	30/21/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/21/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/22/1	Albion Trustee Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/22/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/22/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/22/2	Albion Trustee Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/22/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/22/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/22/3 30/22/4	Albion Trustee Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/22/3/1 30/22/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/22/3/2 30/22/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/23/1	Arith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/23/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/23/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/23/2	Arith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/23/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/23/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/23/3 30/23/4	Arith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/23/3/1 30/23/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/23/3/2 30/23/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/23/5	Arith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption be amended to remove any reference to Jacks Point as a resort zone and to include the following:	C6	Partly Accept
	30/23/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/23/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/23/6	Arith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That with the exception of Arrowtown, the settlements currently listed under the heading ‘Local Centres’ be re-listed under a third category	B3.1	Reject
	30/23/6/1	East Wanaka		Support		

		Land Trust Limited				
	30/23/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

ProformaJE **30/24/1** **BNZL Properties Ltd** **Oppose** **That the plan change be withdrawn.** **G1** **Reject**

	30/24/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/24/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE **30/24/2** **BNZL Properties Ltd** **Oppose** **That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.** **B3.5** **Reject**

	30/24/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/24/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE **30/24/3**
30/24/4 **BNZL Properties Ltd** **Oppose** **That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed** **A2 A3 A4 A5 A6
B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1
C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4
G5 G6
B1.2 B3.1 G2** **Partly Accept**

	30/24/3/1 30/24/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/24/3/2 30/24/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/25/1	Branches Station	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/25/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/25/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/25/2	Branches Station	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/25/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/25/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/25/3 30/25/4	Branches Station	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/25/3/1 30/25/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/25/3/2 30/25/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/26/1	Bungy New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/26/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/26/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/26/2	Bungy New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/26/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/26/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/26/3 30/26/4	Bungy New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/26/3/1 30/26/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/26/3/2 30/26/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/26/5	Bungy New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	That the Plan Change 30 be amended so that tourism, commercial recreation and similar activities are excluded from the scope of the change.	E	Reject
	30/26/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/26/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/27/1	D E Bunn and Co	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/27/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/27/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/27/2	D E Bunn and Co	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/27/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/27/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/27/3 30/27/4	D E Bunn and Co	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/27/3/1 30/27/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/27/3/2 30/27/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/28/1	Faulks Enterprises Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/28/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/28/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/28/2	Faulks Enterprises Limited	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/28/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/28/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/28/3 30/28/4	Faulks Enterprises Limited	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/28/3/1 30/28/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/28/3/2 30/28/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/29/1	Figrove Farm	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/29/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/29/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/29/2	Figrove Farm	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/29/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/29/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/29/3 30/29/4	Figrove Farm	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/29/3/1 30/29/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/29/3/2 30/29/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/30/1	FII Holdings	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/30/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/30/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/30/2	FII Holdings	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/30/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/30/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/30/3 30/30/4	FII Holdings	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/30/3/1 30/30/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/30/3/2 30/30/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/31/1	Henley Downs Village Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/31/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/31/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

ProformaJE	30/31/2	Henley Downs Village Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
-------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--	-------------	---------------

	30/31/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

	30/31/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

ProformaJE	30/31/3 30/31/4	Henley Downs Village Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---	---	----------------------

	30/31/3/1 30/31/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
--	------------------------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

	30/31/3/2 30/31/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	------------------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

ProformaJE	30/31/5	Henley Downs Village Ltd	Oppose	That the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption be amended to remove any reference to Jacks Point as a resort zone and to include the following:	C6	Partly Accept
-------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---	-----------	----------------------

	30/31/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

	30/31/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

ProformaJE	30/31/6	Henley Downs Village Ltd	Oppose	That with the exception of Arrowtown, the settlements currently listed under the heading ‘Local Centres’ be re-listed under a third category	B3.1	Reject
-------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---	-------------	---------------

	30/31/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/31/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
Proforma	Sub. No.	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Issue/Category	Recommendation
ProformaJE	30/32/1	High Plains Wine Company	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/32/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/32/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/32/2	High Plains Wine Company	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/32/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/32/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/32/3 30/32/4	High Plains Wine Company	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/32/3/1 30/32/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/32/3/2 30/32/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/32/5	High Plains Wine Company	Oppose	That the Change be amended so that it has no effect upon land or activities within the Gibbston Character Zone	G8	Reject
	30/32/5/1	East Wanaka		Support		

		Land Trust Limited				
	30/32/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/33/1	Highground Land Company Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/33/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/33/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/33/2	Highground Land Company Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/33/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/33/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/33/3 30/33/4	Highground Land Company Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/33/3/1 30/33/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/33/3/2 30/33/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/34/1	Horrell,K J and E F	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/34/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/34/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/34/2	Horrell,K J and E F	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/34/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/34/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/34/3 30/34/4	Horrell,K J and E F	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/34/3/1 30/34/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/34/3/2 30/34/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/35/1	Jacks Point Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/35/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/35/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/35/2	Jacks Point Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/35/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/35/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/35/3 30/35/4	Jacks Point Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/35/3/1 30/35/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/35/3/2 30/35/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/35/5	Jacks Point Ltd	Oppose	That the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption be amended to remove any reference to Jacks Point as a resort zone and to include the following:	C6	Partly Accept
	30/35/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/35/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE 30/35/6 Jacks Point Ltd Oppose **That with the exception of Arrowtown, the settlements currently listed under the heading ‘Local Centres’ be re-listed under a third category** **B3.1** **Reject**

	30/35/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/35/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

ProformaJE 30/36/1 Jacks Point Village Ltd Oppose **That the plan change be withdrawn.** **G1** **Reject**

	30/36/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/36/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE 30/36/2 Jacks Point Village Ltd Oppose **That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.** **B3.5** **Reject**

	30/36/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/36/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/36/3 30/36/4	Jacks Point Village Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/36/3/1 30/36/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/36/3/2 30/36/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/36/5	Jacks Point Village Ltd	Oppose	That the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption be amended to remove any reference to Jacks Point as a resort zone and to include the following:	C6	Partly Accept
	30/36/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/36/5/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/36/6	Jacks Point Village Ltd	Oppose	That with the exception of Arrowtown, the settlements currently listed under the heading ‘Local Centres’ be re-listed under a third category	B3.1	Reject
	30/36/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/36/6/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/37/1	MacColl,D	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/37/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/37/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/37/2	MacColl,D	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/37/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/37/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/37/3 30/37/4	MacColl,D	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/37/3/1 30/37/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/37/3/2 30/37/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/38/1	Morvern Ferry Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/38/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/38/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/38/2	Morvern Ferry Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/38/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/38/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/38/3 30/38/4	Morvern Ferry Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/38/3/1 30/38/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/38/3/2 30/38/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/39/1	Northridge Investments Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/39/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/39/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/39/2	Northridge Investments Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/39/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/39/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/39/3 30/39/4	Northridge Investments Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/39/3/1 30/39/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/39/3/2 30/39/4/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/40/1	Parkins Bay Preserve Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/40/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/40/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/40/2	Parkins Bay Preserve Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/40/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/40/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/40/3 30/40/4	Parkins Bay Preserve Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/40/3/1 30/40/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/40/3/2 30/40/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/41/1	Pelican Property Company	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/41/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/41/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/41/2	Pelican Property Company	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/41/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/41/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/41/3 30/41/4	Pelican Property Company	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/41/3/1 30/41/4/1	30/41/3/1 East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/41/3/2 30/41/4/2	30/41/3/2 Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/42/1	Queenstown Gravel Supplies Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/42/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/42/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/42/2	Queenstown Gravel Supplies Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/42/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/42/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/42/3 30/42/4	Queenstown Gravel Supplies Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/42/3/1 30/42/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/42/3/2 30/42/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/43/1	Reavers (NZ) Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/43/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/43/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/43/2	Reavers (NZ) Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/43/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/43/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/43/3 30/43/4	Reavers (NZ) Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/43/3/1 30/43/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/43/3/2 30/43/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/44/1	Receivers of Bob's Cove Developments Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/44/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/44/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/44/2	Receivers of Bob's Cove Developments Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/44/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/44/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/44/3 30/44/4	Receivers of Bob's Cove Developments Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/44/3/1 30/44/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/44/3/2 30/44/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/44/5	Receivers of Bob's Cove Developments Ltd	Oppose	That the Change be amended such that it does not apply to the Rural Residential Zones	G6	Reject
	30/45/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

	30/45/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/45/1	Receivers of Walter Peak Developments Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/45/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/45/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/45/2	Receivers of Walter Peak Developments Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/45/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/45/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/45/3 30/45/4	Receivers of Walter Peak Developments Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/45/3/1 30/45/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/45/3/2 30/45/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/46/1	Rodwell,G	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/46/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/46/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/46/2	Rodwell,G	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/46/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/46/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE 30/46/3 Rodwell,G Oppose That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 Partly Accept
30/46/4 concerns expressed B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1

**C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4
G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2**

	30/46/3/1 30/46/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/46/3/2 30/46/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Proforma Sub. Submitter Position Decision Requested Issue/Category Recommendation
No.

ProformaJE 30/47/1 Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Dunedin Oppose That the plan change be withdrawn. G1 Reject

	30/47/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/47/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE 30/47/2 Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Dunedin Oppose That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration. B3.5 Reject

	30/47/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/47/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/47/3 30/47/4	Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Dunedin	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
-------------------	----------------------------	--	---------------	---	---	----------------------

	30/47/3/1 30/47/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/47/3/2 30/47/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub.</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

ProformaJE	30/48/1	Royalburn Farming Company Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
-------------------	----------------	--	---------------	---	-----------	---------------

	30/48/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/48/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE	30/48/2	Royalburn Farming Company Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
-------------------	----------------	--	---------------	--	-------------	---------------

	30/48/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/48/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/48/3 30/48/4	Royalburn Farming Company Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/48/3/1 30/48/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/48/3/2 30/48/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/49/1	Speargrass Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/49/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/49/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/49/2	Speargrass Farms Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/49/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/49/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/49/3 30/49/4	Speargrass Farms Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/49/3/1 30/49/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/49/3/2 30/49/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/50/1	Steve Rout Contracting Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/50/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/50/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
ProformaJE	30/50/2	Steve Rout Contracting Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
	30/50/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/50/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE 30/50/3 Steve Rout Oppose That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 Partly Accept
30/50/4 Contracting Ltd concerns expressed B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1
C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4
G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2

	30/50/3/1 30/50/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/50/3/2 30/50/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Proforma Sub. Submitter Position Decision Requested Issue/Category Recommendation
No.

ProformaJE 30/51/1 The Carter Oppose That the plan change be withdrawn. G1 Reject
Group Ltd

	30/51/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/51/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE 30/51/2 The Carter Oppose That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all B3.5 Reject
Group Ltd of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are
prepared to enable full and proper consideration.

	30/51/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/51/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/51/3 30/51/4	The Carter Group Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---	---	----------------------

	30/51/3/1 30/51/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/51/3/2 30/51/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaJE	30/52/1	The New Zealand Malt Whisky Company Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/52/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/52/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE	30/52/2	The New Zealand Malt Whisky Company Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
-------------------	----------------	--	---------------	--	-------------	---------------

	30/52/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/52/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE	30/52/3 30/52/4	The New Zealand Malt Whisky Company Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
-------------------	----------------------------	--	---------------	---	---	----------------------

	30/52/3/1 30/52/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/52/3/2 30/52/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE	30/52/2	The New Zealand Malt Whisky Company Ltd	Oppose	That the Change be amended so that it has no effect upon land or activities within the Gibbston Character Zone	G8	Reject
-------------------	----------------	--	---------------	---	-----------	---------------

	30/52/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/52/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

ProformaJE	30/53/1	The Station at Waitiri Ltd	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
-------------------	----------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	---	-----------	---------------

	30/53/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/53/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE	30/53/2	The Station at Waitiri Ltd	Oppose	That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration.	B3.5	Reject
-------------------	----------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	--	-------------	---------------

	30/53/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/53/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Appendix 2

ProformaJE 30/53/3 The Station at Waitiri Ltd Oppose That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2 Partly Accept

	30/53/3/1 30/53/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/53/3/2 30/53/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

Proforma Sub. No. Submitter Position Decision Requested Issue/Category Recommendation

ProformaJE 30/54/1 Treble Cone Investments Ltd Oppose That the plan change be withdrawn. G1 Reject

	30/54/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/54/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE 30/54/2 Treble Cone Investments Ltd Oppose That consideration of Plan Change 30 be deferred until all of the particular Urban Growth Boundary plan changes are prepared to enable full and proper consideration. B3.5 Reject

	30/54/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/54/2/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

ProformaJE	30/54/3 30/54/4	Treble Cone Investments Ltd	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is fully amended to address the concerns expressed	A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.1 B3.2 B3.5 C1 C3 C4 E1 E2 F G4 G5 G6 B1.2 B3.1 G2	Partly Accept
	30/54/3/1 30/54/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/54/3/2 30/54/4/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK1	30/55/1	Flight,Nick and Tania	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/55/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK1	30/56/1	Lewis,Toni	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/56/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK1	30/57/1	Miles,Lisa	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/57/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK1	30/58/1	Monk,Rebecca Kaye	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/58/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK1	30/59/1	Monk,Sam	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/59/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK2	30/60/1	Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	A. B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept
	30/60/1/1	Mahon,Don & Judith		Support		
	30/60/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK2	30/61/1	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	A. B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept

	30/61/1/1	Mahon,Don & Judith		Support		
	30/61/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaMK2	30/62/1	Mt Soho Trust	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be amended to resolve the concerns listed, then accepted	A. B3.2 B3.4 B3.6 B3.7 C4 C5 E1 E2	Partly Accept

	30/62/1/1	Mahon,Don & Judith		Support		
	30/62/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaSP	30/63/1	Glencoe Joint Venture Company	Oppose	Rework the definition of urban growth in order to control actual urban development in the Rural General Zone as opposed to capturing a range of appropriate no-urban activities.	E1	Partly Accept

	30/63/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Appendix 2

ProformaSP	30/64/1	Morven Ferry Limited	Oppose	Rework the definition of urban growth in order to control actual urban development in the Rural General Zone as opposed to capturing a range of appropriate no-urban activities.	E1	Partly Accept
------------	---------	----------------------	--------	--	----	---------------

	30/64/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

ProformaSP	30/65/1	Mt Christiana Limited	Oppose	Rework the definition of urban growth in order to control actual urban development in the Rural General Zone as opposed to capturing a range of appropriate no-urban activities.	E1	Partly Accept
------------	---------	-----------------------	--------	--	----	---------------

	30/65/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

ProformaVE	30/66/1	JF Investments Limited	Oppose	That the plan change in its present form be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
------------	---------	------------------------	--------	--	----	--------

	30/66/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

	30/66/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

ProformaVE	30/67/1	Little Stream Limited	Oppose	That the plan change in its present form be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
------------	---------	-----------------------	--------	--	----	--------

	30/67/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

	30/67/1/2	Remarkables Park		Oppose		
--	-----------	------------------	--	--------	--	--

		Limited				
--	--	---------	--	--	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaVE	30/68/1	Mount Field Limited	Oppose	That the plan change in its present form be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/68/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/68/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaVE	30/69/1	Quail Rise Estate Limited	Oppose	That the plan change in its present form be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/69/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/69/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
ProformaVE	30/70/1	Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the plan change in its present form be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/70/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/70/1/2	Remarkables Park		Oppose		

		Limited				
--	--	---------	--	--	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/71/1	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/71/2	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Oppose	That significant amendments be made to the PC 30 provisions to address the concerns detailed and in particular that the proposed changes to Part 5 and Part 8 of the District Plan be cancelled or withdrawn	A A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 B1.2 B1.3 B3.4 C4 E1 E2 F G2 G3 G4 G6 G7	Partly Accept

	30/71/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/72/1	Arrowtown Promotions and Business Association	Support	That the plan change be adopted.	G17	Partly Accept

	30/72/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/73/1	Arrowtown Village Association Inc	Other	Neutral submission to be part of the Plan Change process.	G18	Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/74/1	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	Delete policy 7.2	B3.2	Reject
	30/74/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/74/2	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	Alternatively Reword policy 7.2: To achieve approximately two thirds of the Districts urban growth within the defined Area Centres...	B3.2	Partly Accept
	30/74/3	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	Delete policy 7.6	B3.6	Reject
	30/74/4	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	Delete implementation method i c)	B4.1	Reject
	30/74/5	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	That the assessment matters proposed for sections 5.4.2.3, 5.8.2 and 8.3.2 be deleted.	F	Reject
	30/74/6	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	Oppose	That the decisions above are accepted and any other amendments are made to ensure Urban Boundaries do not stifle appropriate development elsewhere in the District.		Partly Accept
<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/75/1	Balogh,Eva	Oppose	Withdraw the plan change.	G1	Reject
	30/75/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/76/1	Blakely,Philip	Support	Support the entire plan change.	G17	Partly Accept
	30/76/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/77/1	Blennerhassett,Hamish	Oppose	The outer growth boundary for Wanaka should revert to include Waterfall Creek as part of the original 2020 three rivers urban boundary.	G9	Reject
	30/77/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/78/1	Blennerhassett,John	Oppose	The outer growth boundary for Wanaka should be restored to Waterfall Creek.	G9	Reject
	30/78/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/79/1	Blennerhassett,John and Jill	Oppose	The western boundary for Wanaka should be amended as bordering Waterfall Creek, entirely to its discharge into Lake Wanaka.	G9	Reject
	30/79/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/80/1	Davis, Glenn and Gemma	Support	That the definition of urban zones remain as notified in regard to exclusion of rural residential and rural lifestyle and that there is clarification as to whether this would enable the Council to turn down applications for an activity (such as a school) which would be defined as urban growth, and any other consequential amendments required.	E2	Accept
	30/80/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/81/1	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Plan Change 30 is rejected.	G1	Reject
	30/81/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/81/2	Federated Farmers	Oppose	If the plan change is adopted it should be limited in scope to urban areas only and any reference to rural development/activity/subdivision be deletd.	G6	Reject
	30/81/3	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Reword: To enable local economic and social needs of rural communities to be met.	B3.3	Reject
	30/81/4	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Reword: Where there is an identified.. within higher order settlements land will be released beyond the identified urban boundary.	B3.6	Reject
	30/81/5	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Add assessment matter: 7.11.12 The need to provide for sustainable rural communities.	B3.9	Reject
	30/81/6	Federated Farmers	Partly Support	Add other method: (f) rural growth strategy - to provide for sustainable rural growth.	B4.1	Reject
	30/81/7	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Reword: i .. enabling urban communities ii .. Reducing the need to travel by enabling urban communities	C7	Reject
	30/81/8	Federated Farmers	Partly Support	Reword: And make a positive contribution to the sustainability of urban communities and environment. Delete: Local centres.. needs of the local community.	C7	Reject

30/81/9	Federated Farmers	Partly Support	Delete: xiv incremental release of land for development	D	Reject
30/81/10	Federated Farmers	Partly Support	Reword: A density of development - 5 dwellings or sections per hectare (sections of less than 2000m2) Delete: Urban Growth includes clusters of built development within a more extensive landscaped/open area	E1	Reject
30/81/11	Federated Farmers	Partly Support	Delete: A. Urban growth should only occur outside urban boundaries in exceptional circumstances Add: iv. Enables sustainable rural communities Provides for the sustainable growth of rural communities while managing the effects of urban growth Reword: B, iii Support a choice of urban travel modes (e) the extent to which the proposal avoids, remedies or mitigates f) Delete all reference to preserve throughout 4 - replace with maintain vi should be avoid conflict with amenity values of adjacent activities not safeguard	F	Reject

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/82/1	Feehly,James J	Support	Support the plan change.	G17	Partly Accept
	30/82/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/83/1	Griffin,John	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 is withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/83/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

30/83/2	Griffin,John	Oppose	That the location of development should be assessed on it's own merits through an effects based approach.	G2	Reject
---------	--------------	--------	---	----	--------

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/84/1	Guthrie,John	Oppose	Reject plan change 30.	G1	Reject
	30/84/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/85/1	Hammond,Matthew	Partly Support	Amend the proposed new objectives, policies and assessment criteria to recognise existing entitlements and existing consented land use.	G7	Reject
	30/85/2	Hammond,Matthew	Partly Support	amend the proposed new objectives, policies and assessment criteria to provide for modifications to existing consents or new consents which do not increase the envelope of effects beyond that already contemplated by existing consent entitlements.	G7	Reject
	30/85/3	Hammond,Matthew	Partly Support	Amend the definition of urban growth so to ensure that the only land use activities captured by this definition can reasonably be considered as urban land use activities.	E1	Partly Accept
	30/85/4	Hammond,Matthew	Partly Support	Make all necessary changes to address concerns over existing consented and reasonably contemplated land use activities to ensure that they are not unduly hindered by urban boundaries.	G7	Reject
	30/85/5	Hammond,Matthew	Partly Support	Any other relief to address the matters raised in this submission.		Reject

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/86/1	Hanan,Elizabeth (Dame)	Partly Support	Manage scale and location of growth and prevent urban sprawl over the whole basin.	G6	Partly Accept

	30/86/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	---------	--	--

30/86/2 Hanan,Elizabeth (Dame) Partly Support Protect rural landscapes. G6 Partly Accept

	30/86/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	---------	--	--

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

30/87/1 Hanan,John Murray Partly Support Limit and tighten subdivision requirements. G10 Reject

	30/87/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

30/88/1 Hanan,Ralph Oppose That the proposed plan change be clarified as to how it affects current zoning. G7 Reject

	30/88/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	---------	--	--

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

30/89/1 Jardine,D S and J F Oppose That the plan change be withdrawn. G1 Reject

	30/89/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/90/1	Keene,Murray A	Oppose	Oppose any change to the current boundaries.	G7	Reject
	30/90/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/91/1	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Delete policy 7.2	B3.2	Reject
	30/91/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

30/91/2	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Alternative reword policy 7.2 To achieve approximately two thirds of the Districts urban growth within the defined Area Centres...	B3.2	Partly Accept
30/91/3	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Amend policy 7.5 to enable the de-facto boundary to include a rural lifestyle buffer zone between the urban and rural areas as envisaged within the Kingston 2020 Community document.	B3.5	Reject
30/91/4	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Alternatively define a separate urban boundary for the Kingston settlement.	B3.5	Reject
30/91/5	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Delete policy 7.6.	B3.6	Reject
30/91/6	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Delete implementation method i c).	B4.1	Reject

Appendix 2

30/91/7	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	Delete the assessment matters proposed for 5.4.2.3, 5.8.2 and 8.3.2.	F	Reject
30/91/8	Kingston Village Limited	Oppose	That the relief sought is accepted.		Partly Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/92/1	Ladies Mile Partnership	Oppose	That the provisions of Plan Change 30 be withdrawn and/or rejected in their entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/92/1/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/92/1/2	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
	30/92/2	Ladies Mile Partnership	Oppose	Modify Plan Change by: Deleting Policies 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.10, and 7.11	B3.4 B3.5 B3.6 B3.8 B3.9	Reject
	30/92/2/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/92/3	Ladies Mile Partnership	Oppose	Amend Policy 7.8 by deleting: within defined urban boundaries.	B3.7	Reject
	30/92/3/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/92/4	Ladies Mile Partnership	Oppose	Delete definitions of Urban Growth and Urban Zones.	E1 E2	Reject
	30/92/4/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
	30/92/5	Ladies Mile Partnership	Oppose	Delete new assessment criteria introduced to Parts 5 & 8 of the District Plan.	F	Reject
	30/92/5/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		

30/92/6 Ladies Mile Partnership Oppose Suspend the processing of Plan Change 30 so that the approach to identification of urban boundaries for any urban or local centre can be integrated with and considered in association with the urban boundary framework provisions. B3.5 Reject

30/92/6/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

30/92/7 Ladies Mile Partnership Oppose Include Ladies Mile Partnership land within the Urban Growth Boundary as an extension of Lake Hayes Estate as shown on the plan provided. G9 Reject

30/92/7/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
30/92/7/2	Otago Regional Council		Oppose		

30/92/8 Ladies Mile Partnership Oppose Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as considered necessary to address the issues and concerns raised A1 A2 A3 B1.2 B3.5 C1 G2 G4 G9 Reject

30/92/8/1	East Wanaka Land Trust Limited		Support		
-----------	--------------------------------	--	---------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/93/1	Lake McKay Station Ltd	Oppose	That plan change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/93/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/94/1	LongShot Ltd	Oppose	That provision be made for dirty, dusty, noisy industrial activities that no one wants as neighbours.	G11	Reject
	30/94/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/94/1/2	Wanaka Landfill Limited and Maungatua Contracting (Wanaka) Limited		Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/95/1	McCulloch,Scott	Partly Support	Growth boundaries should consider the natural/greenbelt boundaries in place.	B3.9	Accept
	30/95/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/96/1	McRae,Pamela Jane	Oppose	Give the plan change more consideration and a public forum so that questions can be answered.	G12	Partly Accept
	30/96/1/1	Remarkables Park		Support		

		Limited				
--	--	---------	--	--	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/97/1	McRae,Robert Ian	Oppose	Not to proceed with the plan change in its present form.	G1	Reject

	30/97/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	-----------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/98/1	Miles,Carl	Oppose	That plan change 30 be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/98/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	-----------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/99/1	Ministry of Education	Other	Explicit inclusion of provision for education in policy 7.11	B3.9	Reject

	30/99/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	-----------	-----------------------------	--	--------	--	--

	30/99/2	Ministry of Education	Other	Exemption for education from policy 7.5 so that development of schools in not restricted to the urban area of Frankton until an Urban Growth Boundary has been established.	B3.5	Reject
--	---------	--------------------------	-------	---	------	--------

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/100/1	Mt Cardrona Station Limited	Oppose	That Plan Change 30 and the objectives, policies and methods specified be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/100/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

30/100/2 Mt Cardrona Station Limited Oppose That the Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone be added to the list of Local Centres and for provision to be made to allow minor adjustments of the structure plan boundaries. B3.1 Reject

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/101/1	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Partly Support	That the Plan Change be adopted subject to Assessment Criteria 4 xxx (e) (i) being amended to read: (i) preserve or enhance natural resources (soil, minerals, arir and water) landscapes, ecological habitats, historic heritage as defined in Section 2 (1) of the Resource Managemnet Act 1991, cultural features and reserves.	F	Accept
	30/101/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/101/2	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Partly Support	Provide a clear definition of town cramming.	C4	Reject

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/102/1	Newbold, Peter Eric	Oppose	That plan change 30 is withdrawn	G1	Reject
	30/102/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/103/1	Newman, Richard	Oppose	Abolish plan change 30.	G1	Reject
	30/103/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/104/1	Nugent, Denis	Partly Support	Include a policy under objective 1, section 4.9.3: To provide for growth predominantly in or adjoining existing urban settlements avoiding areas of high landscape or ecological value.	B3.10	Reject
	30/104/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		

30/104/2	Nugent, Denis	Partly Support	Insert a new method under objective 1, section 4.9.3: Apply urban boundaries to the District's settlements to discourage growth that would adversely affect the District's natural environment and landscape values.	B4.1	Reject
30/104/3	Nugent, Denis	Partly Support	Under objective 7 insert a policy or policies requiring structure planning of new areas that are to be incorporated into urban boundaries.	B3.10	Reject
30/104/4	Nugent, Denis	Partly Support	In the explanation and reasons under objective 7 give more emphasis to the value of urban boundaries in retaining rural areas with associated landscape, recreational and amenity values.	C8	Accept
30/104/5	Nugent, Denis	Partly Support	Note within the explanation and reasons under objective 7 that land within urban boundaries may also be retained for protection purposes.	C8	Accept

30/104/6	Nugent,Denis	Partly Support	Include in the environmental results: Protection of the visual and open space amenity values of the rural areas of the District.	D	Reject
30/104/7	Nugent,Denis	Partly Support	Such other amendments as will give effect to the submission.		Partly Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/105/1	NZ Transport Agency	Support	That the proposed plan change be accepted in its entirety, subject to considering the decisions requested, or similar outcomes.	G17	Partly Accept
	30/105/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		
	30/105/2	NZ Transport Agency	Partly Support	That 8.3.2 xxx a) be amended to read: The extent to which the proposal helps to meet the identified local needs of established settlements/township including where appropriate, the relevant Growth Management Strategy.	F	Accept

30/105/3 NZ Transport Agency Partly Support

That a new matter be incorporated to read (subject to refinement):
The extent to which a proposal provides for, or will promote, mechanisms to manage demand to travel, or will utilise and/or capitalise on existing mechanisms to manage demand to travel.
In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:
(i) improve the ability to undertake multi-purpose trips to destination nodes
(ii) reduces the distances that need to be travelled in order to reach destination nodes
(iii) supports a choice of travel modes that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport
(iv) capitalises on and/or establishes opportunities for destination nodes to provide access to a comprehensive mix of goods, services and activities

F Partly Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/106/1	Orr,Maurice	Oppose	Abandon the plan change.	G1	Reject

	30/106/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/107/1	Otago Regional Council	Partly Support	That the following be added to policy 7.11: a. Natural hazards b. Land contamination	B3.9	Partly Accept

	30/107/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

30/107/2 Otago Regional Council Partly Support That assessment criteria (ix) be amended to read: a. Avoid areas affected by natural hazards F Accept

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

30/108/1 Remarkables Park Limited Oppose That the plan change be declined. G1 Reject

30/108/2 Remarkables Park Limited Oppose That plan change 30 be placed on hold until plan changes 20 and 21 are ready for hearing. Plan changes 30, 20 and 21 (and possibly 29) should then be heard together. B3.5 Reject

Proforma **Sub. No.** **Submitter** **Position** **Decision Requested** **Issue/Category** **Recommendation**

30/109/1 Rippon Vineyard and Winery Oppose The Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary should be drawn as per the original public determination from the Wanaka 2020 workshops 24-28 May 2002. Lake Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary is defined by Lake Wanaka, Clutha River, Cardrona River, Alpha Face and Waterfall Creek. G9 Reject

	30/109/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

30/109/2 Rippon Vineyard and Winery Oppose That there be improved and efficient person to person dialogue with landowners and the ongoing support of land owners in maintaining existing and/or heritage land values. G12 Partly Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/110/1	Spary,Don	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject
	30/110/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/111/1	Steck,Ervin	Oppose	Abandon plan change 30.	G1	Reject
	30/111/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		

30/111/2 Steck,Ervin Oppose That a new long-term approach be taken to identify future growth areas in stages up to 50 years ahead. B3.4 Reject

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/112/1	Swaine,Karen V	Partly Support	That the current draft of the plan change should be better articulated so that it is not so open to interpretation, ensuring that rural areas are not in a vulnerable position with regard to the District Plan.	G6	Partly Accept
	30/112/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/113/1	Swinney,Ken and Carol	Partly Support	That the Council assesses the merits of and makes additional provision to the policy framework for incorporation of a phased or deferred zone technique to provide clear direction for phased growth outside of the proposed urban growth boundaries.	G13	Partly Accept

	30/113/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/114/1	The Boxer Hill Trust	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/114/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

30/114/2	The Boxer Hill Trust	Oppose	That the submitters' properties be included within the urban growth boundary on the relevant planning maps and provisions be included to enable growth and development in that area.	G9	Reject
----------	----------------------	--------	--	----	--------

30/114/3	The Boxer Hill Trust	Oppose	All consequential relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought.		Reject
----------	----------------------	--------	---	--	--------

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/115/1	Todd,Ian and Susan	Oppose	That the plan change be withdrawn.	G1	Reject

	30/115/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/116/1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Amensd the plan change to ensure that the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission is given effect to: The sustainable management of the National Grid as a physical resource Appropriate provision for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the network including ensuring that lines can be accessed That the existing network can be upgraded in order to meet growth in energy demand The protection of the existing network from issues of reverse sensitivity and the effects of others' activities	G14	Accept
	30/116/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
	30/116/2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Amend policy 7.11 as follows: To take account of the following matters when defining urban boundaries.. The location of existing and future (known) transmission line corridors	B3.9	Accept
	30/116/3	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain paragraph vii without modification.	C	Accept
	30/116/4	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Add the following to Section 4.9.4, Environmental Results Anticipated: (x) Avoidance of encroachment and adverse effects on the existing high-voltage transmsion lines.	D	Accept
	30/116/5	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Make the following amendments to Section 4 (xxx) (g) (vi): In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will: ..	F	Accept

(iv) avoid giving rise to reverse sensitivity issues (including any effects on regionally significant infrastructure).

..
(x) Identify and provide for appropriate Transmission Corridors.

30/116/6	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Any additions, deletions or consequential amendments made necessary as a result of the matters raised in these submissions.	Partly Accept
30/116/7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Any other such relief as to give effect to this submission.	Partly Accept

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/117/1	Waitipu Limited	Oppose	That the provisions of plan change 30 be withdrawn and/or rejected in their entirety.	G1	Reject
	30/117/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/117/2	Waitipu Limited	Oppose	Alternatively - That the definition of Urban Growth be deleted or otherwise amended to exclude community related activities and projects including any related buildings, parking and access that might be captured by the new definition.	E1	Reject

	30/117/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/117/3	Waitipu Limited	Oppose	Make such further additional, amended or consequential changes to any relevant part of the District Plan as are necessary to address the issues and concerns raised: Eastburn Station has been working alongside Council to implement two community related projects by the Crown Range and Cardrona Valley roads. Concerned that PC 30 will be a significant obstacle for the implementation of these projects.	G15	Partly Accept
	30/117/3/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/118/1	Wanaka Landfill Limited and Maungatua Contracting (Wanaka) Limited	Oppose	Identify more clearly the criteria for defining urban boundaries and formulate them with regard to appropriate objectives and policies.	B3.9	Partly Accept
	30/118/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
	30/118/2	Wanaka Landfill Limited and Maungatua Contracting (Wanaka) Limited	Oppose	Define the urban boundaries with proper regard to the need for all land use, rather than predominantly residential.	G11	Accept
	30/118/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

30/118/3	Wanaka Landfill Limited and Maungatua Contracting (Wanaka) Limited	Oppose	Identify in the plan change areas of existing and future industrial use and identify objectives, policies and methods to protect those areas from reverse sensitivity effects.	G11	Partly Accept
-----------------	---	---------------	---	------------	----------------------

	30/118/3/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	--

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/119/1	Wanaka Station Trust (Mills Sub Trust)	Oppose	Withdraw the entire plan change until such time as proposed urban growth boundaries are mapped and are able to be considered alongside the proposed District Plan provisions.	B3.5	Reject
	30/119/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		
	30/119/2	Wanaka Station Trust (Mills Sub Trust)	Oppose	Alternatively , such amendments to proposed plan change 30 provisions as adequately address the submitter's concerns	B1.2 B3.5 G9 G12 G16	Partly Accept
	30/119/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Partly Support		

<u>Proforma</u>	<u>Sub. No.</u>	<u>Submitter</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Decision Requested</u>	<u>Issue/Category</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
	30/120/1	Willowridge Developments Limited	Oppose	Delete policy 7.2	B3.2	Reject
	30/120/1/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/120/2	Willowridge Developments Limited	Oppose	Alternatively Reword policy 7.2: To achieve approximately two thirds of the Districts urban growth within the defined Area Centres...	B3.2	Partly Accept
	30/120/2/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/120/3	Willowridge Developments Limited	Partly Support	Reword policy 7.5: To use Urban Boundaries to define the spatial parameters of urban growth and indicate this on the Planning Maps. Where detailed Urban Boundaries have not been defined for those settlements within the settlement hierarchy, to use the outer extremity of the settlement's existing urban or rural residential zones as the de-facto boundary.	B3.5	Reject
	30/120/3/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/120/4	Willowridge Developments Limited	Oppose	That policy 7.6 is deleted	B3.6	Reject
	30/120/4/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
	30/120/5	Willowridge Developments Limited	Oppose	That implementation method i c) is deleted.	B4.1	Reject
	30/120/5/1	Remarkables Park		Oppose		

		Limited				
--	--	---------	--	--	--	--

30/120/6 Willowridge Developments Limited **Oppose** **That the assessment matters proposed for sections 5.4.2.3, F 5.8.2 and 8.3.2 be deleted** **Reject**

	30/120/6/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

30/120/7 Willowridge Developments Limited **Oppose** **That the relief sought is accepted.** **Partly Accept**

	30/120/7/1	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose		
--	------------	--------------------------	--	--------	--	--

GROWTH DISTRIBUTION IN THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT

INTRODUCTION:

This paper considers some of the key drivers that influence urban growth within Queenstown Lakes District and provides statistical analysis of these factors.

Urban Growth sectors:

Urban growth comprises a range of land uses and activities, including:

- Residential
- Industrial/Business
- Commercial/Retail
- Community facilities

Drivers for growth and its distribution:

In order to understand potential growth scenarios it is necessary to consider supply and demand factors in the local area. Supply consists of land that has development potential. Demand is driven by population and economic growth.

Supply:

Current commitments (zoning & consents) have a significant bearing on the distribution of new development. These form an initial baseline from which studies can evaluate future growth scenarios.

Council's Dwelling Capacity Model provides regularly updated data on the amount of land that is zoned and consented for residential development. Further studies are undertaken periodically for specific topic areas.

Demand:

Council undertakes Growth Projections on a regular basis to provide information on the likely scale, nature and location of population change. Other studies have been commissioned to provide assessments of the need for economic growth and development, including the Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Study 2006.

Residential development makes up approximately 90% of the Districts urban growth.

Infrastructure:

The availability and ability to provide infrastructure services is a key consideration in determining the location of urban growth. There is a range of existing infrastructure throughout the District. However, these facilities are not evenly distributed nor are they all to the same standard.

Growth Management Strategy 2007:

The guiding principles of the Queenstown Lakes District Growth Management Strategy are:

Growth is located in appropriate areas to protect the environment, consolidate development in high density areas and to support new growth areas where these are needed.

The type and mix of growth is appropriate to long term needs, enabling a balanced, more stable community and a more diverse economy.

Infrastructure is provided in a way that supports high quality development located in the right places while adhering to the principles of sustainable development and ensuring that the environmental qualities of the district are protected.

The quality of the environment is improved through good design of individual developments and precincts.

The costs of development reflect demands on infrastructure as well as helping to achieve desired outcomes.

Integrated planning processes are followed that involve the community and stakeholders in identifying issues, solutions and actions. Infrastructure and land uses are planned together. The Council closely monitors development trends and acts to avoid unwanted outcomes.

Principle 1b of the Growth Management Strategy identifies a target of accommodating 85% of the District's growth over the period 2006-2026 in Queenstown and Wanaka.

Principle 1d recognises the need for smaller settlements to achieve a critical mass of around 800 to 1,000 dwellings in order to support local services and infrastructure.

The different components of urban growth are addressed in turn below.

RESIDENTIAL

Residential development will make up a significant proportion, but not all of the future urban growth within the District.

There is sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected dwelling requirement up to 2026 within the current zones in Queenstown, Wanaka and the Townships/Rural areas.

Overall there is a 30% buffer after deductions are made in relation to land availability issues (eg land banking) and the specialist/locational factors relating to the Rural Visitor zone. This 'over supply' is equivalent to about 6 years growth. It provides capacity to absorb fluctuations in the development market and changing trends over this time period. The surplus is relatively evenly distributed between the Area Centres (Queenstown & Wanaka) and Townships/Rural areas, with a slight bias to the Area Centres.

The distribution of projected residential growth and available development capacity is capable of achieving 71% within the main urban centres.

Whilst the residential growth component falls below the Growth Management Strategy's 85% target, it needs to be considered along side other land use activities which are likely to have a considerable urban bias.

1. Current Distribution

2006	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural	Total
Occupied dwellings	4,110	2,145	3,036	9,291
Unoccupied Dwellings	1,347	1,335	1,155	3,837
Visitor Accommodation units	5,973	2,348	893	9,214
Total	11,430	5,828	5,084	22,342
%	51	26	23	100
Area Centres %	77		-	-

2. Growth Projections 2008

2006-2026	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural	Total
Dwellings	3,021	2,710	3,120	8,851
Visitor Units	2,995	1,177	1,003	5,175
Total	6,016	3,887	4,123	14,026
Annual average	301	194	206	701
Area Centres	9,903		-	71%

85% = 11,922 15% = 2,104

3. Dwelling Capacity

2009	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural	Total
Residual Capacity + Approved but not built	7,901	4,469	9,919	22,289
Excluding Rural Visitor	Area Centres 12,370		5,905	18,275
%	68		32	100

4. Residual capacity

@ 2026	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural*	Total
Total	1,885	582	1,782	4,249
%	44	14	42	100
Area Centres %	58		-	-

* Excluding Rural Visitor Zone

5. Residential Land Requirement

2006-2026	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural	Total
Total dwelling unit equivalent demand	6,016	3,887	4,123	14,026
Net land area (Ha) assuming average lot size of 700m ² **	421	272	289	982
%	43	28	29	100
Area Centres %	71		-	-

** Equivalent to typical residential densities of approximately 12 dwellings per hectare.

COMMERCIAL

The urban centres of Queenstown and Wanaka are the focus for industrial, business and commercial development within the District. There is limited provision in smaller townships such as Arrowtown.

The Commercial and Industrial Land Needs Study 2006 indicates the following land requirements beyond current zoning & commitments:

6. Additional Commercial & Industrial land requirements up to 2026

Land Area Ha	Queenstown	Wanaka	Total
Industrial/Business	58	30	88
Retail/Commercial	0	10	10
Total	58	40	98

There is a need for additional Industrial/Business land in both Queenstown and Wanaka. Rezoning is currently progressing at Frankton Flats (PC 19) in Queenstown and Three Parks (PC 16) at Wanaka. These Plan Changes together with land recently rezoned at Ballantyne Ponds, Wanaka will be capable of meeting the identified needs in the Area Centres.

There is only limited need for additional commercial retail land (there being capacity to intensify existing commercial areas). Assuming that the Five Mile development at Frankton Flats progresses, there is no need for additional land within Queenstown. The additional land requirement in Wanaka can be met within the proposed Three Parks development.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

There are a range of community facilities that are needed to support population growth these include:

- Education
- Health Care
- Recreation
- Emergency Services

Education:

In 2009 the Ministry of Education prepared the Wakatipu Area Strategy and the Wanaka Area Report. These indicate that a new secondary and a new primary school are required in the Frankton Flats area of Queenstown prior to 2021. This could have a land requirement of approximately 13Ha. Whilst a projected shortfall of approximately 300 secondary school places is indicated in Wanaka by 2026, the report does not identify the need for a new school site.

Health:

There are ongoing discussions with the DHB regarding the future intentions for Queenstown Hospital. No land requirements have yet been identified.

Recreation:

The Council's Parks Strategy 2002 does not identify the need for any significant new facilities, but it notes that neighbourhood and local reserves will be required as part of residential growth. Consideration is being given to the provision of sports and aquatic facilities in Wanaka, but as yet no additional land requirements have been determined.

Emergency Services:

No land requirements have been identified.

LAND REQUIREMENT

Based on the Growth Projections set out above the amount of land needed to meet the identified growth needs of the community are as follows:

7. Total urban growth land requirement

Area in Ha	Queenstown	Wanaka	Townships/ Rural	Total	% by sector
Residential	421	272	289	982	90
Industrial/Business	58	30	0	88	8
Commercial	0	10	0	10	1
Community Facilities	13	0	0	13	1
Total	492	312	289	1093	100
% by area	45	29	26	100	-
Area Centres %	74		-	-	-

Residential development makes up approximately 90% of the land requirements for growth.

Approximately 74% of total growth is focused on the main centres of Queenstown and Wanaka.

INFRASTRUCTURE

There are a range of infrastructure services available within the District. The District's topography and size has an impact on the delivery of services. Council's infrastructure planning is based around the District's Growth Projections and the Growth Management Strategy.

Transportation

The transportation network is primarily based around roading, although there is a more comprehensive range of facilities within the larger settlements, including scheduled local public transport services in Queenstown, extending as far as Arrowtown. The roading network comprises a hierarchy of State Highways, Arterial, Collector and Local roads. These connect the District's settlements and provide access to some of the rural areas. They are generally located in the valleys and lower lying areas of the District. The standard of the roads varies, with the higher quality and more comprehensive networks focused on the main settlements. In a number of rural areas the roads have unsealed metalled surfaces. Increasing development in rural areas will give rise to pressure for upgrades to the rural road network.

Council has developed two Transportation Strategies covering the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka areas. These consist of a combination of complementary measures that focus on promoting Travel Demand Management (improving modal choice including walking and cycling, particularly in Wanaka), Public Transport (improved network coverage, particularly in the Wakatipu area), Parking management (achieving an appropriate balance through supply, location and management measures) and Roothing (efficient movement and access, enabling multi modal use). Additionally the On Foot, By Cycle Strategy promotes a series of dedicated cycling and walking projects including arterial trails and routes within the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka areas.

Water Supply

There are eight public (QLDC) water supply schemes within the District. These are located in Queenstown, Arrowtown, Lake Hayes, Arthur's Point, Glenorchy, Wanaka & Albert Town, Luggate and Hawea. There is approximately 290km of reticulation, serving these areas, with a total replacement value of \$84 million. The Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-19 (LTCCP) indicates that Council plans to invest approximately \$156 million developing the water supply infrastructure in these locations and providing new services to the communities of Cardrona, Gibbston and Luggate.

Wastewater:

Public (QLDC) wastewater schemes are provided in seven settlements – Queenstown, Lake Hayes Estate, Arthur's Point, Arrowtown, Wanaka, Albert Town and Hawea. There are approximately 273km of reticulation with a replacement value of \$90 million. The 2009-19 LTCCP indicates that Council plans to invest approximately \$130 million in these settlements and at Cardrona, Glenorchy, Kingston and Luggate.

Stormwater:

Council operates stormwater systems within eight communities – Queenstown, Arrowtown, Arthur's Point, Glenorchy, Wanaka, Albert Town, Hawea and Luggate. There are over 174km of reticulated services with a value of approximately \$57 million. The LTCCP indicates that Council plans to invest approximately \$12 million in these settlements and Luggate in the period 2009-19.

The Council's reticulated water services are provided in a number of established settlements. These correspond with the settlement hierarchy set out in District Plan Change 30 – Urban Boundary Framework. The value of these existing physical resources is significant, being over \$200 million dollars. Council has planned further network development, with substantial public investment in the region of \$300 million identified over the next ten years.

There are a number of private infrastructure schemes of various size and standard within the District. These often provide services to specific developments in rural areas, such as Jack's Point.

ASSESSMENT

At present land supply is broadly in step with development demand. Current zoning provisions together with proposals for new zoning at Frankton Flats, Ballantyne Ponds and Three Parks will enable the District's growth projections to be met up to 2026.

There is an 'oversupply' of residential land. Whilst surplus capacity provides some flexibility and choice within the market, there is potential for the market to distort projected growth patterns. There are a number of risks associated with this.

Assuming a worst case scenario, where the market prioritises the use of the Township/Rural capacity, this could result in only 58% of residential growth in the next 20 years being within the Area Centres of Queenstown and Wanaka. The implications of this type of development pattern would be to dilute urban growth with consequential effects on the efficient use of urban land and infrastructure. This would cause major problems for Council as the LTCCPs projects and funding are based around the modelled growth projections.

Conversely if the market chose to prioritise growth in the main urban centres, it would be possible to accommodate up to 88% of the Districts residential growth in the Area Centres. This would marginally exceed the Growth Management Strategy's target. However, this could have implications for the sustainability of the small rural townships and would place additional pressure on urban infrastructure. This may prevent the provision of infrastructure in townships if they are unable to achieve sufficient economies of scale.

It is considered unlikely that such extreme scenarios would occur in practice. However, it is clear that the current planning provisions cannot guarantee that the pattern of growth will achieve the Growth Management Strategy target of 85% within the main urban centres.

Opportunities to 'correct' the distribution are limited and problematic. Down zoning is likely to be highly difficult and would be resisted by land owners.

In order to achieve an integrated and sustainable approach to urban growth it is necessary to ensure that there is co-ordination between land use and the current and planned infrastructure services. Failure to achieve such co-ordination would result in the inefficient utilisation of substantial physical resources. This would have significant cost implications for Council and the District's rate payers.

Urban Boundaries will help to reinforce the delivery of the spatial component of the Growth Management Strategy by focusing the majority of future urban growth proposals in and around the main centres, and resisting any further distribution outside recognised settlements.

Although it appears generally desirable to resist further growth beyond existing zoning provisions within Townships, it will be important to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to meet the local needs of individual communities. This includes providing scope for employment opportunities, local services and affordable housing. Provided this is aimed at meeting local needs and the overall scale of any additional development in the Township is small, then the ability to achieve a higher degree of self sufficiency for the community and reduce the need to travel could outweigh broader spatial planning targets.

Providing 15% of residential growth outside the Area Centres would support an increase equivalent to 234 dwellings per Local Centre over the period 2006-2026 (based on the 9 Local Centres identified in PC 30). Increasing the provision to 25% would enable approximately 150 more dwellings in each Township. This would contribute towards achieving Principle 1d of the Growth Management Strategy. It should be noted that it would be unlikely that the amount of growth would be equally distributed between Townships over any given time period. Some settlements may grow faster than others. This may be due to localised development opportunities, or related to a slowing of growth where the anticipated range of development and services is reached. The key consideration is not so much the rate of growth, rather the ability to reach the critical mass needed to sustain local services upon which the community will rely.

Based on the current land supply situation, projections of future growth and the policy direction established through the Growth Management Strategy, it is considered that it would be appropriate to slightly reduce the growth target for the Area Centres of Queenstown and Wanaka from 85% to 75%. This is likely to be more realistic in the current circumstances and would maintain the current ratio and pattern of urban development within the District. This approach would still achieve a sustainable pattern of urban growth that is consistent with the overall approach of the Growth Management Strategy.

CONCLUSION

Urban Boundaries will help to influence the distribution of development and support the spatial aspects of the Growth Management Strategy. However, due to the current land supply situation it may take some time for urban boundaries to have full effect in managing the distribution of development.

Due to the current supply and demand situation, Urban Boundaries should generally be tightly drawn around existing zoning.

Whilst it is possible to achieve the general spatial pattern sought by the Growth Management Strategy, it is considered appropriate to revise the growth target for the Area Centres of Queenstown and Wanaka to 75%.

Mark Rushworth

Senior Policy Analyst
Queenstown Lakes District Council

January 2010

X Plan Change 30 – Urban Boundary Framework

Proposed changes

The changes proposed to the notified version of this Plan Change in response to submissions are as follows. Additions are underlined and deletions are shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

1. *Add a new objective to 4.9.3 Objectives and Policies as follows:*

4 District Wide Issues

4.9 Urban Growth

4.9.3 Objectives and Policies

Objective 7 Sustainable Management of Development

The scale and distribution of urban growth is effectively managed to ensure a sustainable pattern of development is achieved.

Policies

7.1 *To establish a settlement hierarchy for the District as follows:*

Area Centres

- *Queenstown (including Frankton, Kelvin Heights) and*
- *Wanaka (including Albert Town)*

Local Centres

- *Arrowtown*
- *Lake Hayes Estate*
- *Hawea (including Hawea Flat)*
- *Luggate*
- *Makarora*
- *Glenorchy*
- *Kingston*
- *Cardrona*
- *Arthurs Point*
- *Jack's Point*

7.2 *To achieve ~~85%~~ 75% of the Districts urban growth within the defined Area Centres. This will include provision for meeting local and higher order/district wide needs for housing, employment opportunities, retail and community services and recreation facilities.*

7.3 *To enable the local economic, social and community needs of rural townships and communities to be met in the defined Local Centres.*

7.4 *To use Urban Boundaries to enable sustainable urban development that will meet the identified needs of the community over a twenty year time horizon to occur, and to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained to meet the short term urban growth needs of the community.*

7.5 *To use Urban Boundaries to define the spatial parameters of urban development, and indicate this on the Planning Maps. Where detailed Urban Boundaries have not been defined for those settlements within the settlement hierarchy, to use the outer extremity of the settlement's existing urban zones as the de-facto boundary.*

7.6 *To implement a sequential approach to land release for urban growth as follows:*

7.6.1 *Priority will be given to the utilisation of appropriately zoned and consented land within Urban Boundaries.*

7.6.2 *Where additional land, beyond the available capacity of current zoning and approved consents, is required for urban growth*

initial consideration will be given to further land release within the defined Urban Boundaries, taking into account the need to prioritise land within Inner Boundaries prior to Outer Boundaries (where they exist).

- 7.6.3 *Only in exceptional circumstances, where there is an identified need for urban growth and there is insufficient capacity available within the Urban Boundary, or the land is unsuitable for the type of development required to meet the identified need, and no suitable opportunities exist within higher order settlements will consideration be given to land release beyond the identified Urban Boundary.*
- 7.6.4 *Where land is considered for urban growth outside an identified Urban Boundary priority shall be given to extending settlements with a defined Urban Boundary, subject to an assessment of the potential effects on the natural and physical resources related to the land adjacent to the Urban Boundary and the potential impact on the settlements character and identity.*
- 7.6.5 *Only when there is no suitable land available within or adjacent to an Urban Boundary can consideration be given to other locations for urban growth.*
- 7.6.6 *In considering proposals for urban growth outside Urban Boundaries Council must be satisfied that all reasonable measures have been taken to evaluate and prioritise the use of previously developed land, unless this would conflict with other objectives and policies.*
- 7.7 *To use effective urban design to achieve successful integration of growth areas and new development with existing settlements and adjacent areas, and to avoid potential adverse effects from reverse sensitivity.*
- 7.8 *To avoid piecemeal development that could compromise the delivery of sustainable future urban areas within defined Urban Boundaries.*
- 7.9 *To achieve a scale and pattern of urban growth that maintains or enhances the character and amenity of individual settlements and reinforces local identity.*
- 7.10 *To avoid sporadic and/or ad hoc urban growth in the rural areas of the District.*
- 7.11 *To take account of the following matters when defining Urban Boundaries:*

 - 7.11.1 *The character and scale of the existing urban area*
 - 7.11.2 *The identified needs of the community*
 - 7.11.3 *The need to optimise and enhance the use of urban resources, including infrastructure*
 - 7.11.4 *The capacity of infrastructure (utility and social) networks to accommodate growth*
 - 7.11.5 *The need to reduce energy consumption*
 - 7.11.6 *The need to avoid urban sprawl*
 - 7.11.7 *The need to safeguard sensitive resources*
 - 7.11.8 *The need to achieve cohesive urban areas*
 - 7.11.9 *The need to mitigate the effects of urban development*
 - 7.11.10 *The need to contribute to achieving a sustainable pattern of development*
 - 7.11.11 *The need to achieve a clear and logical alignment that will differentiate between urban and rural areas, and provide a robust defensible limit to urban growth.*
 - 7.11.12 *The need to avoid areas affected by natural hazards.*
 - 7.11.13 *The location of existing and future (known) transmission line corridors.*

APPENDIX 4: PLAN CHANGE 30 – URBAN BOUNDARY FRAMEWORK

X

Implementation Methods

Objective 7 and associated policies will be implemented through a number of methods:

i District Plan

- (a) Establishment of a settlement hierarchy.
- (b) Identification of Urban Boundaries.
- (c) Sequential approach to land release for urban growth.
- (d) Assessment criteria for urban growth proposals in rural areas

ii Other Methods

- (a) The use of Growth Management Strategies to guide and align policy and project development.
- (b) Provision of works and services in settlements through the LTCCP process and external agency funding.
- (c) Monitoring of land availability, development trends and projecting future growth needs.
- (d) The use of Structure Plans to establish development potential in growth areas.
- (e) Community Plans to identify local characteristics and aspirations.

Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption

The spatial distribution of activities is an integral factor in achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. A sustainable pattern of development is one that:

- i Meets local needs – enabling communities to meet their social, economic and cultural needs locally. Recognising that there is a

hierarchy to the delivery of services and facilities. Ensuring that a balanced mix of land uses and activities is achieved.

- ii Reduces energy consumption – reducing the need to travel by enabling communities to have convenient access to a range of local services and facilities that they require to meet their daily needs. Improving the ability to undertake multi-purpose trips to destination nodes. Supporting a choice of travel modes that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Utilise solar access to buildings.
- iii Optimises the use of urban resources – promoting the efficient use of physical resources and services, including developable land and infrastructure, within established settlement areas by concentrating growth whilst avoiding town cramming. Using a staged approach to land release.
- iv Avoids urban sprawl – achieving a compact urban form that maintains the character and setting of settlements and promotes accessible communities. Containing urban development, providing a clear distinction between urban and rural areas. Safeguarding the character of rural areas by avoiding ad hoc urban development and the cumulative effects of urbanisation.
- v Safeguards sensitive resources – recognising the value of natural resources (soil, minerals, air and water), landscapes, ecological habitats, heritage and cultural features and reserves.
- vi Achieves cohesive urban areas – co-ordinating and integrating new development and activities in a way that reflects local circumstances, promotes social capital and improves the efficiency of service delivery and transport through effective urban design.
- vii Mitigates the effects of activities and development – prioritising the use of previously developed land or sites with the lowest productive soil classification. Avoiding sensitive landscapes whilst achieving integration into the landscape. Preserving or enhancing ecological habitats and features of heritage and cultural significance. Avoiding natural hazards. Avoiding giving rise to reverse sensitivity issues. Providing safe access and avoiding a reduction in the level of service of the transportation

APPENDIX 4: PLAN CHANGE 30 – URBAN BOUNDARY FRAMEWORK

X

network in the vicinity. Contributes to the delivery of an efficient, effective and integrated infrastructure network.

- viii Takes a holistic view – considering strategic as well as local issues.
- ix Facilitates community outcomes – through an integrated approach with the LTCCP, the Growth Management Strategy and Community Plans.

A hierarchical network of settlements based on functionality will help to achieve a co-ordinated and integrated approach to urban growth throughout the District, improving efficiency and accessibility to services. It will enable urban development to strengthen the role, vitality and viability of existing centres, and make a positive contribution to the sustainability of the communities and environment.

Area Centres are the main service centres for the District. They should be highly accessible and will accommodate the majority of urban growth. It is important that they achieve a mix of land use activities that supports their role and allows for a high degree of self sufficiency. This will include housing, employment, retail, commerce, visitor accommodation, entertainment, recreation, open space, community facilities (such as education and health care) and infrastructure. Higher order services and facilities aimed at meeting wider district or sub regional needs will be provided in these centres.

Local Centres will accommodate a smaller proportion of development and a more limited range of activities primarily focused on meeting the day to day needs of the local community.

Below this level the focus of centres is primarily on providing visitor facilities. These can have different locational requirements and characteristics compared to traditional settlements. Kinloch township and the Rural Visitor zones are generally remote and largely undeveloped at present. The Resort zones of Millbrook, ~~Jacks Point~~ and Waterfall Creek cater for specific types of development. Whilst there is potential for urban forms of development to occur in these areas, there are specific provisions, including Structure Plans, to manage their growth and development. It is therefore not currently considered necessary to include them within the settlement hierarchy.

Urban Boundaries provide the context for managing the growth of individual settlements. They are intended to promote a sustainable pattern of development. This can have a positive effect on the social, economic and cultural well being of the community and can avoid or mitigate adverse environmental effects associated with urban sprawl and inappropriate urban growth in rural areas. Urban boundaries will help to protect the setting of settlements and the character and amenity values of the rural environment. Not all land within urban boundaries will be suitable for development. Some areas will need to be retained as open space for their recreational and amenity value. Open areas may also be required to support low impact infrastructure design solutions.

Some development and growth will continue to be appropriate within rural areas. Typically this will need to utilise rural resources and will be smaller in scale and less intensive than urban growth. However, it is noted that some activities that require a rural location will be more intensive than is normally the case for such areas. These activities can include ski fields, viticulture and factory farming.

In order to ensure that the needs of the community continue to be met as it grows, it is appropriate to ensure that sufficient land remains available for development and that future land releases occur in a timely and co-ordinated manner. Urban Boundaries are intended to provide for the general growth needs of the community over a twenty year period. They will provide for the full range of activities needed to support the urban population of the District. This will enable integration with other plans and strategies, including infrastructure delivery. Maintaining a minimum land supply to cater for five years growth will ensure that the short term needs of the community can be met. Where the land supply falls below this level this will be an indicator that a boundary review may be required.

In addition to assessing the likely levels of growth (demand) it is also important to understand the ability of the area to accommodate additional development (supply).

Although land may be zoned for urban purposes within the Urban Boundary there is no certainty that it will all be released for development. There are various reasons for this, including: personal attachment, land banking, covenants and developability. In relation to Policy 7.6 land release refers to zoning and resource consents.

Whilst achieving a consolidated urban form has a number of benefits, it is important to ensure that focusing development into a finite area does not result in town cramming – increasing the density of development to such an extent that it would compromise cultural, historic and environmental resources or amenity values. It is also important to ensure that regard is given to the capacity of infrastructure, utilities and community facilities, such as schools and health care.

Monitoring of development rates and land availability, together with assessments of future growth needs are required in order to ensure that provisions for development remain relevant and up to date. The district’s dwelling capacity study and other research on growth and development requirements will indicate whether there is a need to identify additional land to accommodate the longer term development needs of the community. However, the supply of land is not uniform across the District and the needs of individual communities need to be considered when assessing proposals for urban growth.

Whilst it is prudent to plan for longer term development requirements, not all the land identified as being suitable for growth needs to be developed at once. The staged release of land will allow development to be paced according to need and enable infrastructure and utility service provision to be co-ordinated with planned growth. This will also help to ensure that available land within currently zoned areas is effectively utilised prior to rezoning additional land, and it will assist in maintaining a five year supply of land to meet short term needs.

In some circumstances (larger settlements with higher levels of growth) a sequential approach to land release, using Inner and Outer boundaries, can help to co-ordinate development and achieve a cohesive approach with the existing urban environment.

Land resources are finite and the extent to which development may occur is subject to a number of constraints. A sustainable pattern of development must therefore contribute to achieving an efficient use of land. Accordingly, development proposals should not sterilise the potential of other land and buildings to be developed. A structured approach to land release and development will help to avoid the risk of ad hoc or piece meal development.

Urban growth should be highly connected with existing settlements and the community, in particular it should support successful integration with the social and infrastructure networks.

2. Amend 4.9.4 Environmental Results Anticipated as follows:

4.9.4 Environmental Results Anticipated

Implementation of the policies and methods for management relating to urban growth will result in:

- ...
- ix Compact urban settlements.
- x A development pattern that responds positively to the character and identity of the area.
- xi Efficient use of urban land and infrastructure.
- xii Successful assimilation of new development with existing settlements and rural areas.
- xiii Integrated delivery of development and infrastructure. Achieving co-ordination between growth strategies and service provision – District Plan (RMA), LTCCP (LGA), Transport (LTMA).
- xiv Incremental release of land for development.
- xv Sufficient land of a suitable quality in appropriate locations is identified to meet medium – long term development needs of the community for housing, industrial, retail and commercial development, and for community (health & education), leisure and recreation facilities.
- xvi Improved access to housing, jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities, open space, sport and recreation.
- xvii Developments that attract a large number of people, especially retail, leisure and office development, are focused in existing settlements to promote their vitality and viability, social inclusion and more sustainable patterns of development.

- xviii *More efficient use of urban land through higher density, mixed use development and the use of vacant and underused or previously developed land and buildings.*
- xix *The character of rural areas is not eroded by the cumulative effects of urban growth and development.*
- xx *Avoidance of encroachment and adverse effects on the existing high voltage transmission network.*

3. Add the following to the Definitions section:

Definitions

URBAN GROWTH	<p>Means development of a type, scale or intensity that is not consistent with rural activities or characteristics, <u>does not require a rural location</u> and is intended to serve as a focus for residential, commercial, business, industrial or community activities.</p> <p>It will normally have one or more of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A density of development > 2.5 dwellings or sections per hectare (sections of less than 4,000m²) - Building coverage of the site or lots in excess of 15% - A concentration of over 10 adjacent dwellings, VA units, building platforms or sections with common access/servicing arrangements, including reticulated infrastructure - Generates in excess of 100 vehicle trips per day <p>Urban growth includes clusters of built development within a more extensive landscaped/open area.</p>
URBAN ZONES	<p>Means the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Township - Business - Industrial - Wanaka Town Centre - Queenstown Town Centre - Town Centre Transition Sub Zone - Arrowtown Town Centre - Corner Shopping Centre - Low Density Residential - High Density Residential - Residential Arrowtown Historic Management - Queenstown Airport Mixed Use - Special Zones (Remarkables Park, Penrith Park, Meadow Park, Quail Rise, Frankton Flats, Mount Cardrona Station, Ballantyne Road Mixed Use, Three Parks, Kingston Village only) - Rural Visitor Zone (Cardrona & Arthurs Point only).

4. Add the following Assessment Criteria on Urban Growth outside Urban Boundaries to the end of the following sections (the numbering of the Assessment criteria currently shown as 'xxx' will be different in each section):

- 5.4.2.3 Assessment Matters General
- 5.8.2 Assessment Matters
- 8.3.2 Assessment Matters

xxx **Urban Growth outside Urban Boundaries:**

In considering proposals for urban growth outside Urban Boundaries the following guiding principles shall apply:

- A. *Urban growth should only occur outside Urban Boundaries in exceptional circumstances.*
- B. *Urban growth should contribute to achieving a sustainable pattern of development.*

In considering proposals for urban growth outside Urban Boundaries Council shall have regard to:

- (a) *The extent to which the proposal helps to meet the identified local needs of established settlements/townships, including where appropriate the relevant Growth Management Strategy.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

- (i) *enable communities to meet their social, economic, environmental and cultural needs locally*
- (ii) *be proportionate to the needs of the local community, recognising that there is a hierarchy to the delivery of services and facilities*

(iii) *contribute to achieving an appropriate mix and balance of land uses and activities*

(b) *The extent to which the proposal provides for, or will promote mechanisms to manage demand to travel, and reduces energy consumption.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

(i) *reduce the need to travel by enabling communities to have convenient access to a range of local services and facilities that they require to meet their daily needs*

(ii) *improve the ability to undertake multi-purpose trips to destination nodes*

(iii) *support a choice of travel modes that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport*

(iv) *utilise solar access to buildings*

(c) *Whether opportunities exist to utilise existing urban resources.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

(i) *promote the efficient use of identified and committed physical resources, particularly zoned and consented land, infrastructure networks and other services within Urban Boundaries*

(ii) *be necessary to avoid the adverse effects of town cramming*

(d) *The extent to which the proposal avoids urban sprawl.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

(i) *achieve a compact urban form*

(ii) *contain urban development by concentrating growth on established settlement areas*

(iii) *promote accessible communities*

(iv) *avoid cumulative effects that result in the urbanisation of rural areas*

(e) *The extent to which the proposal safeguards sensitive resources.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

(i) *preserve or enhance natural resources (soil, minerals, air and water), landscapes, ecological habitats, historic heritage (as defined by Section 2 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991) and cultural features that are identified for their intrinsic value, and reserves.*

(f) *The extent to which the proposal achieves cohesive urban areas.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

(i) *provide effective urban design that successfully integrates activities*

(ii) *co-ordinate the delivery of activities and infrastructure*

(iii) *preserve or enhance the character and identity of an adjacent settlement and the surrounding area*

(iv) *preserve or enhance the social capital of the local community*

- (v) *be compatible with the scale of existing urban development*
- (vi) *safeguard the amenity values of adjacent activities*
- (g) *The extent to which the proposed site will help to mitigate the effects of urban development.*

In considering whether the potential effects of proposals for urban growth are minor Council should be satisfied that the proposal will:

- (i) *maximise opportunities to re use previously developed land, other than where this conflicts with other criteria*
- (ii) *utilise land with the least productive soil classification*
- (iii) *avoid sensitive landscapes, and can be successfully assimilated into the landscape*
- (iv) *preserve or enhance ecological habitats, particularly significant indigenous vegetation and fauna*
- (v) *preserve or enhance heritage and cultural features*
- (vi) *avoid giving rise to reverse sensitivity issues (including any effects on regionally significant infrastructure)*
- (vii) *provide safe vehicular access and avoid a reduction in the level of service of the transportation network*
- (viii) *contribute to the delivery of an integrated infrastructure network*
- (ix) *avoid areas affected by ~~of identified~~ natural hazards.*
- (x) *Identify and provide for appropriate transmission corridors.*